



Re-Certification Audit Report

2010-2014 Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Standard

November 7, 2014

A. Indiana Division of Forestry FRS # 6L841

B. Scope:

No Change Changed

C. NSF Audit Team: Lead Auditor: Mike Ferrucci Auditors: Dave Wager, Tucker Watts

D. Audit Dates: **October 14-17**

E. Reference Documentation:

2010-2014 SFI Standard®

Company SFI Documentation: Rev. Level: Date Revised:

F. Audit Results: Based on the results at this visit, the auditor concluded

- Acceptable with no nonconformances; or
- Acceptable with minor nonconformances to be corrected before the next scheduled audit 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 If yes, provide brief description of the changes:

H. Other Issues Reviewed:

Yes No Public report from previous audit(s) is posted on SFB web site.

Yes No N.A. SFI and other relevant logos or labels are utilized correctly.
If no, document on CAR forms.

Yes No The program is a Multi-site Organization:

Multi-Site Organization: A n organization having an identified central function (hereafter referred to as a central office — but not necessarily the headquarters of the organization) at which certain activities are planned, controlled or managed and a network of local offices or branches (sites) at which such activities are fully or partially carried out.

Source: SFI Requirements, Section 9, Appendix: Audits of Multi-Site Organizations

IAF-MD1 or The alternate approach outlined in SFI Requirements, Section 9, Appendix 1 was assessed by NSF’s Lead Auditor during the certification audit.

Yes **No** Concerns/ issues are listed in the checklist (to be reviewed by NSF Forestry Program Manager

I. Corrective Action Requests:

No Corrective Action Requests were issued this visit:

Corrective Action Plan is not required.

At the conclusion of this Re-Certification Audit visit, the following CARs remain open:

MAJOR: 0 MINOR: 0 Opportunities for Improvement (OFIs) identified: 4

H. Future Audit Schedule:

Follow-up or Surveillance Audits are required by the 2010-2014 Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard ®. The next Surveillance Audit is scheduled for [date]. The assigned lead auditor will contact you 2-3 months prior to this date to reconfirm and begin preparations.

The SFI Standard 2015-2019 will be released on January 1, 2015. It is expected that 2015 will be a transition year, with the additional requirements subject to review in audits after January 1, 2016. NSF will provide more information on the new standard when it becomes available.

The next Recertification must be completed before November 2017.

Appendices:

Appendix I: Re-Certification Notification Letter and Audit Schedule

Appendix II: Public Re-Certification Audit Report

Appendix III: Audit Matrix

Appendix IV: SFI Reporting Form

Appendix I



Re-Certification Notification Letter and Audit Schedule



September 15, 2014

Brenda Huter, Forest Stewardship Coordinator
Indiana Division of Forestry
402 W. Washington Street, Rm 296 W
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Re: Confirmation of SFI 2014 Re-Certification and FSC 2014 Annual Surveillance Audits,
Indiana DNR

Dear Ms. Huter:

The 2014 Audits of the Indiana DNR are scheduled for October 14-17, starting at 8:30 am with an opening meeting at your office at 402 W. Washington Street, Indianapolis, IN 46204. It will conclude with a closing meeting tentatively scheduled for October 17 at 1:30 p.m. at the Martin State Forest.

This is a combined review of your SFI and FSC Programs to confirm that are in conformance with the requirements and to review past CARs. The audit team includes Dave Wager, FSC Lead auditor, Mike Ferrucci, SFI Lead Auditor, and Tucker Watts, SFI and FSC Auditor. The rest of this document will focus on the SFI Re-Certification Audit; an FSC Audit Plan will be provided by Dave Wager of SCS Global.

During the SFI audit I will lead the team's efforts to:

1. Review progress on achieving SFI objectives and performance measures and the results of the management review of your SFI Program;
2. Review all required components of your SFI program;
3. Review logo and/or label use;
4. Confirm public availability of public reports;
5. Evaluate efforts aimed at continual improvement of your SFI Program; and
6. Evaluate the multi-site requirements.

To facilitate the audit process I am requesting that you email me evidence of conformance with the SFI requirements that consists of electronic documents easily sent. Examples would include state forest management plans, key policies or procedures which guide the activities on the forests, and any special studies used or commissioned by your team. I'd like to receive these documents at least one week in advance of the audit. If you have questions about this document request please contact me.

The enclosed tentative schedule can be adapted either in advance or on-site to accommodate any special circumstances. Please ask the local units to arrange lunches to expedite the visit (bag lunches prepared in advance are preferred if possible).

Multi-Site Sampling Plan:

In your program your central office has general control and authority over the separate state forests. As such the program is eligible for a sampling approach involving field reviews of three of the 10 administrative units. The sampling plan requires visits to 3 state forests (Pike-Ferdinand; Jackson-Washington; and Martin). These forests were selected based on the time elapsed since previous audits, while specific field sites to be reviewed within each forest were primarily selected randomly. Central office issues will be reviewed primarily on the first day (see schedule).

Outline of relevant SFI 2010-2014 Requirements to review during this visit

Objectives 1 to 7: Requirements for Land Management

- 1.1 Sustainable Long-Term Harvest Levels
- 2.1 Prompt Reforestation After Harvest
- 2.2 Minimize Use of Chemicals
- 2.3 Protect and Maintain Forest & Soil Productivity
- 2.4 Forest Protection
- 2.5 Scientific Use of Improved Planting Stock
- 3.1 Best Management Practices
- 3.2 Riparian Protection Measures
- 4.1 Conservation of Biodiversity
- 4.2 Application of Research & Science to Cons. Biodiversity.
- 5.1 Visual Quality of Harvests
- 5.2 Clear-cut Size, Shape, Placement
- 5.3 “Green Up” or Alternative Methods
- 5.4 Support Recreational Opportunities for the Public
- 6.1 Identification & Management of Special Sites
- 7.1 Efficient Utilization

Objectives 14 to 20 Requirements for All Program Participants

- 14.1 Forestry Law/Reg. Compliance System
- 14.2 Social Law Compliance (including ILO)
- 15.1 Support or Funding for Research
- 15.2 Develop or Use Regional Analyses
- 15.3 Broaden Awareness of Climate Change Impacts
- 16.1 Training of Contractors and Personnel
- 16.2 Improved Wood Producer Professionalism
- 17.1 Cooperative Efforts for Sustainable Forestry
- 17.2 Outreach, Education, Involvement
- 17.3 Inconsistent Practices or Concerns
- 18.1 Public Lands Planning Involvement
- 18.2 Public Lands Conferring with Native Peoples
- 19.1 Summary Audit Report (following audits)
- 19.2 Annual Reporting to SFI, Inc.
- 20.1 Management Review System

I look forward to visiting you and evaluating continual improvement in your SFI Program. If you have any questions regarding this planned audit, please contact me.

Best Regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Michael Ferrucci". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Lead Auditor, NSF-ISR, Ltd.

203-887-9248

mferrucci@iforest.com

Enclosure: Agenda for Re-Certification Audit

Appendix II



2014 SFI Summary Re-Certification Audit Report Indiana Division of Forestry

The SFI Program of the Indiana Division of Forestry has achieved conformance with the SFI Standard®, 2010-2014 Edition, according to the NSF-ISR SFIS Re-Certification Audit Process.

NSF-ISR initially certified Indiana Division of Forestry to the SFIS in 2006 and recertified it in 2011. This report describes the second Re-Certification Audit based on the current 3-year certificate span. The audit was designed to focus on 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 2015.

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

Forest Management on Indiana State Forests

Source: http://www.in.gov/dnr/forestry/files/fo-Management_on_SF.pdf

“The State Forest system began with the establishment of Clark State Forest in 1903. Since then, the State Forest system has evolved into 13 State Forests containing more than 150,000 acres. State Forests have been managed for the many forest benefits that these lands are capable of providing. When the state acquired what is now State Forest property, almost every acre was comprised of eroding farm fields, pasture, or cutover timberland considered to have very little value to anyone. Most of the existing woodland had been high-graded, with the residual trees often exhibiting defects from forest fires and livestock grazing.

Many early management activities were aimed at stopping erosion and restoring the productive potential of the land. Tree planting to control erosion and reforest worn out fields was a primary management activity for many years. Early timber harvesting on state forests provided raw materials for projects of the Civilian Conservation Corps and utility poles for rural electrification projects. World War II saw the sustained use of timber sales from State Forests to provide needed wood materials for the war effort. Techniques used to manage the forests evolved as the forests grew. Less emphasis was needed on tree planting and more emphasis was placed on managing new stands of trees. Management activities, such as timber stand improvement and selective harvesting, were used to upgrade the quality of the stands and increase tree growth. This emphasis on stand improvement techniques continues today, with the goal of improving not only timber production but also all of the various forest resource benefits. Increasing emphasis is

being placed on creating early successional habitat, common in the early history of State Forests, but uncommon today.

Because the stands of trees on State Forests all began at about the same time, and because of the conservative nature of their management, most of the State Forests have matured at about the same rate, with little diversity among age classes and habitat types. Based on current forest inventory data the State Forest system contains 1.379 billion board feet of standing sawtimber volume, and is growing 40.4 million board feet of volume per year. Because of the need to increase forest habitat diversity (increase young forest), reduce dependence on general fund allocations, and the desire to demonstrate a working forest concept, the annual harvest target for Indiana State Forests is set at removing 14 million board feet—less than half the annual growth. This rate ensures the sustainability of the forest resource while providing a steady, stable source of certified-sustainable wood for the forest products industry and workers here in Indiana. State Forests are being managed by professional foresters and resource specialists to demonstrate a working forest concept. A working forest is actively managed under a stewardship plan that guides its activities to accomplish the desired goals. The working forest can provide a variety of goods and services such as watershed protection, recreation, wildlife habitat, scenic beauty and wood products.”

SFIS Re-Certification Audit Process

The Re-Certification audit was performed by NSF-ISR on October 14-17 by an audit team headed by Mike Ferrucci, Lead Auditor and Dave Wagner, FSC Lead Auditor supported by Tucker Watts, SFI and FSC Auditor. Audit team members fulfill the qualification criteria for conducting SFIS Certification Audits of “Section 9. SFI 2010-2014 Audit Procedures and Auditor Qualifications and Accreditation” contained in Requirements for the SFI 2010-2014 Program: Standards, Rules for Label Use, Procedures, and Guidance.

The objective of the audit was to assess conformance of the firm’s SFI Program to the requirements of the Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Standard, 2010-2014. The scope of the SFIS Audit included the entire state forest system, but this review included field sites at three state forests: Jackson-Washington State Forest, Ferdinand-Pike State Forest, and Martin State Forest. 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:

- 2.1.4: INDOF doesn’t plant exotic trees.
- Indicator 2.1.6: Planting is not done to change forest composition but to maintain it.
- Objectives 8-13: Indiana Division of Forestry is not involved in forest procurement.
- Indicator 16.2.2: Indiana does not have a logger certification program.

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. There were no non-conformances. Other findings include "Opportunities for Improvement" and "Exceptional Practices" as shown below.

2014 Opportunities for Improvement

SFI Indicator 1.1.1 requires "Forest management planning at a level appropriate to the size and scale of the operation, including: a. a long-term resources analysis..." There is an Opportunity for Improvement in the planning regarding the adoption of an updated strategic plan, currently under review.

SFI Indicator 2.3.6 requires "Criteria that address harvesting and site preparation to protect soil productivity." Criteria for rutting/compaction exist, but do not assure adequate protection to soils.

SFI Indicator 16.1.4 requires "Contractor education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities."

SFI Indicator 16.2.1 requires "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. best management practices, including streamside management and road construction, maintenance and retirement; c. reforestation, invasive exotic plants and animals, forest resource conservation, aesthetics, and special sites; 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.g. Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value); e. logging safety; f. U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety (COHS) regulations, wage and hour rules, and other provincial, state and local employment laws; g. transportation issues; h. business management; i. public policy and outreach; and j. awareness of emerging technologies.

There is an Opportunity for Improvement to more broadly include the SFI training module in the requirements for working on state lands.

Update regarding 2013 Opportunities for Improvement

In 2013 three (3) opportunities for improvement were identified. These have been resolved or modified as follows:

1. 2014 Update: Some sites visited during the 2013 audit had areas with rutting sufficient for localized impact on the roots of trees and soil properties. Rutting was observed in several

locations, but is generally within acceptable limits; OFI resolved.

2013 finding: SFI Indicator 2.3.4 requires “Post-harvest conditions conducive to maintaining site productivity (e.g. limited rutting, retained down woody debris, minimized skid trails).” There had been an opportunity to improve practices in the area of limited rutting.

2. 2014 Update: No issues observed in 2014 audit, resolved:

2013 finding: SFI Indicator 2.3.5 requires “Retention of vigorous trees during partial harvesting, consistent with scientific silvicultural standards for the area.” There had been an opportunity to improve protection of residual trees during harvesting.

3. 2014 Update: Continued, modified slightly; See Opportunities for Improvement listed under SFI Indicator 2.3.4 above.

2013 finding: SFI Indicator 2.3.6 requires “Criteria that address harvesting and site preparation to protect soil productivity.” Criteria for rutting/compaction exist, but may not be providing adequate protection to soils.

Exceptional Practices

The Indiana Division of Forestry’s SFI Program was found to exceed the standard in several areas.

SFI Indicator 1.1.3 requires “A forest inventory system and a method to calculate growth and yield.

The Indiana Division of Forestry has developed an exemplary forest inventory system.

SFI Indicator 3.1.4 requires “Monitoring of overall best management practices implementation. The BMP monitoring program is the most robust known to the audit team. Post-harvest reviews conducted by Indiana Division of Forestry Resource Foresters are checked by a central-office staff specialist and checked again by a comprehensive second-party process.

