



2000 Powell St., Suite 600
Emeryville, CA 94608, USA

www.scscertified.com

Brendan Grady

bgrady@scscertified.com

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

**Indiana DNR Division of Forestry
Classified Forest & Wildlands Program**

SCS-FM/COC-00123N

402 W. Washington St, Room W296

Indianapolis, IN 46204

Brenda Huter, BHuter@dnr.IN.gov

<http://www.in.gov/dnr/forestry/4801.htm>

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

DATE OF FIELD AUDIT
17-22/Oct/2012
DATE OF LAST UPDATE
28/Nov/2012

Organization of the Report

This report of the results of our evaluation is divided into two sections. Section A provides the public summary and background information that is required by the Forest Stewardship Council. This section is made available to the general public and is intended to provide an overview of the evaluation process, the management programs and policies applied to the forest, and the results of the evaluation. Section A will be posted on the FSC Certificate Database (<http://info.fsc.org/>) no less than 30 days after issue of the certificate. Section B contains more detailed results and information for the use of by the FME.

FOREWORD

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

All certificates issued by SCS under the aegis of the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) require annual audits to ascertain ongoing compliance with the requirements and standards of certification. A public summary of the initial evaluation is available on the SCS website www.scscertified.com.

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

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

Contents

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY 4

1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION 4

 1.1 Annual Audit Team..... 4

 1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation 4

 1.3 Standards Employed 4

2.0 ANNUAL AUDIT DATES AND ACTIVITIES 4

 2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities 4

3.0 CHANGES IN MANAGEMENT PRACTICES 5

4.0 RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION 6

 4.1 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations 6

 4.2 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations 32

5.0 STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS 35

 5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted 36

 5.2 Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Responses from the Team, Where Applicable 36

6.0 CERTIFICATION DECISION 36

7.0 CHANGES IN CERTIFICATION SCOPE 36

8.0 ANNUAL DATA UPDATE 36

 8.1 Social Information 36

 8.2 Annual Summary of Pesticide And Other Chemical Use 36

SECTION B – APPENDICES (CONFIDENTIAL) 39

Appendix 1 – List of FMUs Selected For Evaluation..... 39

Appendix 2 – Evaluation of Management Systems 45

Appendix 3 – List of Stakeholders Consulted..... 45

Appendix 4 – Additional Audit Techniques Employed..... 46

Appendix 5 – Pesticide Derogations 46

Appendix 6 – Detailed Observations..... 46

Appendix 7 – Chain of Custody Indicators for FMEs..... 58

Appendix 8 – Group Management Program Members 58

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY

1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1 Annual Audit Team

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

1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation

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

1.3 Standards Employed

1.3.1. Applicable FSC-Accredited Standards

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

2.0 ANNUAL AUDIT DATES AND ACTIVITIES

2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities

17 – Oct – 2011

FMU/Location/ sites visited*	Activities/ notes
District 9 Office, Opening meeting at Harrison Crawford State Forest	Introduction to Classified Forest Program including history, organization structure, management strategy, record keeping, and interviews with ICF staff.
Field visits in District 9	Review of CFs in Crawford and Harrison counties. Viewed recent timber harvests, trail improvement, invasive species control, and TSI work.
18 – Oct	
FMU/Location/ sites visited*	Activities/ notes
District 8 Office at Clark State Forest	Review of hard copies of group records.
Field visit in District 8	Review of CFs in Clark, Jefferson, and Scott counties. Recent timber harvests, trail building, invasive plant control, planting, prescribed fire for grassland maintenance.
19 – Oct	
FMU/Location/ sites visited*	Activities/ notes
District 17 Office at Selmier State Forest	Review of hard copies of group records.
Field visit in District 17	Review of CFs in Ripley and Dearborn counties. Viewed recent timber harvests, pond creation, planting, and TSI work.
20 – Oct	
FMU/Location/ sites visited*	Activities/ notes
District 15	Review of hard copies of group records.
District 15 Office	Review of CFs in Fayette, Union, and Wayne counties. Viewed recent timber harvests, protection of archeological sites.
Field visits in District 15	Review of recent timber harvests, TSI, and road management BMPs
Daily debrief	
22 – Oct	
FMU/Location/ sites visited*	Activities/ notes
Closing meeting with ICF	Review of initial findings, including nonconformities
<i>Add more rows as necessary.</i>	

3.0 CHANGES IN MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

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

4.0 RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION

4.1 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations

Certificate holder/applicant	Indiana DNR Division of Forestry Classified Forest & Wildlands Program (ICF)
CAR/OBS identified by (SCS representative)	Kyle Meister
Date of Issuance	01 - Dec - 2011
Audit Year/Type (select from pull down menu)	2nd annual audit

TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	CAR/OBS Number (e.g. 1, 2, ...)	2011.2
	Select one:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation
	Site CAR/OBS issued to (where more than one site)	
	Deadline for Corrective Action by FME	
	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 month from above Date of Issuance <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):	
	Standard and Requirement Reference	FSC US indicator 4.2.b.
NON-CONFORMITY (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations) (Describe and provide objective evidence) ICF's timber sale contract language recommendations include clauses about following federal and state laws. However, reference to specific safety laws and regulations, such as OSHA, could help group members to better understand safety issues.		
REQUESTED CORRECTIVE ACTION (or Observation) ICF should consider including more specific references to safety requirements in its recommended language for contracts.		

TO BE COMPLETED BY FME	IMPLEMENTED CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Response to Observations is optional)</i> Describe action taken by the FME to address the root cause of the non-conformity	
	EVIDENCE OF CONFORMANCE SUBMITTED WITH THIS FORM <i>(please list)</i>	
	FME Representative Name and Title	Date
TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	SCS REVIEW / ACCEPTANCE OF CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Describe conclusion in detail)</i> No action taken to address this Observation. Observation is continued.	
	<input type="checkbox"/> CLOSED <input type="checkbox"/> UPGRADED TO MAJOR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OTHER DECISION <i>(refer to description above)</i>	
	SCS Representative Name and Title (CAR/OBS reviewer) Dave Wager	Date of Acceptance of Corrective Action 10/22/12
Press Enter twice below table to leave a space, then copy and paste table below for each CAR/OBS		

TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	CAR/OBS Number (e.g. 1, 2, ...)	2011.3
	Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
	Site CAR/OBS issued to (where more than one site)	
	Deadline for Corrective Action by FME <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from above Date of Issuance <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):	
	Standard and Requirement Reference	FSC US indicator 6.3.f.
	NON-CONFORMITY (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations) (Describe and provide objective evidence) Indicator 6.3.f states that : “Management maintains, enhances, or restores habitat components and associated stand structures, in abundance and distribution that could be expected from naturally occurring processes” and “Trees selected for retention are generally representative of the dominant species found on the site.” A few stakeholders expressed concern about the succession of the forests in Indiana progressing to Beech-Maple forests. Several group member FMUs have a history of high grade timber harvests or have had little management conducted over a few decades. There is a tendency among some landowners to harvest heavier seeded mid-shade- to shade-intolerant species, although some of this also is due in part to sugarbush management. ICF staff respect the private property rights and decisions of individual group members.	
REQUESTED CORRECTIVE ACTION (or Observation) While considering adjacent seed sources, ICF and/or ICF group members should evaluate the risk of losing the seed source of mid-shade- to shade-intolerant species on group member FMUs.		

TO BE COMPLETED BY FME	IMPLEMENTED CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Response to Observations is optional)</i> Describe action taken by the FME to address the root cause of the non-conformity The Division of Forestry recognizes and is concerned about the on-going shift from shade intolerant species (oaks, hickory) to shade tolerant species (beech/maple) as a result of the traditional single tree selection harvests conducted in Indiana. The Division of Forestry is introducing the management concepts needed to maintain the shade intolerant species to private landowners. In the April 2011 Classified Forest & Wildlands newsletter, we ran in article title "Time to Think about Regeneration." District foresters discuss regeneration options with landowners when site conditions are appropriate and openings are compatible with the landowner's objectives and future desired condition. On the State Forest system, we create regeneration openings as an example to private landowners.	
	EVIDENCE OF CONFORMANCE SUBMITTED WITH THIS FORM <i>(please list)</i> Time to Think about Regeneration (OBS 2011.3 Time to Think about Regeneration.pdf)	
	FME Representative Name and Title Brenda Huter, Forest Stewardship Coordinator	Date 10-13-2012
TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	SCS REVIEW / ACCEPTANCE OF CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Describe conclusion in detail)</i> DoF has taken action to address the Observation, and thus it can be closed. All DoF foresters interviewed were aware of the need for regenerating shade intolerant species, and have begun educating landowners after many years of only encouraging light improvement harvests. Because of the preferred aesthetics of single tree selection, many landowners are opposed to the larger and heavier cuts needed to regenerate intolerant species. Years of hearing recommendations from DoF to undertake light improvement cuts contributes to the resistance. The discussion of regeneration in the 2011 newsletter is a good step toward educating landowners. Some stewardship plans do recommend TSI work to clean up openings. Given entrenched landowner preferences toward lighter harvests, this is a long term issue, and should be checked for continued progress in subsequent audits.	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CLOSED <input type="checkbox"/> UPGRADED TO MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER DECISION (refer to description above)	
	SCS Representative Name and Title (CAR/OBS reviewer) Dave Wager, Lead Auditor	Date of Acceptance of Corrective Action 10/22/12
Press Enter twice below table to leave a space, then copy and paste table below for each CAR/OBS		

TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	CAR/OBS Number (e.g. 1, 2, ...)	2011.4
	Select one:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation
	Site CAR/OBS issued to (where more than one site)	
	Deadline for Corrective Action by FME	
	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from above Date of Issuance <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):	
	Standard and Requirement Reference	FSC US indicators 6.5.a and 6.5.c.
NON-CONFORMITY (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations) (Describe and provide objective evidence)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ICF does not have written guidelines outlining conformance to all Indicators of criterion 6.5. For example, there are no guidelines on rutting. Excessive rutting was observed on several group member FMUs. Although some rutting may be due to use of legacy roads, it appears that on some sites measures were not implemented to mitigate or eliminate excessive rutting. 		
REQUESTED CORRECTIVE ACTION (or Observation) ICF shall include guidelines for rutting in its written guidelines for ICF group members.		

TO BE COMPLETED BY FME	IMPLEMENTED CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Response to Observations is optional)</i> Describe action taken by the FME to address the root cause of the non-conformity Rutting guidelines added to the Indiana Classified Forest Certified Umbrella Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During the harvest or other management activity the maximum rut depth is 18 inches • At the close of the management activity, no ruts greater than 12 inches deep extending more than 10 feet may remain unless otherwise specified for a resource purpose identified in the stewardship plan. Group members were notified of the new rutting guidelines in the 2012 Classified Forest & Wildlands Newsletter.	
	EVIDENCE OF CONFORMANCE SUBMITTED WITH THIS FORM <i>(please list)</i> ICFG Umbrella Plan (ICFCG Umbrella Plan 10-2012) 2012 Classified Forest & Wildlands Newsletter (CFW Newsletter 2012.pdf)	
	FME Representative Name and Title Brenda Huter, Forest Stewardship Coordinator	Date 10/13/2012
TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	SCS REVIEW / ACCEPTANCE OF CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Describe conclusion in detail)</i> The revision to the Umbrella Plan, demonstrated understanding of the new rutting standard by District Foresters, and the 2012 newsletter satisfy this CAR. Rutting levels were acceptable on nearly all of the tracts visited during the 2012 FSC audit. One exception was landowner in District 8 (Tract 72-0140) that was still active and had some areas of rutting approaching the standards limit. This harvest occurred without advance notice to DoF (CAR 2012.1) District Foresters demonstrated awareness of the revised rutting requirements.	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CLOSED <input type="checkbox"/> UPGRADED TO MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER DECISION <i>(refer to description above)</i>	
	SCS Representative Name and Title (CAR/OBS reviewer) Dave Wager, Lead Auditor	Date of Acceptance of Corrective Action 10/22/12
Press Enter twice below table to leave a space, then copy and paste table below for each CAR/OBS		

TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	CAR/OBS Number (e.g. 1, 2, ...)		2011.5
	Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR
			<input type="checkbox"/> Observation
	Site CAR/OBS issued to (where more than one site)		
	Deadline for Corrective Action by FME		
	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from above Date of Issuance <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):		
	Standard and Requirement Reference		FSC US indicator 6.10.a.
NON-CONFORMITY (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations) (Describe and provide objective evidence) ICF's conversion of forestland policy allows for the lesser of the following to be converted: a) 10% of the FMU or b) 5 acres The FSC US' definition of a "very limited portion" is "less than 2% of the certified forest area on the FMU over a rolling five-year period. Lands that are converted for forest management purposes (e.g. roads, landings, management buildings) are not included in calculations of this limit." Between FMUs of 11.11 acres and 250 acres in size, the conversion ranges from 10% at 11.11 acres down to 2% at 250 acres (i.e., conversion of 5 acres). Conversions that are in conformance to the laws and regulations that established ICF do not disqualify group members from ICF, but may disqualify them from being a part of the FSC-certified group.			
REQUESTED CORRECTIVE ACTION (or Observation) ICF shall document a conversion policy that is in conformance to FSC's guidelines for its FSC-certified group members as outlined in indicator 6.10.a: "Forest conversion to non-forest land uses does not occur, except in circumstances where conversion entails a very limited portion of the forest management unit (note that Indicators 6.10.a, b, and c are related and all need to be conformed with for conversion to be allowed)."			