SFI Indicator 4.1.1 requires “Program to promote the conservation of native biological diversity, including species, wildlife habitats and ecological community types.

Indiana Division of Forestry employs a full-time wildlife biologist, Scott Haulton. His time is focused on special situations and on the HCP effort for Indiana bat, but he also provides support for regular work activities. The Indiana Division of Forestry has dedicated considerable resources to developing state-of-the-art bat conservation practices.

SFI Indicator 4.1.4 requires “Development and implementation of criteria, as guided by regionally appropriate best scientific information, to retain stand-level wildlife habitat elements such as snags, stumps, mast trees, down woody debris, den trees and nest trees.

The Indiana Division of Forestry has an exceptional program to retain stand-level wildlife habitat elements in accordance with scientific information.

SFI Indicator 5.4.1 requires “Provide recreational opportunities for the public, where consistent with forest management objectives.

Indiana Division of Forestry provides excellent recreational opportunities for the public including walking and horse trails, camping and access to lakes and ponds.

SFI Indicator 15.1.1 requires “Financial or in-kind support of research to address questions of relevance in the region of operations. The Indiana Division of Forestry has an exemplary program for research, particularly for issues related to management of forests to conserve ecological values and threatened or endangered species, notably bats.

SFI Indicator 18.1 requires that “Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall participate in the development of public land planning and management processes.

Annual “State Forest Open Houses” and a very comprehensive and well-organized web site contribute to an exceptional program for public involvement in public land management and planning.

General Description of Evidence of Conformity

NSF’s audit team used a variety of evidence to determine conformance. A general description of this evidence is provided below, organized by SFI Objective.

Objective 1. Forest Management Planning - To broaden the implementation of sustainable forestry by ensuring long-term forest productivity and yield based on the use of the best scientific information available.

Summary of Evidence – The Indiana Statewide Forest Assessment 2010 and the 2008-2013 Strategic Plan for INDNR, tract plans, and the associated inventory data and growth models were the key evidence of conformance.

Objective 2. Forest Productivity - To ensure long-term forest productivity, carbon storage and conservation of forest resources through prompt reforestation, soil conservation, afforestation and other measures.

Summary of Evidence –Field observations and associated records were used to confirm practices. INDNR has programs for reforestation, for protection against gypsy moth, emerald ash borer, other pests, and wildfire, and for careful management of activities which could potentially impact soil and long-term productivity.

Objective 3. Protection and Maintenance of Water Resources - To protect water quality in streams, lakes and other water bodies.

Summary of Evidence – Field observations of a range of sites were the key evidence. Auditors visited the portions of field sites that were close to water resources.

Objective 4. Conservation of Biological Diversity including Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value To 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 species.

Summary of Evidence – Field observations, written plans and policies for the conservation of the Indiana bat, employment of an experienced wildlife biologist, and use of heritage databases were the evidence used to assess the requirements involved biodiversity conservation.

Objective 5. Management of Visual Quality and Recreational Benefits - To manage the visual impact of forest operations and provide recreational opportunities for the public.

Summary of Evidence – DOF provides excellent recreational opportunities for the public including walking and horse trails, camping and access to lakes and ponds. Records and field sites were reviewed to assess methods and results in visual management.

Objective 6. Protection of Special Sites - To manage lands that are ecologically, geologically, or culturally important in a manner that takes into account their unique qualities.

Summary of Evidence – Field observations of completed operations, records of special sites and visits to special sites were all factors in the strong finding for protection of special sites.

Objective 7. Efficient Use of Forest Resources - To promote the efficient use of forest resources.

Summary of Evidence – Field observations of completed operations, contract clauses, and discussions with supervising field foresters provided the key evidence.

Objective 14. Legal and Regulatory Compliance - Compliance with applicable federal, provincial, state and local laws and regulations.

Summary of Evidence –Field reviews of ongoing and completed operations were the most critical evidence.

Objective 15. Forestry Research, Science, and Technology - To support forestry research, science, and technology, upon which sustainable forest management decisions are based.

Summary of Evidence –DOF supports a variety of forestry research initiatives, including the Hardwood Ecosystem Experiment (a collaborative research project that currently includes 13 partnering organizations and agencies including researchers from six regional universities) on the Morgan-Monroe and Yellowwood State Forests.

Objective 16. Training and Education -To improve the implementation of sustainable forestry practices through appropriate training and education programs.

Summary of Evidence – Training records of selected personnel, records associated with harvest sites audited, and stakeholder interviews were the key evidence for this objective.

Objective 17. Community Involvement in the Practice of Sustainable Forestry -

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.

Summary of Evidence – INDNR has an exemplary history of soliciting and incorporating public comment into its decision making and planning processes; including the Indiana Forest Stakeholder Summit.

Objective 18: Public Land Management Responsibilities -

To support and implement sustainable forest management on public lands.

Summary of Evidence – Interviews and review of correspondence were used to confirm the requirements.

Objective 19. Communications and Public Reporting - To broaden the practice of sustainable forestry by documenting progress and opportunities for improvement.

Summary of Evidence – Reports filed with SFI Inc. and the SFI Inc. website provided the key evidence.

Objective 20. Management Review and Continual Improvement - To promote continual improvement in the practice of sustainable forestry, and to monitor, measure, and report performance in achieving the commitment to sustainable forestry.

Summary of Evidence – Records of program reviews, agendas and notes from management review meetings, and interviews with personnel from all involved levels in the organization were assessed.

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 and ecosystem services such as the conservation of soil, air and water quality, carbon, biological diversity, wildlife and aquatic habitats, recreation, and aesthetics.

2. Forest Productivity and Health

To provide for regeneration after harvest and maintain the productive capacity of the forest land base, and to protect and maintain long-term forest and soil productivity. In addition, to protect forests from economically or environmentally undesirable levels of wildfire, pests, diseases, invasive exotic plants and animals and other damaging agents and thus maintain and improve long-term forest health and productivity.

3. Protection of Water Resources

To protect water bodies and riparian zones, and to conform with best management practices to protect water quality.

4. Protection of Biological Diversity

To manage forests in ways that protect and promote biological diversity, including animal and plant species, wildlife habitats, and ecological or natural community types.

5. Aesthetics and Recreation

To manage the visual impacts of forest operations, and to provide recreational opportunities for the public.

6. Protection of Special Sites

To manage forests and lands of special significance (ecologically, geologically or culturally important) in a manner that protects their integrity and takes into account their unique qualities.

7. Responsible Fiber Sourcing Practices in North America

To use and promote among other forest landowners sustainable forestry practices that are both scientifically credible and economically, environmentally and socially responsible.

8. Avoidance of Controversial Sources including Illegal Logging in Offshore Fiber Sourcing

To avoid wood fiber from illegally logged forests when procuring fiber outside of North America, and to avoid sourcing fiber from countries without effective social laws.

9. Legal Compliance

To comply with applicable federal, provincial, state, and local forestry and related environmental laws, statutes, and regulations.

10. Research

To support advances in sustainable forest management through forestry research, science and technology.

11. Training and Education

To improve the practice of sustainable forestry through training and education programs.

12. Public Involvement

To broaden the practice of sustainable forestry on public lands through community involvement.

13. Transparency

To broaden the understanding of forest certification to the SFI 2010-2014 Standard by documenting certification audits and making the findings publicly available.

14. Continual Improvement

To continually improve the practice of forest management, and to monitor, measure and report performance in achieving the commitment to sustainable forestry.

Source: Sustainable Forestry Initiative® (SFI) Standard, 2010-2014 Edition

For Additional Information Contact:

Norman Boatwright
SFI Program Manager, NSF-ISR
843-229-1851
nboatwright12@gmail.com

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

Appendix III



Audit Matrix

2NSF-ISR SFI 2010-2014 MATRIX
Indiana Division of Forestry 2014 Re-Certification

Findings and Instructions:

C	Conformance
Exr	Exceeds the Requirements
Maj	Major Non-conformance
Min	Minor Non-conformance
OFI	Opportunity for Improvement (can also be in Conformance)
NA	Not Applicable
Likely Gap *	Likely Gap Against 2010-2014 SFIS (used for scoping or baseline audits)*
Likely Conf. *	Likely Conformance With 2010-2014 SFIS (used for scoping or baseline audits)*
Auditor	Optional; may be used for audit planning.
13, 14	Date Codes, for example: 13= October 2013; 14=October 14-17, 2014
Other	Words in <i>italics</i> are defined in the standard.

Yes No N.A. NSF mark (logo) is being used correctly. Audit Notes: IDOF is not using the NSF Mark

Objective 1. Forest Management Planning

To broaden the implementation of *sustainable forestry* by ensuring *long-term forest productivity* and yield based on the use of the *best scientific information* available.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
1.1	Program Participants shall ensure that forest management plans include long-term harvest levels that are sustainable and consistent with appropriate growth-and-yield models.	MF	14						
Notes	See indicators below.								

	2010-2014 Requirement (Performance Measures bold)	Audit or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
1.1.1	Forest management planning at a level appropriate to the size and scale of the operation, including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. a long-term resources analysis; b. a periodic or ongoing forest inventory; c. a land classification system; d. soils inventory and maps, where available; e. access to growth-and-yield modeling capabilities; f. up-to-date maps or a geographic information system; g. recommended sustainable harvest levels for areas available for harvest; and h. a review of non-timber issues (e.g. recreation, tourism, pilot projects and economic incentive programs to promote water protection, carbon storage, bioenergy feedstock production, or biological diversity conservation, or to address climate-induced ecosystem change). 	MF	14						

Notes

There is an Opportunity for Improvement in the planning regarding the adoption of an updated strategic plan, currently under review.

Key Components of the Management Program

- 2008-2013 Strategic Plan
- 2014-2018 Draft Strategic Plan (under review at agency and executive levels)
- 2008 Indiana State Forests Environmental Assessment 2008-2027; pages 28-30 describe “Tract Management Guide Process”
- State Forest Procedures Manual, which describes process for developing the Management Guides
- 9 Issue Papers describing various aspects of the program confirmed at www.in.gov/dnr/forestry/3605.htm
- Folders maintained at the local (site) offices containing Compartment Information and Tract Files, Resource Management Guides (aka “tract management plan”) that describe current conditions and proposed management on tracts of 50 to 200 acres. Tracts are based on easily recognized boundaries and may contain more than one cover type.

Key Items Reviewed and links to the sub-indicators:

The stand-level “Resource Management Guides” were confirmed for each timber harvest selected for field review. These guides included sufficient information to find conformance with items b, c, d, f, and h.

- a. DOF maintains a long-term resource analysis through its Strategic Plans, which are updated at 5-year intervals. Landscape-level objectives for forest management have been established in the current plan;
- b. DOF uses FIA data and its own CFI plots to maintain a forest inventory system;
- c. DOF uses a tract and stand based land classification system
- d. DOF uses NRCS soil classification data and maps;
- e. Met by CFI system, see 1.1.3;
- f. DOF has a sophisticated GIS with forest inventory, wildlife, harvests, and other information; also maintains topo maps at field offices
- g. DOF has documented its sustainable harvest levels in its production forests; and
- h. Non-timber issues are addressed stand-level “Resource Management Guides” which include recreation, wildlife and T/E considerations. Heritage Reviews are conducted for each Management Guide. They include a review of any information within one mile of the boundaries of the lands included in the management guide. Summaries also found in Indiana Division of Forestry White Papers such as “Wildlife Habitat Management on Indiana’s State Forests”

Reviewed the Resource Management Guide for Jackson-Washington, Compartment 8, Tract 3, posted December 1, 2010. Also reviewed the Resource Management Guide for Jackson-Washington State Forest Compartment 2 Tract 15; Forester: Vogelpohl (Potts 2014) Date: May 26, 2010 Revised: January 22, 2014, Management Cycle End Year 2037 Management Cycle Length 20 years.