TO BE COMPLETED BY FME	IMPLEMENTED CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Response to Observations is optional)</i> Describe action taken by the FME to address the root cause of the non-conformity <i>Classified Forest & Wildlands Procedures Manual</i> special permit procedure has been modified for certified tracts to limit conversion to 2% in a rolling 5 year period. Group members were notified of the limitation on special permits for conversion of forest in the 2012 <i>Classified Forest & Wildlands Newsletter</i> .	
	EVIDENCE OF CONFORMANCE SUBMITTED WITH THIS FORM <i>(please list)</i> Classified Forest & Wildlands Procedure Manual -Procedure 13 Special Permits (CAR 2011.5 CFW Procedure 13 Special Permits.pdf) 2012 Classified Forest & Wildlands Newsletter (CFW Newsletter 2012.pdf)	
	FME Representative Name and Title Brenda Huter, Forest Stewardship Coordinator	Date 9/13/2012
TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	SCS REVIEW / ACCEPTANCE OF CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Describe conclusion in detail)</i> ICF changed its policy so the maximum conversion allowed is 2% over a 5 year rolling period. When a conversion occurs information is collected through CF&W Form 0690. DoF will review these conversions to ensure that they are not occurring on HCVF before approval (6.10.b). With respect to conversion contributing to long-term conservation benefits (6.10.c), most conversions where the land remains in the program are for wildlife openings or water ponds.	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CLOSED <input type="checkbox"/> UPGRADED TO MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER DECISION <i>(refer to description above)</i>	
	SCS Representative Name and Title (CAR/OBS reviewer) Dave Wager, Lead Auditor	Date of Acceptance of Corrective Action 10/22/12
Press Enter twice below table to leave a space, then copy and paste table below for each CAR/OBS		

TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	CAR/OBS Number (e.g. 1, 2, ...)	2011.6
	Select one:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation
	Site CAR/OBS issued to (where more than one site)	
	Deadline for Corrective Action by FME	
	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from above Date of Issuance <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):	
	Standard and Requirement Reference	FSC-STD-40-004 V2-1 and SCS COC for FMEs 1.1.4.
NON-CONFORMITY (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations) (Describe and provide objective evidence)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ICF currently includes the product claim, "FSC Pure," on its invoices. However, the newest version of FSC-STD-40-004 V2-1 changes this claim to "FSC 100%." Existing clients have until June 2012 to comply with this change (and they may use the new FSC claim immediately). ICF's UMP contains COC procedures that may be somewhat confusing for group members. While it is true that all FSC certified products must be kept separate from non-FSC certified products to maintain the integrity of the chain of custody system, it is not clear when group members must follow the procedures in FSC-STD-40-004 V2-1 and what that means. ICF group members who process only harvested timber from their own certified FMU into logs, firewood, chips (biomass) or use a debarker or portable sawmill generally do not require a separate COC certificate. 		
REQUESTED CORRECTIVE ACTION (or Observation)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ICF should change its product claim on all invoice documentation used to make FSC-certified sales to "FSC 100%" before June 2012. ICF should review SCS' COC indicators for FMEs to clarify when a group member requires a separate COC certificate. 		

TO BE COMPLETED BY FME	IMPLEMENTED CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Response to Observations is optional)</i> Describe action taken by the FME to address the root cause of the non-conformity The Division of Forestry updated its guidance to landowners regarding timber contracts for certified sales, "Required Elements of a Certified Timber Sale." Group members were notified of the FSC claim change from "FSC Pure" to "FSC 100%" in the 2012 Classified Forest & Wildlands Newsletter. The Division of Forestry is reviewing and updating the ICFCG Umbrella Plan marketing section to clarify COC procedures for group members. This section should be completed by the end of 2012.	
	EVIDENCE OF CONFORMANCE SUBMITTED WITH THIS FORM <i>(please list)</i> Required Elements of a Certified Timber Sale (OBS 2011.6 Required Elements of a Certified Timber Sale Contract 10-12.doc) 2012 Classified Forest & Wildlands Newsletter (CFW Newsletter 2012.pdf)	
	FME Representative Name and Title Brenda Huter, Forest Stewardship Coordinator	Date 10/13/2012
TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	SCS REVIEW / ACCEPTANCE OF CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Describe conclusion in detail)</i> SCS auditor verified that ICF updated guidance to landowners and consultants regarding timber contracts for certified sales and also briefed landowners in the 2012 newsletter. Contracts viewed during the 2012 audit contained the claim "FSC Pure", but these contracts originated prior to the change in language to "FSC 100%". <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CLOSED <input type="checkbox"/> UPGRADED TO MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER DECISION <i>(refer to description above)</i>	
	SCS Representative Name and Title (CAR/OBS reviewer) Dave Wager, Lead Auditor	Date of Acceptance of Corrective Action 10/22/12
Press Enter twice below table to leave a space, then copy and paste table below for each CAR/OBS		

TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	CAR/OBS Number (e.g. 1, 2, ...)	2011.7
	Select one:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation
	Site CAR/OBS issued to (where more than one site)	
	Deadline for Corrective Action by FME	
	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from above Date of Issuance <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):	
	Standard and Requirement Reference	FSC-STD-30-005 indicator 2.3 (see also CAR for 4.2)
NON-CONFORMITY (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations) (Describe and provide objective evidence) Group members could not demonstrate knowledge of the Group’s procedures and the FSC US standard. SCS observed that very few group members were aware of the pre-harvest conference requirement, although this is described in the UMP. ICF has the potential to reach at least 20% of the group members each year to discuss this and other requirements.		
REQUESTED CORRECTIVE ACTION (or Observation) ICF shall create a training/communication plan, including appropriate timelines, to ensure that group members can demonstrate knowledge of the group’s procedures and basic requirements of the FSC US standard.		