1.1.2	Documentation of annual harvest trends in relation to the sustainable forest management plan in a manner appropriate to document past and future activities.	MF	14																														
<i>Notes</i>	<p>Current Target 14 million board feet, determined based on desire for a conservative harvest level until growth information is more-fully updated. The allocation of this harvest to the individual units is proportional. The general approach to timber harvest allocation by property is described on page 33 of the Environmental Assessment. This process is detailed in the notes for SFI Indicator 1.1.4 below.</p> <p>Timber Sale Volumes Sold in the Past Twelve Years:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>2013-2014</td> <td>17.1 mmbf</td> <td>2007-2008</td> <td>11.3mmbf</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2012-2013</td> <td>12.0 mmbf</td> <td>2006-2007</td> <td>10.3 mmbf</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2011-2012</td> <td>14.4 mmbf</td> <td>2005-2006</td> <td>7.7 mmbf</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2010-2011</td> <td>14.0 mmbf</td> <td>2004-2005</td> <td>3.6 mmbf</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2009-2010</td> <td>10.6 mmbf</td> <td>2003-2004</td> <td>3.4 mmbf</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008-2009</td> <td>12.1 mmbf</td> <td>2002-2003</td> <td>3.4 mmbf</td> </tr> </table>									2013-2014	17.1 mmbf	2007-2008	11.3mmbf	2012-2013	12.0 mmbf	2006-2007	10.3 mmbf	2011-2012	14.4 mmbf	2005-2006	7.7 mmbf	2010-2011	14.0 mmbf	2004-2005	3.6 mmbf	2009-2010	10.6 mmbf	2003-2004	3.4 mmbf	2008-2009	12.1 mmbf	2002-2003	3.4 mmbf
2013-2014	17.1 mmbf	2007-2008	11.3mmbf																														
2012-2013	12.0 mmbf	2006-2007	10.3 mmbf																														
2011-2012	14.4 mmbf	2005-2006	7.7 mmbf																														
2010-2011	14.0 mmbf	2004-2005	3.6 mmbf																														
2009-2010	10.6 mmbf	2003-2004	3.4 mmbf																														
2008-2009	12.1 mmbf	2002-2003	3.4 mmbf																														
	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>																								
1.1.3	A forest inventory system and a method to calculate growth and yield.	MF		14																													
<i>Notes</i>	<p>The Indiana Division of Forestry has developed an exemplary forest inventory system.</p> <p>The Indiana Division of Forestry has five full-time positions devoted to forest inventory (covering state lands and the private lands enrolled in the current-use taxation program). Three positions are currently vacant, but plans are in place to refill these.</p> <p>A continuous forest inventory where 1/5 of the land base is inventoried each year is in the 7th. After the 5th year was completed, DOF started to re-measure the plots allowing for growth computation. A preliminary comparison is being calculated, but another year of inventory is needed to come close to a statistically-reliable growth estimate. The system design is based on 10 years to develop a reliable growth estimate.</p> <p>The current growth estimate is based on 3 methods: 1) 50 FIA plots on state forests from which growth can be calculated, 2) 2005 system-wide inventory is compared to the inventories done in the 1980s and 3) Increment borings were collected during the 2005 SWI and growth was estimated using the Burrel-Ashley system. All 3 estimates of net annual growth are about 28 million bf; the cutting budget is set at 50% of that growth rate.</p> <p>Standing Volume:</p> <p>337.4 million cubic feet from CFI measurements 2008-2012 1.379 Billion Board Feet (International 1/4) from CFI measurements 2008-2012 1.17 Billion Board Feet (Doyle) reported based on the 2005 system inventory</p>																																

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
1.1.4	Periodic updates of forest inventory and recalculation of planned harvests to account for changes in growth due to productivity increases or decreases (e.g. improved data, long-term drought, fertilization, climate change, forest land ownership changes, etc.).	MF	14						
Notes	<p>Harvest levels are targeted for approximately one-half of estimated growth in an attempt to be conservative. When better information is available the plan is to adjust harvest levels. Three more years of CFI re-measurements will be needed to make the adjustments at a level of precision that is sought.</p> <p>The Indiana State Forester sets the annual harvest goal for the system, targeting about half of estimated annual (based on long-term growth estimates). These goals are allocated proportionally to the properties based on standing volume percentages, with adjustments for special situations such as variations driven in large part by forest health issues. Allowable cut is based on previous growth/yield data as described in 1.1.3 and is allocated to each forest based on the 2005 SWI figures with the intent being to not over harvest any particular forest. These figures are then adjusted based on special circumstances such as the need for salvage cuts.</p> <p>Harvests over the past 10 or more years have been targeting ash within stands planned for harvest, somewhat shifting the harvest from Oak to Ash.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
1.1.5	Documentation of forest practices (e.g., planting, fertilization, and thinning) consistent with assumptions in harvest plans.	MF	14						
Notes	<p>Review of tracts files for forests visited indicates they have summary of activities. Also forester inspects activity, completes Purchase Order Approval and turns it into HQ so the contractor can be paid.</p> <p>90% of the harvesting involves single-tree selection, while the rest involves patch clear-cutting to maintain some even-aged patches and sun-loving species. Mixed hardwood-pine stands are being targeted for patch cuts to salvage the mostly planted pine trees and associated hardwoods, generally creating new even-aged stands of Oak-Hickory-Mixed Hardwoods.</p> <p>One key forest practice driving projected growth and thus the timing of re-entry cycles involves stocking control through removal of undesirable trees. Auditors observed many marked but uncut trees in completed harvest areas. Indiana Division of Forestry personnel described planned TSI treatments, but older treatments were not visited to confirm. This area should receive further scrutiny during the 2014 Re-Certification Audit.</p>								

Objective 2. Forest Productivity.

To ensure *long-term forest productivity*, carbon storage, and *conservation* of forest resources through prompt *reforestation*, *soil conservation*, *afforestation* and other measures.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.1	Program Participants shall promptly reforest after final harvest.	MF	14						
Notes	See indicators below.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.1.1	Designation of all harvest areas for either natural regeneration or by planting.	MF	14						
Notes	<p>The Management Guides for each tract clearly state the preferred regeneration method, which is primarily natural regeneration under the selection system of silviculture. 90% of the harvesting involves single-tree selection, while the rest involves patch clear-cutting to maintain some even-aged patches and sun-loving species. Mixed hardwood-pine stands are being targeted for patch cuts to salvage the mostly planted pine trees and associated hardwoods, generally creating new even-aged stands of Oak-Hickory-Mixed Hardwoods.</p> <p>After every timber sale there is a post-harvest TSI plan identifying the methods to complete the creation of regeneration openings and conduct other stand tending operations. Many of these projects include control of invasive woody plants (Ailanthus or bush honeysuckle); most involve removal of un-merchantable trees within regeneration gaps; some also involve crop-tree release or stand improvement thinning work within the selection portion of the harvest area.</p> <p>Planting is rare, and only on old agricultural fields.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.1.2	Reforestation, unless delayed for site-specific environmental or forest health considerations or legal requirements, through planting within two years or two planting seasons, or by planned natural regeneration methods within five years.	MF	14						
Notes	Reforestation is accomplished by natural regeneration with occasional supplemental planting of native species where warranted. Inspected many recent harvest sites and saw several older (completed three to over twenty years ago) harvest areas; all showed tendency towards prompt stocking with desirable species of natural regeneration.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.1.3	Clear criteria to judge adequate regeneration and appropriate actions to correct understocked areas and achieve acceptable species composition and stocking rates for both planting and natural regeneration.	MF	14						
<i>Notes</i>	<p>Regeneration checks are conducted by year 4 after clear-cutting.</p> <p>At Ferdinand-Pike State Forests there is an access data base used to track regeneration and the timing of required regeneration checks. Confirmed the access database includes 3-year regeneration checks.</p> <p>Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Successful regeneration required within 5 years. • Natural Regeneration: 1,000 native species seedlings/acre • Tree plantings: 400 stems of native species/acre • Management guides should include regeneration expectation statement <p>Indiana Division of Forestry now requires management guides to include a statement about regeneration expectation for any tracts which include regeneration prescriptions. Confirmed these comments in the silvicultural prescription statements the following Resource Management Guides:</p> <p>Archived Resource Management Guide, Ferdinand State Forest, Compartment 1 Tract 5</p> <p>Morgan Monroe Compartment 13, Tract 2, RMG Amended April 3, 2014 did not include regeneration treatments as a significant component of the harvest so a target statement would not be expected. The RMG does include a description of existing trees in the ground layer and the need for the 3-year check.</p> <p>Morgan Monroe Compartment 14, Tract 4, RMG</p> <p>The process to evaluate regeneration in regeneration opening (group selection and clear-cuts) is described in the new form “State Forest Timber Sale Post-Harvest Evaluation”. The form includes Y/N answers for regeneration adequacy, presence of invasive species, and actions needed.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.1.4	Minimized plantings of exotic tree species, and research documentation that exotic tree species, planted operationally, pose minimal risk.	NA							
<i>Notes</i>	<p>Indiana Division of Forestry doesn't plant exotic trees. Mostly plant native oak, generally a small number of acres confined to recently-acquired land to reforest former cropland. Some patch openings may be planted following removal of exotic pines planted decades ago on open lands.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>

2.1.5	Protection of desirable or planned advanced natural regeneration during harvest.	MF	14						
<i>Notes</i>	Site visits to completed timber harvests indicate advanced regeneration is not adversely impacted during harvest.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.1.6	Planting programs that consider potential ecological impacts of a different species or species mix from that which was harvested.	NA							
<i>Notes</i>	Planting is not done to change forest composition but to maintain or restore it to native species composition. For example some patch openings may be planted following removal of exotic pines planted decades ago on open lands.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.1.7	Afforestation programs that consider potential ecological impacts of the selection and planting of tree species in non-forested landscapes.		NA						
<i>Notes</i>	No afforestation is being conducted. Indiana Division of Forestry plants a small area of non-forested land, and never in non-forested landscapes. When it does plant former farmland it plants only local indigenous species, mostly oak. One planting site was reviewed; on this site most planted trees were oaks, with walnut also planted.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.2	Program Participants shall minimize chemical use required to achieve management objectives while protecting employees, neighbors, the public and the environment, including wildlife and aquatic habitats.	MF	14						
<i>Notes</i>	See indicators below.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
--	------------------------------	--------------	----------	------------	------------	------------	------------	-------------------------	---------------------------

2.2.1	Minimized chemical use required to achieve management objectives.	MF	14						
Notes	<p>A review of records of chemical applications in 2013 showed a relatively low proportion of the certified area is treated with chemicals each year. Most treatments are to control invasive species or aquatic weeds. There were only 5 acres of weed control (pesticide application) associated with tree planting, using a total of 0.2 gallons of Oust (Sulfometuron-methyl). Careful records of pesticide applications are helping managers determine the most effective formulations and techniques. At Martin State Forest trials are being made with three different approaches to kill invasive exotic trees (Ailanthus).</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.2.2	Use of least-toxic and narrowest-spectrum pesticides necessary to achieve management objectives.	MF	14						
Notes	<p>Review of records of chemical applications in 2013 for the entire Indiana State Forest System showed that chemicals are generally used to control invasive species and/or hardwood brush. The highest volume chemical is Glyphosate, a chemical with low mammalian toxicity and a very short life in the environment. Triclopyr is second and is used to control Japanese Knotweed as well as Right of way vegetation control; invasive species control, TSI (deadening cut tree stems or applying basally or in frills), opening completion. These and other chemicals are applied based on experience and match label rules.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.2.3	Use of pesticides registered for the intended use and applied in accordance with label requirements.	MF	14						
Notes	<p>Pesticide records and interviews with Indiana foresters who have licenses and who apply chemicals or supervise their application show that chemicals used and treatment needs match, per labels. Records include the following information: Property Name Date Used Personnel Location (Comp/Tract, other) Acres Treated Pesticide Commercial Name Active Ingredient Gallons used Work Type Target Pest "Method and comments; Include % solution and effectiveness comment"</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.2.4	Use of integrated pest management where feasible.	MF	14						
Notes	<p>Integrated pest management is indicated by the use of proper silviculture to maintain healthy, vigorous stands. Stands are generally properly stocked; assessments of forest health incidents determine causes before treatments are selected; treatments are based on site-specific prescriptions. Salvage harvests are employed as needed, often in over-mature pine stands, but also pre-salvage of Ash, to minimize the impact and spread of insect pests.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.2.5	Supervision of forest chemical applications by state- or provincial-trained or certified applicators.	MF	14						
<i>Notes</i>	<p>Indiana Division of Forestry provides training to staff every November/December; 2014 training is scheduled for November 21, 2014.</p> <p>Jamie A. Winner, Manager Ferdinand State Forest, Ohio Pesticide Applicator License # PB210778, expires 12/31/14.</p> <p>Martin State Forest property manager and resource manager attended this training and maintain their pesticide cards.</p> <p>Pesticide Applicators CORE training requires 8 contact hours.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.2.6	Use of management practices appropriate to the situation, for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. notification of adjoining landowners or nearby residents concerning applications and chemicals used; b. appropriate multilingual signs or oral warnings; c. control of public road access during and immediately after applications; d. designation of streamside and other needed buffer strips; e. use of positive shutoff and minimal-drift spray valves; f. aerial application of forest chemicals parallel to buffer zones to minimize drift; g. monitoring of water quality or safeguards to ensure proper equipment use and protection of streams, lakes and other water bodies; h. appropriate storage of chemicals; i. filing of required state or provincial reports; and/or j. use of methods to ensure protection of threatened and endangered species. 	MF	14						
<i>Notes</i>	<p>In all cases the label is followed, which identifies PPE and the range of rates for the intended purpose; the label is followed.</p> <p>Apply chemicals in spot applications, generally via topical application to stumps, basal application, or into a girdled tree.</p> <p>Round-up is applied using a backpack or a pressurized tank mounted on an ATV. Generally have a buffer around aquatic areas.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
--	------------------------------	--------------	----------	------------	------------	------------	------------	-------------------------	---------------------------

2.3	Program Participants shall implement forest management practices to protect and maintain forest and soil productivity.	MF	14						
<i>Notes</i>	See indicators below.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.3.1	Use of soils maps where available.	MF	14						
<i>Notes</i>	Review of Management Guides for all timber harvests visited indicates soils maps are used and the soil information is discussed in the write-up. Soils mapping is available on GIS, and is of high quality. Interviews with resource specialists indicates soils maps are used during tract level planning in a variety of ways, including stand delineation, gross site index estimates, and on occasion, to plan for seasonal harvests mitigation and BMP planning (e.g. highly erosive soils).								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.3.2	Process to identify soils vulnerable to compaction, and use of appropriate methods to avoid excessive soil disturbance.	MF	14						
<i>Notes</i>	Use of soil surveys in tract planning (pre-harvest), planned skid trails and BMPs confirmed by review of the Resource Management Guide.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.3.3	Use of erosion control measures to <i>minimize</i> the loss of soil and site productivity.	MF	14						

Notes	<p>Indiana Division of Forestry has a policy to use the state BMPs which have guidelines to prevent erosion. These are routinely and systematically applied. Most site visits did not identify erosion issues.</p> <p>On one site there was an eroding road despite use of BMPs. A fire lane / timber and management access road in Compartment 3 on the Ferdinand State Forest with a road surface primarily of heavy silt-clay loam soil (likely the subsoil) has several sections of minor surface erosion between several water bars which are generally properly spaced per BMPs. One section of road without water bars but with a light surfacing of limestone and designed crowning and side-hill drains has more significant gullying. A section of road 240 feet long has recent gullying that is mostly 6-12 inches deep, but up to 15 inches deep in places, and mostly 8-12 inches wide, but twice as wide or braided in places. Eroded material has traveled to a low point where it has settled out within 40 feet of the road, including in a small area (perhaps 100 of 300 square feet impacted) with plants indicative of poorly-drained soils (cat tails and rushes). The erosion occurred after the sale close-out and follow-up second party BMP reviews. Routine maintenance (annual mowing and inspection) normally done in early fall was delayed during workload, but this site would have likely soon been assessed and repaired. Based on significant adherence to BMPs and the recent heavy rainfall, combined with follow-up inspections of roads and 3-year post-harvest evaluations that would have found this issue there was no finding issued.</p>
--------------	---

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.3.4	Post-harvest conditions conducive to maintaining site productivity (e.g. limited rutting, retained down woody debris, minimized skid trails).	MF	14						
Notes	<p>Indiana Division of Forestry has a policy to use the state BMPs which have guidelines to prevent erosion.</p> <p>Retained down woody debris and minimized skid trails were observed in all harvest areas. Some limited rutting was observed in several locations, but generally within acceptable limits</p> <p>In 2013 there was an opportunity to improve practices in the area of limited rutting. Some sites visited during the 2013 audit had areas with rutting sufficient for localized impact on the roots of trees and soil properties. This OFI was not reissued, but a focus on Indicator 2.3.6 is suggested.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.3.5	Retention of vigorous trees during partial harvesting, consistent with scientific silvicultural standards for the area.	MF	14						
Notes	<p>Review of State Forest Procedures Manual/ Silvicultural Guide – Hardwood Management Section encourages the retention of sound vigorous trees.</p> <p>Site visits indicated vigorous trees are retained and low-vigor, defective, malformed, declining, or off-site trees are targeted for removal in the improvement thinning / selection harvests that are implemented on the vast majority of acres harvested. Residual stem damage levels were minor.</p> <p>In 2013 there was an opportunity to improve protection of residual trees during harvesting. Some harvest sites inspected had considerable residual stem damage in places. This was not observed in 2014.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>

2.3.6	Criteria that address harvesting and site preparation to protect soil productivity.	MF	14				14		
<i>Notes</i>	<p><u>Opportunity for Improvement: Criteria for rutting/compaction exist, but do not assure adequate protection to soils.</u></p> <p>Managers have the authority and responsibility to halt logging activities if impacts are beyond levels they deem unacceptable.</p> <p>Reviewed Resource Management Guides for evidence that site-specific harvest criteria are included, such as seasons of operation. BMPs are the main tool, and these are enforced and tracked.</p> <p>2013 Opportunity for Improvement: Criteria for rutting/compaction exist, but may not be set in ways that would ensure provide adequate protection to soils should they be “tested” by timber buyers who insist on operating to the limits of the contract.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.3.7	Road construction and skidding layout to minimize impacts to soil productivity and water quality.	MF	14						
<i>Notes</i>	<p>Indiana Division of Forestry rarely builds new roads. Site visits indicate it also gravels existing roads as needed.</p> <p>Roads/fire lanes are routinely gated, and access is controlled. This results in reduced need for road re-construction and lowered impacts to the environment.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.4	Program Participants shall manage so as to protect forests from damaging agents, such as environmentally or economically undesirable wildfire, pests, diseases and invasive exotic plants and animals, to maintain and improve long-term forest health, productivity and economic viability.	MF	14						
<i>Notes</i>	See indicators below.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.4.1	Program to protect forests from damaging agents.	MF	14						

Notes	<p>Foresters are quite familiar with their forests and current and potential pests. They conduct informal recon to assess forest health.</p> <p>Procedure Manual Section F: Silvicultural guidelines: ““State forest timber management should create a forested condition that is healthy and vigorous without fiber production being an overriding consideration. The forests should have a natural rather than planted look. There should be varied species composition, forest structure, and tree size to provide habitat diversity and aesthetic integrity within a contiguous-canopy forest context.”</p> <p>2013 Owen-Putnam State Forest reports mortality of elm (Dutch Elm Disease) and tulip-poplar (dieback and decline).</p>
--------------	---

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.4.2	Management to promote healthy and productive forest conditions to minimize susceptibility to damaging agents.	MF	14						
Notes	Confirmed by field observations that the indicator is met. Periodic selection harvests are used to control stocking and remove unhealthy trees. Operable, productive forest are treated on roughly a 15 or 20-year cutting cycle. Patch clear-cuts target old-field plantations of exotic pines.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.4.3	Participation in, and support of, fire and pest prevention and control programs.	MF	14						
Notes	<p>Work with the Indiana State Entomologist: He flies the state each year, with a focus on Indiana State Forests. Monitors: EAB, Thousand Canker Disease, Slow-the-Spread monitoring. Information updates and training on pests is provided by the entomologist.</p> <p>U.S. Forest Service grants managed by the Indiana State Entomologist.</p> <p>New Fire Coordinator. All forests are expected to have at least 1 staff member with a Red Card.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.5	Program Participants that deploy improved planting stock, including varietal seedlings, shall use sound scientific methods.	MF	14						
Notes	All seed is collected in Indiana, including some from the state’s seed orchards and grown in the Indiana State Nursery located in Vallonia, IN. The nursery’s manager has college training, considerable experience, and a strong reputation throughout the mid-west. There have been some plantings using improved American Chestnut. 40% of walnut planting uses improved seed. Butternut hybrid between Japanese and native.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
--	------------------------------	--------------	----------	------------	------------	------------	------------	-------------------------	---------------------------

2.5.1	Program for appropriate research, testing, evaluation and deployment of improved planting stock, including varietal seedlings.	MF	14						
Notes	<p>See notes under Performance Measure 2.5 above.</p> <p>Vallonia Nursery grows a variety of hardwoods and White Pine – Bare Root. Seed source is local vendors for wild seed, with some seed from genetically improved Walnut and Red Oak. Protocols are in place that meet the indicator.</p>								

Objective 3. Protection and Maintenance of Water Resources

To protect water quality in rivers, streams, lakes, and other water bodies.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
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 Canadian or U.S. Environmental Protection Agency–approved water quality programs.	MF	14						
<i>Notes</i>	See indicators below.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
3.1.1	Program to implement state or provincial best management practices during all phases of management activities.	MF	14						
<i>Notes</i>	The use of professional foresters to plan and oversee harvests, timber sale contracts with provisions to follow BMPs, pre-harvest meetings between foresters and logging contractors, sale supervision and weekly checklists signed by loggers, post-harvest inspections of all sites by a specialist, and the BMP audit system by a second-party comprise the program.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
3.1.2	Contract provisions that specify conformance to best management practices.	MF	14						
<i>Notes</i>	Contracts unchanged from 2012. Confirmed that the Letter of Agreement for Sale of Timber on State Forest Land contains a BMP clause– Item #9. The following contracts were reviewed – Site 4; Jackson-Washington - Site 4; C 11 – T 3&4; C 8 – T 3; C 9-T 16 & 20; Pike – Site 21 (C 11 – T 2, 3, 4); Site 22 (C 8 – T 6 & 8). Contracts contain the following: BMP Requirements; Logger Training Requirements; Safety Requirements; EEO Requirements								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
3.1.3	Plans that address wet-weather events (e.g. forest inventory systems, wet-weather tracts, definitions of acceptable operating conditions).	MF	14						

<i>Notes</i>	Confirmed that the “BMP Field Guide – Road and Trail Maintenance” section provides general guidelines. Managers have the authority and responsibility to halt logging activities. Interviews with Resource Specialists and review of completed Timber Sale Visitation and Evaluations indicate they halt harvesting when wet weather becomes an issue. No active harvests were taking place during the 2014 audit due to wet conditions; idle logging equipment was seen.
--------------	--

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
3.1.4	Monitoring of overall best management practices implementation.	MF		14					
<i>Notes</i>	<p><u>Exceptional Practice: The BMP monitoring program is the most robust known to the audit team. Post-harvest reviews conducted by Indiana Division of Forestry Resource Foresters are checked by a central-office staff specialist and checked again by a comprehensive second-party process.</u></p> <p>Indiana Division of Forestry State Forest Properties 1996 through 2013 Forestry BMP Monitoring Results describe a long-term program of comprehensive second-party BMP audits.</p> <p>Monitoring includes at least weekly site inspections with the results documented on the Timber Sale Visitation and Evaluations. Each sale is also officially “closed out” in regards to BMP’s with an inspection a central office forester. Documentation was reviewed for a selection of sites visited during the audit.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
3.2	Program Participants shall have or develop, implement and document riparian protection measures based on soil type, terrain, vegetation, ecological function, harvesting system and other applicable factors.	MF	14						
<i>Notes</i>	See indicators below.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
3.2.1	Program addressing management and protection of rivers, streams, lakes, and other water bodies and riparian zones.	MF	14						
<i>Notes</i>	The use of BMPs, the design of all harvest projects by trained foresters, and the review of all projects by supervisory personnel, as well as the regulatory programs of the Division of Water and Department of Environmental Management comprise such a program. Further, there is an internal audit program for BMPs following all timber harvests (see 3.1.4 above). Harvest blocks (generally tracts), ridge-top roads, and skid road systems are designed to avoid stream crossings in most harvests.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
3.2.2	Mapping of rivers, streams, lakes, and other water bodies as specified in state or provincial best management practices and, where appropriate, identification on the ground.	MF	14						
Notes	Harvest site maps and flagging in the field showed locations of streams and stream buffers. Review of GIS indicates water bodies are adequately mapped – generally the 7.5’ USGS topographic maps are used as the base map. There is also a GIS layer of small dug out water holes.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
3.2.3	Implementation of plans to manage or protect rivers, streams, lakes, and other water bodies.	MF	14						
Notes	Field observations confirmed protection of these features, including use of buffers, care taken to design proper stream crossings and to stabilize them following completion of work. Roads are well-designed and maintained.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
3.2.4	Identification and protection of non-forested wetlands, including bogs, fens and marshes, and vernal pools of ecological significance.	MF	14						
Notes	These features are not common on most portions of the Indiana State Forests. Division of Nature Preserves helps identify these sites on a system or individual basis. Foresters identify such sites on maps and often flag them off from active harvest areas. Confirmed by field observations at all sites visited.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
3.2.5	Where regulations or best management practices do not currently exist to protect riparian areas, use of experts to identify appropriate protection measures.	MF	14						
Notes	NA. Indiana has BMPs.								

Objective 4. Conservation of Biological Diversity including Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value.

To 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 a diversity of types of habitat and successional stages, and conservation of forest plants and animals, including aquatic species.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
4.1	Program Participants shall have programs to promote biological diversity at stand- and landscape-levels.	Team	14						
Notes	See indicators below.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
4.1.1	Program to promote the conservation of native biological diversity, including species, wildlife habitats and ecological community types.	Team		14					
Notes	<p>Exceptional Practice: Indiana Division of Forestry employs a full-time wildlife biologist, Scott Haulton. His time is focused on special situations and on the HCP effort for Indiana bat, but he also provides support for regular work activities. The Indiana Division of Forestry has dedicated considerable resources to developing state-of-the-art bat conservation practices.</p> <p>Program for protection of and maintenance of Indiana bats and their habitat.</p> <p>There are 14 nature preserves on state land.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
4.1.2	Program to protect threatened and endangered species.	Team	14						
Notes	<p>As part of the program to protect the endangered Indiana Bat harvest restrictions are in place on significant portions of the forests. Depending on location harvesting (felling and yarding) activities are not allowed from March 31 through either October 1 or November 15.</p> <p>Workshop (office and field) presented by TNC at MMSF to train field staff on invasive species control practices.</p> <p>A database of known T&E species is checked during tract and sale planning. Results are documented on forms which were reviewed during the audit. When there are “hits” the Indiana Division of Forestry’s Wildlife Biologist is consulted for technical assistance as needed</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
4.1.3	Program to locate and protect known sites associated with viable occurrences of critically imperiled and imperiled species and communities also known as Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value. 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.	Team	14						
Notes	A database of known T&E species, including G1 and G2 species, is checked during tract and sale planning. Results are documented on forms which were reviewed during the audit. When there are “hits” the Indiana Division of Forestry’s Wildlife Biologist is consulted for technical assistance as needed.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
4.1.4	Development and implementation of criteria, as guided by regionally appropriate best scientific information, to retain stand-level wildlife habitat elements such as snags, stumps, mast trees, down woody debris, den trees and nest trees.	Team		14					
Notes	<p><u>Exceptional Practice: The Indiana Division of Forestry has an exceptional program to retain stand-level wildlife habitat elements in accordance with scientific information.</u></p> <p>The written criteria are well-crafted, comprehensive, and understood by foresters responsible for marking or for approving timber harvests. These guidelines are regularly reviewed and updated to reflect current understanding and changing regulatory requirements, particularly with respect to habitat for the endangered Indiana bat. Implementation is strong.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
4.1.5	Program for assessment, conducted either individually or collaboratively, of forest cover types, age or size classes, and habitats at the individual ownership level and, where credible data are available, across the landscape, and take into account findings in planning and management activities.	Team	14						
Notes	The Indiana bat strategy as well as individual tract plans demonstrate conformance.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
--	------------------------------	--------------	----------	------------	------------	------------	------------	-------------------------	---------------------------