TO BE COMPLETED BY FME	IMPLEMENTED CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Response to Observations is optional)</i>		
	Describe action taken by the FME to address the root cause of the non-conformity		
	The Division of Forestry has developed a training/communication plan to help ensure group members can demonstrate basic certification requirements and procedures:		
	ICFCG Training & Communication Plan		
	Action Item	Timeline	Description
	Classified Forest & Wildlands Newsletter	Ongoing – Annual/Semiannual	Continue use of the Classified Forest & Wildlands Newsletter to provide group members information regarding certification requirements and forest management issues.
	Landowner Certification Acceptance Confirmation	2012 – 2017 for “opted-in” group members Ongoing for new enrollments	When the ICFCG was created all eligible landowners were “opted-In” with the ability to “opt-out.” While this was good to create a large certified group that could provide certified raw material for Indiana’s forest industry, many landowners did not have a basic understanding of certification and the responsibilities and obligations of being certified. The Division of Forestry is currently asking group members to confirm that they want to be certified at the time of enrollment in the Classified Forest & Wildlands Program (new landowners) or when their property is reinspected (existing group members). Each landowner is given a copy of “Stewardship Note: Certification of Classified Forests” and “Green Certification Benefit Decision State Form 55101” which describe the basics of FSC certification and the associated obligations.
	District Forester & other CFM staff Training	Ongoing	Continued certification related training for staff, so they better explain and implement FSC standards and policies, and ICFCG procedures.
One-on-One Group Member – District Forester Interactions	Ongoing	During the required Classified Forest reinspections or other property visits, district foresters will continue to help landowners understand certification.	
Professional Forester Communications/ Training	Ongoing	Continue providing updates and training for professional foresters regarding FSC certification and the ICFCG, so they can be another resource for private landowners and recommend/implement forest management practices on their client’s property that are consistent with certification. The State Forester frequently attends the consulting forester professional association meetings to share information. This practice should continue.	
Timber buyer & Logger	Ongoing	Continue providing updates and training for forestry industry staff regarding FSC certification, so they understand the	

	Communications/ Training		expectations when working on certified land. Division of Forestry staff attend industry meetings. This practice should continue.
	Division of Forestry Website – Certification Resources update	2012-2013	The Division of Forestry will review and update existing forest certification information on the website by the end of 2012. In 2013, the CFM staff working with the Forest Education staff, will add/develop more group member friendly documents in addition to the standards, policy documents, and audit reports that currently are available.
	Group Member E-mails	2013	For the past 5 years, the Division of Forestry has been collecting group member e-mails. Electronic communication with group members has been limited. In 2013, the Division of Forestry will explore opportunities to use this communication method.
<p>EVIDENCE OF CONFORMANCE SUBMITTED WITH THIS FORM <i>(please list)</i></p> <p>2012 Classified Forest & Wildlands Newsletter (CFW Newsletter 2012.pdf)</p> <p>Stewardship Note: Certification of Classified Forests (CAR 2011.7 Certification of Classified Forests 2012.doc)</p> <p>Green Certification Benefit Decision State Form 55101 (CAR 2011.7 SF 55101 Green Certification Benefit Decision.doc)</p> <p>Division of Forestry Website (http://www.in.gov/dnr/forestry/)</p>			
FME Representative Name and Title		Date	
Brenda Huter, Forest Stewardship Coordinator		10/13/2012	
TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	<p>SCS REVIEW / ACCEPTANCE OF CORRECTIVE ACTION</p> <p><i>S(Describe conclusion in detail)</i></p> <p>SCS confirmed that ICF has begun implementing the communication/training action plan in accordance with the proposed timeline. Implementation of the Green Certification Benefit Decision requiring landowners to explicitly accept and opt into certification should greatly improve landowner’s understanding of FSC certificate. As a result of this progress, the CAR can be closed.</p> <p>See CAR 2012.1 regarding continued fulfillment of the key requirement of making sure consulting foresters, loggers, and/or landowners follow through with the requirement to notify the District Forester prior to starting a harvest. Several properties selected during the 2012 had recent harvests that occurred without the required notification.</p>		
	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CLOSED</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> UPGRADED TO MAJOR</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> OTHER DECISION (refer to description above)</p>		
SCS Representative Name and Title (CAR/OBS reviewer)		Date of Acceptance of Corrective Action	
Dave Wager, Lead Auditor		10/22/12	
<i>Press Enter twice below table to leave a space, then copy and paste table below for each CAR/OBS</i>			

TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	CAR/OBS Number (e.g. 1, 2, ...) 2011.9	
	Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
	Site CAR/OBS issued to (where more than one site)	
	Deadline for Corrective Action by FME <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from above Date of Issuance <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):	
	Standard and Requirement Reference	FSC-STD-30-005 indicator 3.3.
NON-CONFORMITY <i>(or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations)</i> <i>(Describe and provide objective evidence)</i> ICF has not defined the qualifications or training measures required for the implementation of group management procedures.		
REQUESTED CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(or Observation)</i> ICF shall define, or provide reference to related documentation, the personnel responsible for each procedure together with the qualifications or training measures required for its implementation.		

TO BE COMPLETED BY FME	IMPLEMENTED CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Response to Observations is optional)</i> Describe action taken by the FME to address the root cause of the non-conformity The Division of Forestry has added minimum qualifications to the <i>Group Responsibilities</i> section of the ICFCG Umbrella Plan.	
	EVIDENCE OF CONFORMANCE SUBMITTED WITH THIS FORM <i>(please list)</i> ICFCG Umbrella Plan Group Responsibilities Section (CAR 2011.9 Group Responsibilities with Minimum Qualifications.pdf)	
	FME Representative Name and Title Brenda Huter, Forest Stewardship Coordinator	Date 10/13/2012
TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	SCS REVIEW / ACCEPTANCE OF CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Describe conclusion in detail)</i> SCS verified that the added section to the ICFCG Umbrella Plan detailing minimum qualifications to the <i>Group Responsibilities</i> satisfies FSC requirement FSC-STD-30-005 Indicator 3.3.	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CLOSED <input type="checkbox"/> UPGRADED TO MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER DECISION <i>(refer to description above)</i>	
	SCS Representative Name and Title (CAR/OBS reviewer) Dave Wager, SCS Lead Auditor	Date of Acceptance of Corrective Action 10/22/12
Press Enter twice below table to leave a space, then copy and paste table below for each CAR/OBS		

TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	CAR/OBS Number (e.g. 1, 2, ...)	2011.10
	<i>Select one:</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation
	Site CAR/OBS issued to (where more than one site)	
	Deadline for Corrective Action by FME	
	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from above Date of Issuance <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):	
	Standard and Requirement Reference	FSC-STD-30-005 indicator 4.1 ii, iii & iv.
NON-CONFORMITY (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations) (Describe and provide objective evidence) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ICF does not provide an explanation of the certification body's process (i.e., 5 year cycle of certification and annual audits, assignment of CARs, etc); • ICF does not provide an explanation of the certification body's, and FSC's rights to access the Group members' forests and documentation for the purposes of evaluation and monitoring (i.e., all audits by the CB and ASI evaluations of the CB); and • ICF does not provide an explanation of the certification body's (CB), and FSC's requirements with respect to publication of information (i.e., public summaries under C7.4, C8.5 and C9.3, and the CB's public summary of audit reports). 		
REQUESTED CORRECTIVE ACTION (or Observation) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ICF shall provide an explanation of the certification body's process; • ICF shall provide an explanation of the certification body's, and FSC's rights to access the Group members' forests and documentation for the purposes of evaluation and monitoring; and • ICF shall provide an explanation of the certification body's (CB), and FSC's requirements with respect to publication of information. 		

TO BE COMPLETED BY FME	IMPLEMENTED CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Response to Observations is optional)</i> Describe action taken by the FME to address the root cause of the non-conformity The DoF has added a section regarding the role of the certification body to the ICFCG Umbrella Plan which addresses audits, CARs, CB access to property and documentation requirements, and publication of information.	
	EVIDENCE OF CONFORMANCE SUBMITTED WITH THIS FORM <i>(please list)</i> ICFCG Umbrella Plan Role of Certification Body section (CAR 2011.10 Role of Certification Body.pdf)	
	FME Representative Name and Title Brenda Huter, Forest Stewardship Coordinator	Date 10/13/2012
TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	SCS REVIEW / ACCEPTANCE OF CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Describe conclusion in detail)</i> SCS verified ICF added a section regarding the role of the certification body to the ICFCG Umbrella Plan which addresses audits, CARs, CB access to property and documentation requirements, and publication of information.	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CLOSED <input type="checkbox"/> UPGRADED TO MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER DECISION <i>(refer to description above)</i>	
	SCS Representative Name and Title (CAR/OBS reviewer) Dave Wager, Lead Auditor	Date of Acceptance of Corrective Action 10/22/12
Press Enter twice below table to leave a space, then copy and paste table below for each CAR/OBS		

TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	CAR/OBS Number (e.g. 1, 2, ...)	2011.11
	<i>Select one:</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation
	Site CAR/OBS issued to (where more than one site)	
	Deadline for Corrective Action by FME	
	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from above Date of Issuance <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):	
	Standard and Requirement Reference	FSC-STD-30-005 indicator 4.1.d.
NON-CONFORMITY (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations) (Describe and provide objective evidence) ICF includes a reference to FSC's previous product list in its COC procedures. The new product list is FSC-STD-40-004a (V2-0), which SCS has included in its certificate scope update forms.		
REQUESTED CORRECTIVE ACTION (or Observation) ICF should update its product code list in the UMP. Evidence: ICF Umbrella Plan (update Oct 2012)		

TO BE COMPLETED BY FME	IMPLEMENTED CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Response to Observations is optional)</i> Describe action taken by the FME to address the root cause of the non-conformity	
	EVIDENCE OF CONFORMANCE SUBMITTED WITH THIS FORM <i>(please list)</i>	
	FME Representative Name and Title	Date
TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	SCS REVIEW / ACCEPTANCE OF CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Describe conclusion in detail)</i> ICF updated its product group list in the Umbrella Plan. Evidence: ICF Umbrella Plan (update Oct 2012)	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CLOSED <input type="checkbox"/> UPGRADED TO MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER DECISION <i>(refer to description above)</i>	
	SCS Representative Name and Title (CAR/OBS reviewer) Dave Wager, lead Auditor	Date of Acceptance of Corrective Action 10/22/12
Press Enter twice below table to leave a space, then copy and paste table below for each CAR/OBS		

TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	CAR/OBS Number (e.g. 1, 2, ...)	2011.12
	Select one:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation
	Site CAR/OBS issued to (where more than one site)	
	Deadline for Corrective Action by FME	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 months from above Date of Issuance <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):	
	Standard and Requirement Reference	FSC-STD-30-005 Indicator 4.2 i, ii, iii & v.
	NON-CONFORMITY (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations) (Describe and provide objective evidence) The signature page on the Stewardship Management Plan (SMP) serves as the consent declaration for inclusion into the ICF group. However, the signature only binds the group member to the SMP and not any other group membership requirements. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. The SMP signature page does not refer to any other related binding documents on the group management program. ii. The signature page of the SMP demonstrates partial conformance to this indicator as group members must contact ICF for any changes or deviations from the SMP. However, the signature page does not reference or seem to bind group members to responsibilities detailed in the UMP or other group membership documents. iii. The signature page of the SMP does not bind group members to this requirement. iv. (Conformance) v. Although in the division of responsibilities section of the UMP it is explained that group member's must voluntarily join ICF, there is not a statement that effectively authorizes the group entity to be the primary contact for certification on the member's behalf. 	
REQUESTED CORRECTIVE ACTION (or Observation) ICF shall modify its consent declaration to meet the requirements of this indicator. Group members are expected to be in conformance to this requirement by the next update to each individual's SMP.		

TO BE COMPLETED BY FME	IMPLEMENTED CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Response to Observations is optional)</i> Describe action taken by the FME to address the root cause of the non-conformity The Division of Forestry has developed a Green Certification Benefit Decision form. The form allows eligible landowners to document their decision on enrolling their land in the Indiana Classified Forest Certified Group (ICFCG). The new form contains the consent declaration requirements identified in FSC-STD-30-005 Indicator 4.2. This form will replace the Accept/Decline certification section on the SMP signature page. The form will now be sent through the State’s Forms Management process and should be finalized by May 1, 2012. There may be formatting changes as a result of the Forms Management process. The Division of Forestry will begin using the draft version of the form while the form is going through the formal Forms Management process. New eligible landowners will complete the form when they complete their Classified Forest & Wildlands application. Existing certified landowners will complete the form at their 5 year reinspection to reconfirm their commitment to the ICFCG and FSC.	
	EVIDENCE OF CONFORMANCE SUBMITTED WITH THIS FORM <i>(please list)</i> Green Certification Benefit Decision form	
	FME Representative Name and Title Brenda Huter	Date 2/29/2012
TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	SCS REVIEW / ACCEPTANCE OF CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Describe conclusion in detail)</i> The signature page refers to the ICFCG Umbrella Plan and the Classified Forest & Wildlands Program law and rules, which addresses elements i, ii, and iii. By signing the form, the group member acknowledges that ICF acts as the primary contact for certification on behalf of the group member, which addresses element v. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CLOSED <input type="checkbox"/> UPGRADED TO MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER DECISION <i>(refer to description above)</i>	
	SCS Representative Name and Title <i>(CAR/OBS reviewer)</i> Kyle Meister, Certification Forester	Date of Acceptance of Corrective Action March 1, 2012
Press Enter twice below table to leave a space, then copy and paste table below for each CAR/OBS		

TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	CAR/OBS Number (e.g. 1, 2, ...)	2011.13
	Select one:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation
	Site CAR/OBS issued to (where more than one site)	
	Deadline for Corrective Action by FME	
	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from above Date of Issuance <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):	
	Standard and Requirement Reference	FSC-STD-30-005 5.1.ii and viii.
	NON-CONFORMITY (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations) (Describe and provide objective evidence)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ICF does not maintain complete and up-to-date records covering records of training provided to Group members, relevant to the implementation of this standard or the FSC US standard. Training of group members is not recorded in group member records at ICF offices, but may be tracked via sign-in sheets. These sign-in sheets may be the property of partner organizations. FSC-STD-30-005 is clear that the group manager must track training records of group members. ICF does not maintain records of the estimated annual overall FSC production and annual FSC sales of the Group 		
REQUESTED CORRECTIVE ACTION (or Observation)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ICF shall create a mechanism to maintain training records of group members. ICF shall create a mechanism to maintain records of the estimated annual overall FSC production and annual FSC sales of the group. 		

TO BE COMPLETED BY FME	IMPLEMENTED CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Response to Observations is optional)</i> Describe action taken by the FME to address the root cause of the non-conformity Training: A question [Question 7: Please list any natural resource management trainings (classes, workshops, field days, etc.) you attended in YYYY] was added to the Classified Forest & Wildlands Program Annual Report. This training information is stored in the Indiana Forest Resource Management System (INFRMS) online database. In addition to reporting on their annual report, landowners can log into the system and add training throughout the year. Tracking of FSC production: INFRMS tracks management activities conducted on enrolled lands. For timber sales, the volume and if the timber was sold as FSC certified are both collected. Landowners can report timber sales on their annual report or by logging into INFRMS and adding management records throughout the year.	
	EVIDENCE OF CONFORMANCE SUBMITTED WITH THIS FORM <i>(please list)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2011 Classified Forest & Wildlands Annual report (CAR 2011.3 Annual Report.pdf) • Screenshots from Indiana Forest Resource Management System regarding tracking of training and timber harvests (CAR 2011.13 INFRMS screen shots.doc) 	
	FME Representative Name and Title Brenda Huter, Forest Stewardship Coordinator	Date 10/13/2012
TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	SCS REVIEW / ACCEPTANCE OF CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Describe conclusion in detail)</i> As described in the response to the CAR, ICF now has a system for tracking training activities of group members and the annual FSC sales/production of the group. A rough estimate of volume sold as FSC certified has been collated from the 2011 annual report. Although there are some possible under and over-reporting errors to this approach (e.g., landowner mistakenly thinks sale is certified or vice versa), it does provide an approximate for total volume sold as FSC certified. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CLOSED <input type="checkbox"/> UPGRADED TO MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER DECISION <i>(refer to description above)</i>	
	SCS Representative Name and Title (CAR/OBS reviewer) Dave Wager, Lead Auditor	Date of Acceptance of Corrective Action 10/22/12
Press Enter twice below table to leave a space, then copy and paste table below for each CAR/OBS		

TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	CAR/OBS Number (e.g. 1, 2, ...)	2011.14
	Select one:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation
	Site CAR/OBS issued to (where more than one site)	
	Deadline for Corrective Action by FME	
	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from above Date of Issuance <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):	
	Standard and Requirement Reference	FSC-STD-30-005 Indicator 6.2
NON-CONFORMITY (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations) (Describe and provide objective evidence) Although stated in the opening meeting, ICF has not specified in its procedures the maximum number of members that can be supported by the management system and the human and technical capacities of the Group entity.		
REQUESTED CORRECTIVE ACTION (or Observation) ICF shall specify in its procedures the maximum number of members or acreage that can be supported by the management system and the human and technical capacities of the Group entity.		

TO BE COMPLETED BY FME	IMPLEMENTED CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Response to Observations is optional)</i> Describe action taken by the FME to address the root cause of the non-conformity The Division of Forestry has considered our current management system and the human and technical capacities and has determined that the maximum certified acreage that can be supported is 1,000,000 acres. This requires the more efficient use of administrative staff, database improvements to decrease plan writing time, and integrating technology to streamline procedures.	
	EVIDENCE OF CONFORMANCE SUBMITTED WITH THIS FORM <i>(please list)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indiana Classified Forest Certified Group Umbrella Plan, Group Enrollment, Maximum Group Enrollment section (CAR 2011.14 Umbrella Plan Group Enrollment Max.pdf) • Maximum Program Acres Calculations (CAR 2011.14 Max acres calculation.pdf) 	
	FME Representative Name and Title Brenda Huter, Forest Stewardship Coordinator	Date 10/13/2012
TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	SCS REVIEW / ACCEPTANCE OF CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Describe conclusion in detail)</i> ICF has now defined the maximum acreage of the group at 1,000,000 acres. Evidence: ICF Umbrella Plan <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CLOSED <input type="checkbox"/> UPGRADED TO MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER DECISION <i>(refer to description above)</i>	
	SCS Representative Name and Title (CAR/OBS reviewer) Dave Wager, Lead Auditor	Date of Acceptance of Corrective Action 10/22/12
	<i>Press Enter twice below table to leave a space, then copy and paste table below for each CAR/OBS</i>	

TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	CAR/OBS Number (e.g. 1, 2, ...)	2011.15
	<i>Select one:</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation
	Site CAR/OBS issued to (where more than one site)	
	Deadline for Corrective Action by FME	
	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from above Date of Issuance <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):	
	Standard and Requirement Reference	SCS COC indicators for FMEs 1.4.2.
NON-CONFORMITY <i>(or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations)</i> <i>(Describe and provide objective evidence)</i> ICF does not have records of trademark approvals for off-product/ promotional uses and furthermore has not updated its FSC trademarks to the new standard's requirements (FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2).		
REQUESTED CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(or Observation)</i> DOF shall implement documented procedures for off-product/ promotional use of FSC trademarks, and demonstrate any updated uses and approvals for trademarks according to FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2.		