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	14						
Notes	<p>Indiana Division of Forestry annually reviews inventory data (CFI) to locate stands older than 150 years. These stands are considered for protection; found one recently that is already in a natural area.</p> <p>A procedure for old growth management (five acres or larger that has been logged but have old-growth characteristics) is in place, with at least one training session held.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
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.	Team	14						
Notes	<p>Workshop (office and field) presented by TNC at MMSF to train field staff on invasive species control practices.</p> <p>Indiana Division of Forestry has prioritized the control of invasive plant species over the past year, with a particular emphasis on the control of invasive Stilt grass. Many examples of treatment sites were seen during the audit. Invasive species are mapped. Data is compiled by Central Office staff.</p> <p>On the Martin State Forest a part-time “C.R. & R” technician is employed in part to conduct invasive species control treatments.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
4.1.8	Program to incorporate the role of prescribed or natural fire where appropriate.	Team	14						
Notes	<p>Indiana Division of Forestry has not often used prescribed fire, but does so occasionally.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
4.2	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.	Team		14					

Notes	<p><u>Exceptional Practice: Indiana Division of Forestry has an exceptional program for developing new information that is needed to manage wildlife habitat and contribute to the conservation of biological diversity and for applying that information on the state forests.</u></p> <p>This program is driven by recognition of the enormous challenges of maintaining and even improving biodiversity in the fragmented, highly-altered, and ever-changing forest landscapes of southern Indiana. The presence of and challenges associated with managing the namesake Indiana bats, a species which appears suited to forest structures evidently maintained in large part by fire-linked disturbance patterns that have mostly ended, can only be met by such a focused program. Oak-dominated forests are favored by the hardwood timber industry as well as a vast array of wildlife species, lending urgency to the need to sustain these forests that will not survive absent active management.</p>
--------------	---

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
4.2.1	Collection of information on Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value 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 non-proprietary scientific information, time and assistance by staff, or in-kind or direct financial support.	MF	14						
Notes	<p>Resource Management Guides prepared in advance of each timber harvest document the results of a review of the Indiana Natural Heritage Database “to locate and identify any known endangered, threatened or rare (E.T.R.) animal species”</p> <p>Foresters contribute information to the heritage database.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
4.2.2	A methodology to incorporate research results and field applications of biodiversity and ecosystem research into forest management decisions.	MF	14						
Notes	<p>Many field foresters and manager are members of professional associations and all attend regular training meetings or workshops. Indiana Division of Forestry employs a full-time wildlife biologist, Scott Haulton, who is responsible for providing current, science-based information regarding wildlife and biodiversity to the organization’s employees. Scott’s current focus is on conservation of bat species and leading the preparation of a Habitat Conservation Plan for bats.</p>								

Objective 5. Management of Visual Quality and Recreational Benefits.

To manage the visual impact of forest operations and provide recreational opportunities for the public.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
5.1	Program Participants shall manage the impact of harvesting on visual quality.	MF, TW	14						
<i>Notes</i>	See indicators below.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
5.1.1	Program to address visual quality management.	MF, TW	14						
<i>Notes</i>	<p>Trained foresters are involved in all aspects of harvest planning and execution. The use of trained foresters (most have training in visual management) and the department’s sale review process (which considers visual issues) constitute a program.</p> <p>Particular emphasis is made on visual quality management adjacent to recreation areas, without an effort to “hide” active forestry.</p> <p>Procedure Manual Section F: Silvicultural guidelines:</p> <p>“Uneven-age systems provide for some of the other benefits that state forests provide to users. Aesthetically the relatively unbroken canopies maintain their appeal and visual continuity. Human management intervention appears less severe than under even-age systems. The continuous canopy cover benefits some wildlife species that are area sensitive. With their limited disturbance, even-age systems do not appear to offer a distinct advantage over uneven-age systems in the maintenance of some species or community types in the Central Hardwoods.”</p> <p>“State forest timber management should create a forested condition that is healthy and vigorous without fiber production being an overriding consideration. The forests should have a natural rather than planted look. There should be varied species composition, forest structure, and tree size to provide habitat diversity and aesthetic integrity within a contiguous-canopy forest context.”</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
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, TW	14						
<i>Notes</i>	Field observations showed excellent practices and results.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
5.2	Program Participants shall manage the size, shape and placement of clearcut harvests.	MF, TW	14						

<i>Notes</i>	<p>Clear-cutting is generally restricted to “regeneration openings” many of which already are vegetated. The total number of acres in regeneration openings is modest in light of the total acres under management (approximately 170,000).</p> <p>Source: Indiana Division of Forestry</p> <table border="1"> <caption>Regeneration Openings (Acres) by Fiscal Year</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Fiscal Year</th> <th>Acres</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>2001-2002</td><td>10</td></tr> <tr><td>2002-2003</td><td>60</td></tr> <tr><td>2003-2004</td><td>45</td></tr> <tr><td>2004-2005</td><td>200</td></tr> <tr><td>2005-2006</td><td>290</td></tr> <tr><td>2006-2007</td><td>370</td></tr> <tr><td>2007-2008</td><td>285</td></tr> <tr><td>2008-2009</td><td>365</td></tr> <tr><td>2009-2010</td><td>450</td></tr> <tr><td>2010-2011</td><td>435</td></tr> <tr><td>2011-2012</td><td>460</td></tr> </tbody> </table>									Fiscal Year	Acres	2001-2002	10	2002-2003	60	2003-2004	45	2004-2005	200	2005-2006	290	2006-2007	370	2007-2008	285	2008-2009	365	2009-2010	450	2010-2011	435	2011-2012	460
Fiscal Year	Acres																																
2001-2002	10																																
2002-2003	60																																
2003-2004	45																																
2004-2005	200																																
2005-2006	290																																
2006-2007	370																																
2007-2008	285																																
2008-2009	365																																
2009-2010	450																																
2010-2011	435																																
2011-2012	460																																

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
5.2.1	Average size of clear-cut harvest areas does not exceed 120 acres (50 hectares), except when necessary to meet regulatory requirements or to respond to forest health emergencies or other natural catastrophes.	MF, TW	14						

<i>Notes</i>	Most regeneration openings are under 10 acres, and the larger than 20 acres have significant retention including clumps.								
--------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
5.2.2	Documentation through internal records of clear-cut size and the process for calculating average size.	MF, TW	14						
<i>Notes</i>	The average size is 15.1 acres; the smallest was 10.7 acres and the largest was 20.3 acres. “The method I use to calculate is the properties report on the size of each regeneration opening (clearcut and group selection). I pull out all the clear-cut numbers and do the math to get the average size. Attached is an Excel spreadsheet. The O column shows the listing and math for the clear-cuts.”								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
5.3	Program Participants shall adopt a green-up requirement or alternative methods that provide for visual quality.	MF, TW	14						
<i>Notes</i>	See indicators below.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
5.3.1	Program implementing the green-up requirement or alternative methods.	MF, TW	14						
<i>Notes</i>	Clear-cutting is generally restricted to “regeneration openings” many of which already are vegetated. Most openings are buffered by extensive “matrix” patches of mature hardwood forest treated with light improvement thinning.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
5.3.2	Harvest area tracking system to demonstrate conformance with the green-up requirement or alternative methods.	MF, TW	14						
<i>Notes</i>	GIS is used, as well as formal or informal tracking for regeneration checks.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
--	------------------------------	--------------	----------	------------	------------	------------	------------	-------------------------	---------------------------

5.3.3	Trees in clear-cut harvest areas are at least 3 years old or 5 feet (1.5 meters) high at the desired level of stocking before adjacent areas are clear-cut, or as appropriate to address operational and economic considerations, alternative methods to reach the performance measure are utilized by the Program Participant.	MF	14						
<i>Notes</i>	No adjacent clear-cuts were observed.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
5.4	Program Participants shall support and promote recreational opportunities for the public.	Team		14					
<i>Notes</i>	See indicators below.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
5.4.1	Provide recreational opportunities for the public, where consistent with forest management objectives.	Team		14					
<i>Notes</i>	<p><u>Exceptional Practice: Indiana Division of Forestry provides excellent recreational opportunities for the public including walking and horse trails, camping and access to lakes and ponds.</u></p> <p>Interviewed Dale Brier, Section Chief, Steams & Trails Section, Division of Outdoor Recreation, Indiana Department of Natural Resources. He provided a map of and described the Knobstone Trail, a 60-mile trail that runs mostly on the Clark and Jackson-Washington State Forests. This trail is managed and maintained by Outdoor Recreation personnel who work closely with Indiana Division of Forestry staff on temporary trail relocations when there is a timber harvest planned. Several sections of the trail, including some having “trail temporarily closed” signs were seen.</p> <p>Dan Ernst has met with representatives of and trail interest groups.</p> <p>Jackson-Washington State Forest accommodates many recreational uses. The web site lists camping, hunting, Five forest lakes open to fishing, an Archery Range, Picnicking including shelters and day use picnic areas, playgrounds, and many trails including 10 shorter (1 to 6 miles) hiking trails, a rugged backcountry trail, and the Knobstone Trail, a 60-mile trail affording the remote backcountry experience, and mountain bike trails. Many of these were observed during the site visits, including Trail #4 which is being upgraded to meet guidelines from the Federal Americans with Disabilities Act to allow for use via Wheelchairs. Trail heads and recreational access points are well signed and maintained.</p> <p>Ferdinand-Pike State Forest also has a wide range of superb recreational facilities, as does Martin State Forest. At Martin the emphasis is on dispersed recreation, picnicking, hiking, and hunting.</p> <p>Special event permits are granted for a range of recreational and community activities.</p>								

Objective 6. Protection of Special Sites.

To manage lands that are ecologically, geologically or culturally important in a manner that takes into account their unique qualities.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
6.1	Program Participants shall identify special sites and manage them in a manner appropriate for their unique features.	Team	14						
Notes	See indicators below.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
6.1.1	Use of information such as existing natural heritage data, expert advice or stakeholder consultation in identifying or selecting special sites for protection.	MF	14						
Notes	<p>A database of known T&E species, including G1 and G2 species, is checked during tract and sale planning. Results are documented on forms which were reviewed during the audit. When there are “hits” the Indiana Division of Forestry’s Wildlife Biologist is consulted for technical assistance as needed.</p> <p>INDOF has a robust cultural resources identification and protection program including employing a full time archeologist. Archaeological clearance is needed for all except the most minor ground disturbing activities. Any major work on historic structures also requires clearance. Properties have awareness (lists) of cultural resources, and management activities avoid or buffer known cultural resource areas.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
6.1.2	Appropriate mapping, cataloging and management of identified special sites.	MF	14						
Notes	<p>Special sites reviewed were mapped and protected, generally by buffering from activities.</p> <p>Resource Management Guides prepared in advance of each timber harvest document the results of a review of the Indiana Natural Heritage Database “to locate and identify any known endangered, threatened or rare (E.T.R.) animal species”. The guides also describe protection of known cultural resources and the need to contact the division’s forest archeologist if any cultural resources are discovered. Harvest records include documentation describing cultural resources reviews. Interviewed AJ Ariens, Forestry Archeologist, Indiana Division of Forestry.</p> <p>Workers do basic maintenance to cemeteries as time allows. Location, condition and age of cemeteries are documented in Historic Preservation and Archaeology’s SHAARD Database.</p>								

Objective 7. Efficient Use of Forest Resources.

To promote the efficient use of forest resources.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<i>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.	MF, TW	14						
<i>Notes</i>	See indicators below.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<i>7.1.1</i>	Program or monitoring system to ensure efficient utilization, which may include provisions to ensure: a. management of harvest residue (e.g. slash, limbs, tops) considers economic, social and environmental factors (e.g. organic and nutrient value to future forests) and other utilization needs; b. training or incentives to encourage loggers to enhance utilization; c. cooperation with mill managers for better utilization of species and low-grade material; d. exploration of markets for underutilized species and low-grade wood and alternative markets (e.g. bioenergy markets); or e. periodic inspections and reports noting utilization and product separation.	MF, TW	14						
<i>Notes</i>	Harvests reviewed showed careful attention to utilizing logs efficiently, but pulpwood/firewood portions of felled trees, as well as trees not suited to sawtimber were generally left in the stands. Most forests are located far from pulpwood markets. Special markets for mulch, for local use, and for use on state infrastructure improvement projects are used when opportunities present themselves.								

Objective 8 to 13 are not applicable: Indiana Division of Forestry is not involved in forest procurement.

Objective 14. Legal and Regulatory Compliance.

Compliance with applicable federal, provincial, state and local laws and regulations.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<i>14.1</i>	Program Participants shall take appropriate steps to comply with applicable federal, provincial, state and local forestry and related social and environmental laws and regulations.	MF	14						
<i>Notes</i>	See indicators below.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<i>14.1.1</i>	Access to relevant laws and regulations in appropriate locations.	MF	14						
<i>Notes</i>	Web sites. Indiana Code on web. Printed regulations booklet: “State of Indiana Department of Natural Resources: Rules Affecting the Public Use of Land, Water and Facilities Owned, Leased or Licensed by the Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Effective July 1, 2013”. Field foresters use the Indiana BMP manual, which has “Appendix D: Known Regulations – Summary of State and Local Forestry Regulations in Indiana Affecting Timber Harvesting”.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<i>14.1.2</i>	System to achieve compliance with applicable federal, provincial, state or local laws and regulations.	MF	14						
<i>Notes</i>	Indiana Division of Forestry’s policies and procedures incorporate the laws and regulations. Professional foresters, trained on the organization’s policies, plan and oversee activities. Plans and proposed harvests are reviewed by Indiana Division of Forestry senior managers; these managers understand the laws. Harvests reviewed by John Friedrich and other contracts by Dan Ernst. For construction projects (recreation-related mostly) the Indiana Department of Natural Resources Division of Engineering.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<i>14.1.3</i>	Demonstration of commitment to legal compliance through available regulatory action information.	MF	14						

<i>Notes</i>	No violations in past year.
--------------	-----------------------------

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
14.2	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.	MF	14						
<i>Notes</i>	See indicators below.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	C	EXR	Maj	Min	OFI	Likely Gap *	Likely Conf. *
14.2.1	Written policy demonstrating commitment to comply with social laws, such as those covering civil rights, equal employment opportunities, anti-discrimination 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	14						
<i>Notes</i>	<p>Monthly safety meetings are held at each work unit (state forest), and annual safety inspections are documented. Indiana DNR employs a full-time safety officer who provides guidance and training, mostly in association with annual safety inspections of most work units. Each office has a designated safety officer, and annual training is required for each employee. Much of the training is on-the-job, wherein experienced workers show new workers how to perform their duties safely.</p> <p>Posters, websites regarding social laws were observed.</p> <p>Access to laws and policies is located in the state employee website.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
14.2.2	Forestry enterprises will respect the rights of workers and labor representatives in a manner that encompasses the intent of the International Labor Organization (ILO) core conventions.	MF	14						
<i>Notes</i>	There have not been any ILO-related complaints. If any occur then these should be reported to NSF who must pass these along to SFI Inc.								