TO BE COMPLETED BY FME	IMPLEMENTED CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Response to Observations is optional)</i> Describe action taken by the FME to address the root cause of the non-conformity The Division of Forestry has setup an account with SCS to use the FSC label generator and reviewed the label approval process with SCS contact Rachel Lem. The group manager is familiar with FSC-STD-50-001. Procedures for the use of FSC trademarks have been added to the ICFCG Umbrella Plan.	
	EVIDENCE OF CONFORMANCE SUBMITTED WITH THIS FORM <i>(please list)</i> ICFCG Umbrella Plan – Use of FSC Trademarks (CAR 2011.15 Use of FSC Trademarks.pdf)	
	FME Representative Name and Title Brenda Huter, Forest Stewardship Coordinator	Date 10/14/2012
TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	SCS REVIEW / ACCEPTANCE OF CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Describe conclusion in detail)</i> Procedures for FSC trademarks are now consistent FSC requirements (FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2). ICF has not used the FSC trademark.	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CLOSED <input type="checkbox"/> UPGRADED TO MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER DECISION <i>(refer to description above)</i>	
	SCS Representative Name and Title (CAR/OBS reviewer) Dave Wager, Lead Auditor	Date of Acceptance of Corrective Action 10/22/12
Press Enter twice below table to leave a space, then copy and paste table below for each CAR/OBS		

4.2 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations

Certificate holder/applicant	Indiana DNR Division of Forestry Classified Forest & Wildlands Program (ICF)
CAR/OBS identified by (SCS representative)	Dave Wager
Date of Issuance	10.22.12
Audit Year/Type	Surveillance

Note that **OBS 2011.2** remains open.

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

Finding Number: 2012.2	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	

Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator(s):	Indicator 9.1.a.
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):	
<p>Indicator 9.1.a requires that the forest owner or manager identifies and maps the presence of High Conservation Value Forests (HCVF) within the FMU. Given the relative rarity of old growth forests in the contiguous United States, these areas are normally designated as HCVF, and all old growth must be managed in conformance with Indicator 6.3.a.3 and requirements for legacy trees in Indicator 6.3.f. Most of ICF's HCVF types can be identified through Natural Heritage Database searches that occur pre-harvest. However, some forest types or conditions (e.g., type I and type II old growth) are not tracked in the Natural Heritage Database and the auditor determined that there is insufficient effort to search for HCV forests prior to harvests or during management plan development. Given the lack of tract level inventory and that old growth is not a layer in the Natural Heritage Database, there is a need for more guidance to Umbrella Group participants on identifying and managing these types.</p>	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation):	
<p>ICF must implement an enhanced strategy to identify and ensure maintenance of Type I and Type II Old Growth Forests and other HCVF not tracked in the Natural Heritage Database.</p>	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2012.3
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):

Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator(s):	Family Forest Indicator 7.1.a
<p>Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): Written management plans that are in conformance with FSC requirements do not exist for all properties within the certified group. While many Districts have made excellent progress at updating plans per the timeline established when ICF was certified, some Districts have fallen behind schedule. DoF does not have a tally of the total number of properties lacking a current plan, and as such lack a strategy to direct the necessary resources to ensure all plans meet the FSC standards over time. NOTE: Certain elements of FF indicator 7.1.a may be met in the Umbrella Management Plan and other overarching management planning documents.</p>	
<p>Corrective Action Request (or Observation):</p> <p>DoF must determine the number of properties lacking a current management plan and develop a strategy to ensure FSC compliant plans are in-place.</p>	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

5.0 STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS

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

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

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

5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted

DoF employees	Logging contractors
IFG group members	

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

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

The primary stakeholder consultation was with ICF group members, all of whom were very appreciative and supportive of DoF staff assistance on forestry issues, the tax incentive of the program, and the Classified Forest Program as a whole.

6.0 CERTIFICATION DECISION

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

7.0 CHANGES IN CERTIFICATION SCOPE

There were no changes in the scope of the certification in the previous year.

8.0 ANNUAL DATA UPDATE

8.1 Social Information

Number of forest workers (including contractors) working in forest within scope of certificate (differentiated by gender):		
20 of male workers	6 of female workers	
Number of accidents in forest work since last audit	Serious: 0	Fatal: 0

8.2 Annual Summary of Pesticide and Other Chemical Use

FME does not use pesticides.

Commercial name of pesticide/ herbicide	Active ingredient	Quantity applied annually (kg or lbs)	Size of area treated during previous year	Reason for use
2,4-D	2,4-D			Timber stand

			1,700 acres	improvement, invasive species control, grape vine control
Gordon's Brush Killer, Triplet	2,4-D, dicamba, R-2-(2-Methyl-4 Chlorophenoxy) propionic acid)		16 acres	Grape vine control
Milestone	aminopyralid		30 acres	Invasive species control
Transline	cloypralid		29 acres	Invasive species control
Fusilade	fluazifop-P-butyl		62 acres	Invasive species control
Accord, Glyphosate, Roundup, Touchdown Pro, Buccaneer, Rodeo	glyphosate		8,698 acres	Timber stand improvement, invasive species control, grape vine control, tree planting
Habitat, Stalker	imazapyr		279 acres	Timber stand improvement, invasive species control, grape vine control
Tordon	picloram		5,510 acres	Timber stand improvement, invasive species control, grape vine control
Pathway	picloram, 2,4-D		626 acres	Timber stand improvement, invasive species control, grape vine control
Ferti lome	pyrethrins, pipronyl butoxide, neem oil		11 acres	Invasive species control
Poast	sethoxydim		154 acres	Invasive species control
Princep, Simazine	simazine			Tree planting,