Objective 15. Forestry Research, Science, and Technology.

To support forestry research, science, and technology, upon which sustainable forest management decisions are based.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<i>15.1</i>	Program Participants shall individually and/or through cooperative efforts involving SFI Implementation Committees, associations or other partners provide in-kind support or funding for forest research to improve forest health, productivity, and sustainable management of forest resources, and the environmental benefits and performance of forest products.	MF	14						
<i>Notes</i>	See indicators below.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
15.1.1	<p>Financial or in-kind support of research to address questions of relevance in the region of operations. The research shall include some of the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. forest health, productivity, and ecosystem functions; b. chemical efficiency, use rate and integrated pest management; c. water quality and/or effectiveness of best management practices including effectiveness of water quality and best management practices for protecting the quality, diversity and distributions of fish and wildlife habitats; d. wildlife management at stand- and landscape-levels; e. conservation of biological diversity; f. ecological impacts of bioenergy feedstock removals on productivity, wildlife habitat, water quality and other ecosystem functions; g. climate change research for both adaptation and mitigation; h. social issues; i. forest operations efficiencies and economics; j. energy efficiency; k. life cycle assessment; l. avoidance of illegal logging; and m. avoidance of controversial sources. 	Team		14					
<i>Notes</i>	<p><u>Indiana Division of Forestry has an exemplary program for research, particularly for issues related to management of forests to conserve ecological values and threatened or endangered species, notably bats.</u></p> <p>Indiana Division of Forestry devotes \$240,000 per year on research through a contract with Purdue University. Topics include: overstory and understory veg. sampling, summer bird survey, salamanders, small mammals, rattlesnakes, Cerulean warblers, wood boring beetles, box turtles, deer exclosures.</p> <p>Reviewed US Forest Service GTR NRS-P-108. The Hardwood Ecosystem Experiment: A Framework for Studying Responses to Forest Management. Website heeforeststudy.org The Hardwood Ecosystem Experiment is a 100 year study of the impacts of timber harvesting on plant and animal communities in the oak forests of Indiana.</p> <p>Scott Haulton, Wildlife Biologist tracks research and provided a spreadsheet showing a summary of permits for cooperative research; there were 42 permits listed from 1.01.2001 to 10.01.2014.</p> <p>Indiana Division of Forestry White Paper “Forest Management and the Economy”</p>								
	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>

15.1.2	Research on genetically engineered trees via forest tree biotechnology shall adhere to all applicable federal, state, and provincial regulations and international protocols.	NA							
<i>Notes</i>	NA								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
15.2	Program Participants shall individually <u>and/or</u> through cooperative efforts involving SFI Implementation Committees, associations or other partners develop or use state, provincial or regional analyses in support of their sustainable forestry programs.	MF	14						
<i>Notes</i>	See indicators below.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
15.2.1	Participation, individually and/or through cooperative efforts involving SFI Implementation Committees and/or associations at the national, state, provincial or regional level, in the development or use of some of the following: a. regeneration assessments; b. growth and drain assessments; c. best management practices implementation and conformance; d. biodiversity conservation information for family forest owners; and e. social, cultural or economic benefit assessments.	MF	14						
<i>Notes</i>	a. regeneration assessments: U.S. Forest Service’s FIA; and CFI on state forests and on private Classified Forest Land (800,000 acres approx. included in the CFI) b. growth and drain assessments: Jeff Settle contributes data to the US Forest Service’s primary processing survey c. best management practices implementation and conformance: BMP surveys done on Indiana State Forests (every harvest) and on private Classified Forest Land (10% sample) d. biodiversity conservation information for family forest owners: Working on a “Redesign Grant” on deer browsing with links to biodiversity mgmt.; Woodland Steward Newsletter funding e. social, cultural or economic benefit assessments: found in the Indiana Forest Assessment; also funded a public opinion survey. Indiana Division of Forestry White Paper “Forest Management and the Economy”								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
15.3	Program Participants shall individually and/or through cooperative efforts involving SFI Implementation Committees, associations or other partners broaden the awareness of climate change impacts on forests, wildlife and biological diversity.	MF	14						
<i>Notes</i>	See indicators below.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
15.3.1	Where available, monitor information generated from regional climate models on long-term forest health, productivity and economic viability.	MF	14						
<i>Notes</i>	Staff interviewed were generally aware of model predictions. Predicted condition changes are going to be warmer and drier, which will have impacts on invasive species problems. Sources consulted include US Forest Service Climate Change Clearinghouse-type website (central hardwood forest section) and the Bird Atlas and Tree Atlas through US Forest Service and the Fish and Wildlife Service								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
15.3.2	Program Participants are knowledgeable about climate change impacts on wildlife, wildlife habitats and conservation of biological diversity through international, national, regional or local programs.	MF	14						
<i>Notes</i>	Bird Atlas and Tree Atlas were mentioned as a useful source of information on impacts on birds and trees. Warmer conditions are expected to manifest impacts on biodiversity largely through the mechanisms of drier, warmer conditions and more challenges from invasive species.								

Objective 16. Training and Education.

To improve the implementation of sustainable forestry practices through appropriate training and education programs.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<i>16.1</i>	Program Participants shall require appropriate training of personnel and contractors so that they are competent to fulfill their responsibilities under the SFI 2010-2014 Standard.	MF	14						
<i>Notes</i>	See indicators below.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<i>16.1.1</i>	Written statement of commitment to the SFI 2010-2014 Standard communicated throughout the organization, particularly to facility and woodland managers, fiber sourcing staff and field foresters.	MF	14						
<i>Notes</i>	The commitment letter, signed by the Indiana State Forester Jack Seifert is on the Indiana Department of Natural Resources' web site, under Forestry/Forest Certification: http://www.in.gov/dnr/forestry/files/fo-SFI_Commitment_Letter.pdf								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<i>16.1.2</i>	Assignment and understanding of roles and responsibilities for achieving SFI 2010-2014 Standard objectives.	MF	14						
<i>Notes</i>	Brenda Huter is the management representative with overall responsibility for the program including tracking CARs and responses. Field-related objectives are the responsibility of foresters, while the other Objectives are covered by central office. On September 19, 2013 Indiana Division of Forestry conducted a one-hour, section-wide (Property Section) training via webinar covering general management items and certification-related items. PowerPoint included 29 slides								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<i>16.1.3</i>	Staff education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities.	MF	14						

Notes	<p>Foresters, managers, and specialists interviewed have professional degrees (mostly in forestry) from major universities.</p> <p>October 9, 2014: Statewide Resource Specialist/Manager Meeting (aka Fall Resource Management Update, 5 hours)</p> <p>Reviewed the “Record of Training” or equivalent for several employees: D.P., Resource Specialist (31 contact hours in 2014 through 9 months).</p> <p>Stilt grass training and work day on 7.09.14: office and field training by TNC at MMSF to train field staff on invasive species control practices.</p> <p>Amanda Smith participated in the recent training on stilt grass control, and her written record of training shows a systematic, practical, and comprehensive training program as applied to a recently-hired forester.</p>
--------------	---

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	C	EXR	Maj	Min	OFI	Likely Gap *	Likely Conf. *
16.1.4	Contractor education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities.	MF	14				14		
Notes	<p><u>There is an Opportunity for Improvement to more broadly include the SFI training module in the requirements for working on state lands.</u></p> <p>At least one on-site worker for each forestry operation must have been through the required training: Level 1 Game of Logging including BMP training and Game of Logging for Cutters through Level 4. A module is available but not widely taken that covers SFI-related issues. This is not required by IDOF.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	C	EXR	Maj	Min	OFI	Likely Gap *	Likely Conf. *
16.1.5	Forestry enterprises shall have a program for the use of certified logging professionals (where available) and qualified logging professionals.	MF	14						
Notes	<p>Required by contract to have at least one on-site individual during active harvesting operations. There is a process in place to police this requirement including a form found in the sale folder backed by a web site which lists the names of trained loggers.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	C	EXR	Maj	Min	OFI	Likely Gap *	Likely Conf. *
16.2	Program Participants shall work individually and/or with SFI Implementation Committees, logging or forestry associations, or appropriate agencies or others in the forestry community to foster improvement in the professionalism of wood producers.	MF	14						
Notes	<p>See indicators below.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
16.2.1	<p>Participation in or support of SFI Implementation Committees to establish criteria and identify delivery mechanisms for wood producers' training courses that address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. awareness of sustainable forestry principles and the SFI program; b. best management practices, including streamside management and road construction, maintenance and retirement; c. reforestation, invasive exotic plants and animals, forest resource conservation, aesthetics, and special sites; 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.g. Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value); e. logging safety; f. U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety (COHS) regulations, wage and hour rules, and other provincial, state and local employment laws; g. transportation issues; h. business management; i. public policy and outreach; and j. awareness of emerging technologies. 	MF	14				14		
Notes	<p><u>There is an Opportunity for Improvement to more broadly include the SFI training module in the requirements for working on state lands.</u></p> <p>Currently in place: BMP training for loggers (classroom and field, 1 day); Game of Logging Cutter 1, 2, 3, and 4 available and on demand; SFI-day involved to meet SFI requirements; GOL Skidder 1 and 2. Training held at State Forests, done by industry group "Indiana Hardwood Lumberman's Association".</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
16.2.2	<p>Participation in or support of SFI Implementation Committees to establish criteria for recognition of logger certification programs, where they exist, that include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. completion of SFI Implementation Committee recognized logger training programs and meeting continuing education requirements of the training program; b. independent in-the-forest verification of conformance with the logger certification program standards; c. compliance with all applicable laws and regulations including responsibilities under the U.S. Endangered Species Act, the Canadian Species at Risk Act and other measures to protect wildlife habitat; d. use of best management practices to protect water quality; e. logging safety; f. compliance with acceptable silviculture and utilization standards; g. aesthetic management techniques employed where applicable; and h. adherence to a management or harvest plan that is site specific and agreed to by the forest landowner. 	NA							
<i>Notes</i>	NA Indiana does not have a logger certification program.								

Objective 17. Community Involvement in the Practice of Sustainable Forestry.

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.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<i>17.1</i>	Program Participants shall support and promote efforts by consulting foresters, state, provincial and federal agencies, state or local groups, professional societies, conservation organizations, indigenous peoples and governments, community groups, sporting organizations, labor, universities, extension agencies, the American Tree Farm System® and/or other landowner cooperative programs to apply principles of sustainable forest management.	MF	14						
<i>Notes</i>	See indicators below.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<i>17.1.1</i>	Support, including financial, for efforts of SFI Implementation Committees.	MF	14						
<i>Notes</i>	There is no active SFI Implementation Committee in Indiana. Indiana Division of Forestry is the only SFI Certified Landowner. The organization acts independently to meet the requirements.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<i>17.1.2</i>	Support for the development of educational materials for use with forest landowners (e.g. information packets, websites, newsletters, workshops, tours, etc.).	MF	14						
<i>Notes</i>	The private forestry program of Indiana Division of Forestry meets this requirement. Support for The Indiana Forestry Exchange http://www.in.gov/dnr/forestryexchange/INForestryX/default.aspx Also see next indicator.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>

17.1.3	Support for the development of regional, state or provincial information materials that provide forest landowners with practical approaches for addressing special sites and biological diversity issues, such as invasive exotic plants and animals, specific wildlife habitat, Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value, and threatened and endangered species.	MF	14						
<i>Notes</i>	The private forestry program of Indiana Division of Forestry meets this requirement. Information meeting this requirement is available on the division's web site. Supplies of printed materials for forest landowners were observed at the central office (Indianapolis) and at the field offices visited. The information being generated by the research into bats and the development of the HCP will be important to help private landowners comply with the results of the expected listing of the Northern Long-Eared Bat.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
17.1.4	Participation in efforts to support or promote conservation of managed forests through voluntary market-based incentive programs such as current-use taxation programs, Forest Legacy Program or conservation easements.	MF	14						
<i>Notes</i>	Indiana Division of Forestry continues to acquire land, in part using forestry revenues, but at a reduced rate due to state funding and fiscal priorities The state's Classified Forest Program is a current-use taxation program administered by the Indiana Division of Forestry.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
17.1.5	Program Participants are knowledgeable about credible regional conservation planning and priority-setting efforts that include a broad range of stakeholders and have a program to take into account the results of these efforts in planning.	MF	14						
<i>Notes</i>	Work done by the wildlife biologist (see Objective 4) meets this indicator. Indiana State Wildlife Action Plan being drafted to build on the Wildlife Assessment done in 2004 (SGCN). The 2004 top issues for forest-related habitats were habitat loss and habitat fragmentation.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
17.2	Program Participants shall support and promote, at the state, provincial or other appropriate levels, mechanisms for public outreach, education and involvement related to sustainable forest management.	MF	14						

<i>Notes</i>	See indicators below.
--------------	-----------------------

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<i>17.2.1</i>	Periodic educational opportunities promoting sustainable forestry, such as a. field tours, seminars, websites, webinars or workshops; b. educational trips; c. self-guided forest management trails; d. publication of articles, educational pamphlets or newsletters; or e. support for state, provincial, and local forestry organizations and soil and water conservation districts.	MF	14						
<i>Notes</i>	<p>There are two Nature Centers/Forest Education Centers operated at state forests. The team visited the Forestry Education Center, Starve Hollow State Recreation Center, a well-provisioned nature center with live reptiles and ample evidence of a thriving program for environmental education.</p> <p>A booth is set up at the Indiana State Fair</p> <p>Property Newsletters and Annual Open Houses are important mechanisms to educate the public about sustainable forestry.</p> <p>Indiana Division of Forestry hosted the “Teacher Institute”</p> <p>Staff based in Indianapolis listed these events/activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hoosier Outdoor Experience speaker and booth • Earth Day (Clark State Forest) – Forestry program for 7 & 8 Graders • Participate in Teachers Institute, 13 30-minute TV spots • PBS program – Individual Working Forest • DNR – Community & Urban Forestry Department conducts outreach activities and advertising • Project Learning Tree • Participate in Forestry Committee for SW Indiana Group – Annual Family Forest Fun Day • State Fair and county fair booths • Newsletter to neighbors and others interested in receiving. Witnessed The Ranger at Ferdinand-Pike State Forest • 20 permitted special events annually – Orienteering, Trail runs, Polar Bear Dip, car show • Eagle Scout projects • Tours – Media, Legislative, Special interest, SAF, Woodlands Owners • Facebook for properties 								

<i>Notes (cont.)</i>	<p>Resource Forester at Ferdinand-Pike reported these activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presented 2 programs to 50 people is goal for year • Host High School program day - teach about forestry • Presentation at Ferdinand Library, Jasper Rotary Club • Will participate in 150 year anniversary of Ferdinand County – Parade and booth • Open House of each forest annually. 40 attendees at Ferdinand-Pike State Forest
----------------------	--

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<i>17.3</i>	Program Participants shall establish, at the state, provincial, or other appropriate levels, procedures to address concerns raised by loggers, consulting foresters, employees, unions, the public or other Program Participants regarding practices that appear inconsistent with the SFI Standard principles and objectives.	MF	14						
<i>Notes</i>	See indicators below.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<i>17.3.1</i>	Support for SFI Implementation Committees (e.g. toll free numbers and other efforts) to address concerns about apparent nonconforming practices.	MF	14						
<i>Notes</i>	There is no SFI Implementation Committee in Indiana. The Indiana Division of Forestry has a very accessible mechanism for receiving input. See indicator below.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<i>17.3.2</i>	Process to receive and respond to public inquiries. SFI Implementation Committees shall submit data annually to SFI Inc. regarding concerns received and responses.	MF	14						
<i>Notes</i>	The Indiana Division of Forestry has a system to track comments, including a database and a written summary. The division’s web-site provides an e-form where the public can input a comment or concern. Public comment forms are available to visitors; most are filled out by recreation users.								

Objective 18. Public Land Management Responsibilities.

To promote and implement sustainable forest management on public lands.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
18.1	Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall participate in the development of public land planning and management processes.	MF		14					
<i>Notes</i>	<u>Annual “State Forest Open Houses” and a very comprehensive and well-organized web site contribute to an exceptional program for public involvement in public land management and planning.</u>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
18.1.1	Involvement in public land planning and management activities with appropriate governmental entities and the public.	MF	14						
<i>Notes</i>	State Forest Management Guides are posted on the DNR website: http://www.in.gov/dnr/forestry/3635.htm .								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
18.1.2	Appropriate contact with local stakeholders over forest management issues through state, provincial, federal or independent collaboration.	MF	14						
<i>Notes</i>	Open houses for the public are held at most state forest units each year. These are advertised in newspaper, on web-site, supplemented by direct mailing to neighbors. At Ferdinand-Pike State Forest the recent open house attracted over 40 people, and the posters from that event were left in the meeting room and reviewed by the audit team. A comment page was provided next to the sign-in sheet; the sole comment was positive. At Martin State Forest the annual open house is held in conjunction with the Martin County Agriculture Day. This event attracts over 400 people. The Indiana Division of Forestry has a system to track comments, including a database and a written summary.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
18.2	Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall confer with affected indigenous peoples.	MF	14						

<i>Notes</i>	See indicators below.
--------------	-----------------------

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<i>18.2.1</i>	Program that includes communicating with affected indigenous peoples to enable Program Participants to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. understand and respect traditional forest-related knowledge; b. identify and protect spiritually, historically, or culturally important sites; and c. address the use of non-timber forest products of value to indigenous peoples in areas where Program Participants have management responsibilities on public lands. 	MF	14						
<i>Notes</i>	There is a policy and program for protecting all known historic and prehistoric archeological sites of potential significance, and most sites even if not significant and primary. Most known sites are historic (not tribal). The state has no federally-recognized tribes. The main tribe that is still active is the Miami tribe. Indiana Division of Forestry has contacted both local and federal tribes known to have been active in Indiana on two occasions, but not recently. Several responses were received but no concerns were voiced regarding the management of state forests.								

Objective 19. Communications and Public Reporting.

To broaden the practice of sustainable forestry by documenting progress and opportunities for improvement.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<i>19.1</i>	A Certified Program Participant shall provide a summary audit report, prepared by the certification body, to SFI Inc. after the successful completion of a certification, recertification or surveillance audit to the SFI 2010-2014 Standard.	MF	14						
<i>Notes</i>	See indicators below.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<i>19.1.1</i>	The summary audit report submitted by the <i>Program Participant</i> (one copy must be in English), shall include, at a minimum, a. a description of the audit process, <i>objectives</i> and scope; b. a description of substitute <i>indicators</i> , if any, used in the audit and a rationale for each; c. the name of <i>Program Participant</i> that was audited, including its SFI representative; d. a general description of the <i>Program Participant's</i> forestland and manufacturing operations included in the audit; e. the name of the <i>certification body</i> and <i>lead auditor</i> (names of the <i>audit team</i> members, including <i>technical experts</i> may be included at the discretion of the <i>audit team</i> and <i>Program Participant</i>); f. the dates the certification was conducted and completed; g. a summary of the findings, including general descriptions of evidence of conformity and any nonconformities and corrective action plans to address them, opportunities for improvement, and exceptional practices; and h. the certification decision.	MF	14						
<i>Notes</i>	Confirmed that summary audit reports from 2013 and 2012 are on the SFI web site and include all of the required information.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
19.2	Program Participants shall report annually to SFI Inc. on their conformance with the SFI 2010-2014 Standard.	MF	14						
Notes	See indicators below.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
19.2.1	Prompt response to the SFI annual progress report.	MF	14						
Notes	Confirmed by Rachel Dierolf, SFI Inc. who reported receiving the report as follows: “Indiana DNR – March 19, 2014”.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
19.2.2	Recordkeeping for all the categories of information needed for SFI annual progress reports.	MF	14						
Notes	Review of the report and interviews with personnel about how the data was derived indicates recordkeeping is capable of completing the SFI annual progress reports.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
19.2.3	Maintenance of copies of past reports to document progress and improvements to demonstrate conformance to the SFI 2010-2014 Standard.	MF	14						
Notes	Copies of past reports were available for review; a copy of the 2013 report was provided.								

Objective 20. Management Review and Continual Improvement.

To promote continual improvement in the practice of sustainable forestry, and to monitor, measure and report performance in achieving the commitment to sustainable forestry.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<i>20.1</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.	MF	14						
<i>Notes</i>	See indicators below. The Indiana Division of Forestry operates an efficient program with few layers of management (with a very flat organizational structure).								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<i>20.1.1</i>	System to review commitments, programs and procedures to evaluate effectiveness. Note: For multi-site programs the auditing requirements of Section 9 or the ISO MD-1 requirements must be followed (see Multi-site Checklist); at a minimum internal audits or monitoring that spans all sites and addresses the relevant part of the SFI Standard is expected.	MF	14						
<i>Notes</i>	<p>This program is modest in size, remarkably “flat” in terms of organizational structure, and has a remarkable degree of contact between the central office management and staff specialists and the field unit managers and resource specialists (foresters). Specialists in silviculture/operations, wildlife, and archeology review every proposed activity and provide input on many projects. The system is highly effective at ensuring consistency of operations while allowing for needed variation based on local conditions.</p> <p>System includes an annual management review which covers the SFI Program. It also includes an annual internal audit. This year, it included the Jackson-Washington and the Martin State Forests and the central office issues such as upcoming updates to the state forest procedures manual and the template for the resource management guides, improvements to public comment, financial issues, HCP, invasive species and other topics.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<i>20.1.2</i>	System for collecting, reviewing, and reporting information to management regarding progress in achieving SFI 2010-2014 Standard objectives and performance measures.	MF	14						

Notes	Central office personnel review and approve projects, ensuring consistency and that senior management understands progress. For example John Friedrich, Property Specialist reviews all proposed timber sales for completeness of paperwork and overall compliance and maintains overall timber harvest records. Dan Ernst oversees the contracting of other services. An audit of selected timber sales is conducted by counting stumps as a financial control measure, but one which provides an additional opportunity to view results of harvests. The system includes recordkeeping, reviewing and reporting information to the SFI Team.
--------------	--

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
20.1.3	Annual review of progress by management and determination of changes and improvements necessary to continually improve conformance to the SFI 2010-2014 Standard.	MF	14						
Notes	Confirmed by a review of agenda that an annual review occurred October 6, 2014 and was attended by upper management. The review included a review of the SFI Objectives, internal audit results, identifying and summarizing SFI accomplishments and needed improvements and included 2 action items, 2 were carryovers from last year. The process for tracking progress in meeting gaps identified during internal audits is quite informal.								

Multi-site Certification – Two Options

A multi-site organization is defined as an organization having an identified central function (hereafter referred to as a central office – but not necessarily the headquarters of the organization) at which certain activities are planned, controlled or managed and a network of local offices or branches (sites) at which such activities are fully or partially carried out.

Option 1: Alternate Approach to Multi-site Certification Sampling based on the Requirements for the SFI 2010-2014 Program, Section 9, Part 5.1 & Appendix 1

- a) What specific activities are planned, controlled or managed at the central office?
The program is very centralized, with budgeting, setting of overall harvest levels, policies, and most planning done centrally.
- b) For each activity, provide evidence:
See checklist above.

General Eligibility Criteria:

A legal or contractual link shall exist between all sites.

Yes No Evidence All sites part of Indiana's state forest system and governed by a uniform set of laws, policies, and procedures.

The scope and scale of activities carried out by participating sites shall be similar.

Yes No Evidence All sites consist of managed forestland with associated infrastructure, and have the same range of activities.

The management system framework shall be consistent across all sites (allowing for site level procedures to reflect variable local factors).

Yes No Evidence All sites part of Indiana's state forest system and governed by a uniform set of laws, policies, and procedures.

Central Function Requirements:

Provide a commitment on behalf of the whole multi-site organization to establish and maintain practices and procedures in accordance with the requirements of the relevant standard.

Yes No Evidence The commitment is described in the notes for SFI Indicator 16.1.1 above.

Provide all the sites with information and guidance needed for effective implementation and maintenance of practices and procedures in accordance with the relevant standard.

Yes No Evidence Guidance consists of the State Forest Procedures Manual and other parts of the management system described in the checklist above, particularly Performance Measures 1.1.1 and 20.1.

Maintain the organizational or contractual connection with all sites covered by the multisite Organization including the right of the Central Function to exclude any site from participation In the certification in case of serious non-conformities with the relevant standard.

Yes No Evidence The central office has the authority to manage the state forest system.

Keep a register of all the sites of the multi-site organization, including (for SFI 2010-2014 Standard) the forest area associated with each participating site.

Yes No Evidence List is found within the scope statement and on the Indiana Division of Forestry web site.

Maintain an internal audit or monitoring program sufficient to provide annual performance data on overall organizational conformance with the relevant standard.

Yes No Evidence See Indicators 20.1.1 and 20.1.2 above.

Maintain an internal audit or monitoring program sufficient to provide periodic performance data on overall organizational conformance with the relevant standard.

Yes No Evidence See Indicators 20.1.1 and 20.1.2 above.

Operate a review of the conformity of sites based on results of internal audit and/or monitoring data sufficient to assess Organizational performance as a whole rather than at the individual site level.

Yes No Evidence See Indicator 20.1.3 in the checklist.

Establish corrective and preventive measures if required and evaluate the effectiveness of corrective actions taken.

Yes No Evidence Done informally and through annual training meetings.

Establish procedures for inclusion of new sites within the multi-site organization including an internal assessment of conformity with the standard, implementation of corrective and preventive measures and a requirement to inform the relevant certification body of changes in participation prior to including the sites within the scope of the certification.

Yes No Evidence New state forests must be authorized by the Indiana Legislature.

Individual Site Functions and Responsibilities

Sites implement and maintain the requirements of the relevant standard.

Yes No Evidence Confirmed during audit; see checklist above.

Sites respond effectively to all requests from the Central Function or certification body for relevant data, documentation or other information whether in connection with formal audits or reviews or otherwise.

Yes No Evidence No issues found in this regard during audit.

Sites provide full co-operation and assistance in respect of the satisfactory completion of internal audits, reviews, monitoring, relevant routine enquiries or corrective actions.

Yes No Evidence The auditors observed good interactions between staff of central office and field staff during audit. There are no indications of lack of co-operation.

Sites implement relevant corrective and preventive actions established by the central office.

Yes No Evidence Program changes established by the central office are quickly adopted in the field.

2014 Audit Field Notes and Interviewees

October 14, 2014 – Indiana State Forestry Offices

Brenda Huter, Forest Certification Coordinator, Indiana Division of Forestry
John Seifert, State Forester, Indiana Division of Forestry
Dan Ernst, Assistant State Forester, Indiana Division of Forestry
John Friedrich, Property Specialist, Indiana Division of Forestry
Scott Haulton, Forestry Wildlife Specialist, Indiana Division of Forestry
AJ Ariens, Forestry Archaeologist, Indiana Division of Forestry
Dale Brier, Streams and Trails Section Chief, Indiana Division of Outdoor Recreation
Dwane A. McCoy, Forest Hydrologist, Indiana Division of Forestry
John Bacone, Director, Division of Nature Preserves

October 15, 2014, Jackson-Washington State Forest

Brenda Huter, Forest Certification Coordinator, Indiana Division of Forestry
John Seifert, State Forester, Indiana Division of Forestry
Dan Ernst, Assistant State Forester, Indiana Division of Forestry
John Friedrich, Property Specialist, Indiana Division of Forestry
Scott Haulton, Forestry Wildlife Specialist, Indiana Division of Forestry
AJ Ariens, Forestry Archaeologist, Indiana Division of Forestry
Brad Schneck, Property Manager, Jackson-Washington State Forest
Derrick Potts, Jackson-Washington State Forest, Indiana Division of Forestry
Sandy Derringer, Naturalist/Forester, Jackson-Washington State Forest

Jackson-Washington State Forest Field Sites

Site 1 Compartment 1, Tract 10. Stilt grass control from below dam along creek where one treatment was conducted with Post applied via ATV-mounted foliage sprayer. Did not treat close to drainage. This is the first treatment of an expected series. Did not use glyphosate so that there would remain some vegetation along the stream

Site 2 Trail #4. A walking trail with signs, trail markers, footbridges, and a well-maintained walkway. A project has begun to upgrade a portion of this trail as a loop that is ADA-compliant for wheelchair access.

Site 3 Compartment not known. Completed harvest near Trail #2, reviewed status of regeneration in openings that were created as part of a timber harvest with follow-up TSI completed three years ago. Observed some oak seedlings expected to survive and many other hardwood species including taller tulip-poplar, confirming adequate and thrifty natural regeneration.

Site 4 Compartment 3, Tract 37. Selection harvest with scattered patch regeneration openings completed in 2012 with post-harvest TSI also completed. Openings targeted removal of post-agricultural planted non-native pine.

Site 5, Forestry Education Center, Starve Hollow State Recreation Center. A well-provisioned nature center with live reptiles and ample evidence of a thriving program.

Site 6 Completed timber sale viewed from Mail Route Road. Confirmed good attention to visual management issues.

Site 7 Compartment 9, Tracts 14, 28. Active harvest on large sale with nearly 700 mbf and over 300 cords sold. Due to wet ground conditions and rain on the day of the visit by the auditors the logging equipment was parked. Several cutting blocks and associated skid trails and much of the haul road being used were assessed and found to be holding up. Water bars are well-constructed and the deep mixture of yarding equipment (crawler dozer, rubber-tired skidder and rubber-tired grapple skidder, all with cable winches) has been effectively deployed to minimize site impacts on the steep terrain. Logger interviews completed by phone while on this site.

Site 8 Indian Bitter (Cucumber tree) State Natural Area. 35-acre site dedicated 2.21.86.

Site 9 Mail Route Access Road. This access road is open to the public all year and is maintained by Indiana Division of Forestry. Some drainage issues were pointed out by the resource forester, with repairs scheduled for next week using Indiana Division of Forestry equipment and operator.

Site 10 – Walked through four different tracts of Back Country Area (BCA) along Knobstone Trail. Tracts visited had been harvested in 2004, 1992, 1971, and 1978. Also walked along two tracts that had no record of harvest under State ownership. All harvest areas had been treated with improvement thinnings and no regeneration openings were created. According to DoF staff, this Back Country Area was originally set-aside because its size and location fit with the need to have an area for remote site camping. It was not selected based on any ecological uniqueness and area walked through did not appear to have any unique ecological features. This BCA was a mature secondary forest similar to much of the forest on Jackson-Washington State Forest. Interviewed backpacker on the trail as he was hiking the approximate 58 mile trail.

Interviewee: Kaleb Staton- Bloomington, Indiana

Site 11- Compartment 10 Tract 16. 144 acre improvement thinning (single tree selection) in BCA. Timber sale setup in 2011 and harvested in 2013. Confirmed that no regeneration openings were created in harvest area. Approximately 37% (332,000 bf) of the standing volume (900,000 bf) was harvested. 217 cull trees were listed in the harvest tally. There was some residual stand damage and penalties were assessed to the logger. Water bars were well constructed and were serving intended purpose.

Site 12 (Tucker) Jackson-Washington - C 11 – T 3 & 4 – Minimal skid trails, Minimal damage to residual stands, and water bars meet BMPs. The log yard is clean of fluids and trash and was smoothed and leveled prior to closure of tract. TSI will be next operation

Jackson-Washington State Forest

Jackson-Washington State Forest encompasses nearly 18,000 acres in Jackson and Washington counties in the heart of southern Indiana. The main forest and office area are located 2.5 southeast of Brownstown on State Road 250. This part of the state contains unique topography known as the “knobs”. This region provides scenic views second to none and offers some breathtaking hiking opportunities.

The majority of the land that now makes up Jackson-Washington was purchased by the state of Indiana in the 1930's and 1950's. The [Heritage Trust](#) program, which uses funds from the sale of environmental license, Division of Forestry funds generated from portions of timber sales, and assistance from other conservation partners has made possible the acquisition of additional state forest lands. Source: Indiana Division of Forestry web site

October 16, 2014, Ferdinand –Pike State Forest

Brenda Huter, Forest Certification Coordinator, Indiana Division of Forestry
John Seifert, State Forester, Indiana Division of Forestry
Dan Ernst, Assistant State Forester, Indiana Division of Forestry
John Friedrich, Property Specialist, Indiana Division of Forestry
Scott Haulton, Forestry Wildlife Specialist, Indiana Division of Forestry
AJ Ariens, Forestry Archaeologist, Indiana Division of Forestry
Jamie Winner, Property Manager
Amanda Smith, Resource Specialist

Ferdinand –Pike State Forest Sites Visited

Site #1: Regeneration and shelterwood cut adjacent to Ferdinand-Pike office: Harvested in 2011. Abundant regeneration dominated by tulip poplar. Prescribed fire to promote oak had not accomplished objective of releasing underplanted oak.

Site #2: C 2 T 4 - 142 acre tract of mixed hardwood. 113 acre improvement thinning with five regeneration openings. The one regeneration opening inspected was successfully regenerated. No rutting or residual stand damage observed. Removal of approximately 2600 bf per acre. Remnants of a historic home site were protected from equipment. TSI completed in March 2013. Tract had recreation opportunities for mountain biking and disabled hunters.

Site #3: Fire Lane 1: Annually mowed and graded, when staff resources allow. Fire lanes are also used as disabled hunting trails.

Site #4: Fire tower: Open to public allows viewing of Ferdinand-Pike, Hoosier, and private forests. Small amount of trash are left by public and DoF staff periodically clean it up.

Site #5: C 3, T2: Completed treatments on 53 acres, most of which is improvement thinning. There are 9 regeneration openings, 2 of non-native pine and 7 smaller hardwood openings. Pine openings have ample regeneration and sufficient retention. Hardwood opening inspected has TSI pending.

Site #6: C 3 - T 2, 3, 4, & 5- 322 acres of non-native pines and mixed hardwoods. 100 acres of clear-cut and improvement thinning. Invasive plant treatment of forester spraying multi-flora rose with round-up prior to harvest. Additional invasive control is scheduled to be done through a post TSI harvest contract. Three large regeneration openings, with two of them requiring

retention patches of 5% due to size being over 20 acres. Forester and wildlife biologist communicated to determine and implement appropriate retention patches, which were mapped and painted prior to harvest. Additional peninsula added to Tract 3 to protect ephemeral drainage. Erosion problem on fire lane that was used to access harvest blocks. Soils with high susceptibility to erosion along with ineffective drainage controls resulted in several areas of road washout. Most significant area was a 250 ft long washout that emptied into a very small wetland. Fire lanes are typically maintained annually but this had been deferred due to higher-priority facility maintenance needs at property headquarters.

Site #7: C 3 - T 4- Small timber harvest by Fire Headquarters removing white pines for special project. Initial water bars not fully functional, but sedimentation into perennial stream prevented by fiber erosion matting.

Site #8: CCC shelter and campground site. Nice example of the recreation facilities available at Ferdinand - Pike. New vault toilets added in 2013. Plans are in place to bring in cabins.

(Tucker Watts) Ferdinand - C 1 T 10 – Marking sale in Ferdinand State Forest. Salvage sale of pine, Improvement cut of hardwood, Blended timber sale marking with mountain bike trail.

(Tucker Watts) Site 21 - Pike - C 11 T 2, 3, 4 – Salvage of blown down pine and intermediate cut of hardwood. Good utilization – mulching increased. Monitoring for hardwood natural regeneration. Cultural sites identified on ground and tagged and mapped in GIS. Debris used to stabilize yard and skid trails. Water bars implemented on tract. Camping area will be closed during harvesting.

(Tucker Watts) Site 22 - Pike C 8 T 6 & 8 – Harvest pine with intermediate harvest of hardwood. Boundary line freshly painted. Low water crossings on access. Plan for additional rock when using. Yard is abandoned F & W food plot. Cultural site – Home site – marked with 100' buffer. Will be reflagged prior to harvesting. Pine in Opening sold by inventory. 3 pine areas (5.4 acres, 5.0 acres, 6.4 acres), Hardwood marked for improvement.

Ferdinand State Forest

In 1933, a local conservation club raised funds to buy 900 acres to build a lake and establish an area to hunt and fish. They offered management of the project to the Indiana Department of Conservation the following year, and this marked the establishment of Ferdinand State Forest. Established in 1934 as a Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) camp, CCC workers built roads, service buildings, and one of the most beautiful forest lakes in the state. Ferdinand State Forest is well known for its excellent deer and squirrel hunting. Source: Indiana Division of Forestry web site. Ferdinand and Pike are managed together, with slightly over 12,000 acres combined.

October 17, 2014, Martin State Forest

Brenda Huter, Forest Certification Coordinator, Indiana Division of Forestry

John Seifert, State Forester, Indiana Division of Forestry

Dan Ernst, Assistant State Forester, Indiana Division of Forestry

John Friedrich, Property Specialist, Indiana Division of Forestry

Scott Haulton, Forestry Wildlife Specialist, Indiana Division of Forestry
AJ Ariens, Forestry Archaeologist, Indiana Division of Forestry
Jim Lauck, Property Manager
Joshua Kush, Resource Specialist

Martin State Forest Sites Visited

Site 1, State Forest Fire Lane #12. Forest access road with gravel surface, crown, ditches, and ditch-relief culverts built to high standards. Maintained by state forest staff using Bobcat, with annual mowing and spot repairs the normal approach. The spot repairs in 2014 have been delayed due to staff shortages and other priorities, and mowing intervals are longer than in the past. Despite this the road is holding up well. Road is gated but disabled hunters are allowed access on request. Side or branch fire lanes are not built to the same standard so they are gated without similar provisions for disabled hunters.

Site 2, Compartment 4, Tract 9, 2, and 8. Marked 331 acres and sold but not harvested yet. Silvicultural prescription is mostly improvement thinning with some regeneration openings. Inspected one opening which has received pre-harvest TSI in the form of girdling Unmerchantable pole size trees.

Site 3, Compartment 4. Stand was burned 4 years ago and then a shelterwood seed-tree harvest was done. Adequate regeneration, defined as more than 1,000 trees per acres, apparent, with some oaks. Biologist stated that this treatment approach when monitored in other locations has shown to be desirable for bats, likely because it emulates a very common forest structure when the historic disturbance fire regime was in place.

Site 4, Compartment 1, Tracts 1, 11, 14, active harvest site but loggers were not present due to wet conditions. 2 sales: 187-acre selection tract with a pine regeneration opening; salvage sale added later. Some rutting was observed, linked to change in time of year for harvesting dictated by the recent bat management guidelines.

Site 5, Compartment 1, Tract 11. Sale layout reviewed; 52 acres of pine salvage regeneration openings with some areas of selection harvesting around the stream.

Site 6 (Watts), Compartment 1 Tracts 9 and 10. Approximate boundaries noted. No issues. Intermediate harvest of hardwood with openings. Opening has retention trees. Good reproduction found in site. No damage to residual stand. Good utilization. No issues identified on site.

Martin State Forest

Martin State Forest was established in 1932 with the purchase of 1,205 acres. A fire tower and a small picnic area were soon built. In 1933, the Civilian Conservation Corps built several shelter houses. Three fishing ponds were constructed in 1957. Each pond measured 3 to 4 acres. In the mid-1960s a 26-site, primitive campground was developed.

The property has grown to 7,863 acres through additional land purchases and trades with the U.S. Forest Service. Most of the land was eroding, abandoned farmland or heavily cut-over woodland when acquired. With years of intensive management, including the planting of

thousands of trees, countless hours fighting wildfires and hundreds of acres of selective improvement harvests, the area has been transformed into a lush, healthy, growing forest.
Source: Indiana Division of Forestry web site

Contractors Interviewed:

- Danny Richards – Commiskey Hardwood
- Billy Trueblood – Trueblood Logging

Appendix IV



SFI Reporting Form (no changes, not needed)