			92 acres	invasive species control
Oust	sulfometuron methyl		243 acres	Timber stand improvement, invasive species control, grape vine control, tree planting
Garlon, Element, Pathfinder	triclopyr		1,998 acre	Timber stand improvement, invasive species control, grape vine control
Crossbow	triclopyr, 2,4-D		1,903 acres	Timber stand improvement, invasive species control, grape vine control

SECTION B – APPENDICES (CONFIDENTIAL)**Appendix 1 – List of FMUs Selected For Evaluation**

- FME consists of a single FMU
- FME consists of multiple FMUs or is a Group

Selection of FMUs for evaluation**Introduction**

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

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

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

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

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

Group Management certificates

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

Sampling process for large and medium size FMUs**Part 1:**

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

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

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

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

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

Table 1

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

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

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

nearest upper whole number)		
-----------------------------	--	--

Part 2:

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

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

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

Sampling process for small size FMUs

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

Part 1:

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

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

B) Step B defines the minimum number of sets of 'like' FMUs *to be sampled* in each evaluation. This

number (x) shall be calculated by entering the total number of sets of 'like' FMUs (y) found in Step A into the applicable formula in Table 2.

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

Table 2

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

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

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

Part 2

Part 2 defines the minimum number of units to be sampled within each set of 'like' FMUs selected to be sampled in Part 1. For this purpose, FMUs managed by the same managerial body (e.g. the same resource manager) may be combined to a single 'resource management unit' (RMU). The number of

units to be sampled (x) shall be calculated by entering the total number of units (y= number of FMUs directly managed by the forest owner + number of RMUs) within the set of 'like' FMUs (y) into the applicable formula in Table 2. So the number of units to be sampled (x) is calculated by entering the total number of units (y= number of RMUs + remaining FMUs) within the set of 'like' FMUs (y) is as follows:

		Applicable equation for evaluation from Table 2	Sample size (rounded to nearest upper whole number)
Set 1 – description of set:			
1. ICF is organized into RMUs, thus the exercise done in Worksheet 2 is irrelevant. All FMUs ≤ 1,000 ha are classified as natural/ semi-natural forest management. ICF qualifies for RMU classification since ICF district foresters provide: a) management planning preparation; b) harvesting planning review using ICF templates; c) group level baseline documentation and information; d) robust group member training programs; e) a timber sale clearinghouse for group members to market certified forest products; and f) group member monitoring at intensity greater than that required by FSC-STD-30-005. Due to these multiple factors, ICF reasonably qualifies as the managerial body that manages all group members.			
2. ICF organizes RMUs at the district level, which is a group of counties based on legislative representation. Although a regional office may serve multiple districts, sampling for monitoring of group members is based at the district level.			
Basis for RMU classification: 1. Describe how the FME’s management meets the requirement that each FMU within an RMU must be managed by the same managerial body. 2. Describe how RMUs are determined. FMUs classified as part of a given RMU may be based on the group manager’s or certification body’s grouping of 'like' FMUs according management type, ecozones, districts, political boundaries, regulatory context, and/or other units. For example, an FME may stratify 'small' FMUs into districts based on location and then classify FMUs into an RMU based at the county-level.			
Number of RMUs	20	$X = 0.6 * \sqrt{y} \rightarrow X = 0.6 * \sqrt{20} = 2.68$	3; actual sample size was 4 districts.
Remaining FMUs	0		
Total (y = RMU + FMU)	20		
		Applicable equation for evaluation from Table 2	Sample size (rounded to nearest upper whole number)
Set 2 – description of set			
Basis for RMU classification: (as above)			
Number of RMUs			
Remaining FMUs			
Total (y = RMU + FMU)			

Sampling within a 'resource management unit' shall be conducted in accordance to Clause 5.4.2 in a main- and re-evaluation and in accordance to Clause 6.3 in a surveillance evaluation as detailed in FSC-

STD-20-007.

Simplified sampling options for large Group Certificates of 'small' FMUs (based Annex 1 of FSC-STD-20-007)**Mega groups of small size FMUs ≤ 1,000 ha**

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

2. In the demonstrated absence of:

- high conservation value attributes, and
- land use or tenure disputes, and
- short (< 30 years) rotation cycles,

the certification body may reduce the sampling size as specified in Table 2 for units within a set of 'like' FMUs by a maximum of 50% (but not less than 55 units in total).

Non-SLIMF FMUs***Natural/ Semi-Natural Forest Management***

Name	Rationale for selection (check all that apply)	
NA	<input type="checkbox"/> Random sample	<input type="checkbox"/> Near other sampled FMU
	<input type="checkbox"/> Stakeholder issue	<input type="checkbox"/> Other:

Plantation Forest Management

NA	<input type="checkbox"/> Random sample	<input type="checkbox"/> Near other sampled FMU
	<input type="checkbox"/> Stakeholder issue	<input type="checkbox"/> Other:

SLIMF FMUs***Natural/ Semi-Natural Forest Management***

Name	Rationale for selection (check all that apply)	
NA	<input type="checkbox"/> Random sample	<input type="checkbox"/> Near other sampled FMU
	<input type="checkbox"/> Stakeholder issue	<input type="checkbox"/> Other:

Plantation Forest Management

NA	<input type="checkbox"/> Random sample	<input type="checkbox"/> Near other sampled FMU
	<input type="checkbox"/> Stakeholder issue	<input type="checkbox"/> Other:

SLIMF RMUs (groups of 'small' FMUs managed by same managerial body only)***Natural/ Semi-Natural Forest Management***

Name	RMU Name	Rationale for selection (check all that apply)	
1. Stanly Wehr 2. Gordon Taylor 3. Stemtech	District 9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Random sample	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Near other sampled FMU
		<input type="checkbox"/> Stakeholder issue	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: Owner with several tracts in group; recent timber harvest;
1. Jean Merritt 2. TNC 3. William	District 18	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Random sample	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Near other sampled FMU
		<input type="checkbox"/> Stakeholder issue	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: view trail work, nature,

Sigman 4. Nathan Yazel 5. Baxter 6. Mark Hilderbrand			preserve, tree planting, withdrawal, wildlife grasslands and prescribed fire.
1. Pahner 2. Wilhelm 3. Anderson 4. Schebler	District 17	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Random sample	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Near other sampled FMU
		<input type="checkbox"/> Stakeholder issue	<input type="checkbox"/> Other:
1. McClure 2. Crawford 3. Baker 4. Chris Mull 5. Hiller Farms	District 15	<input type="checkbox"/> Random sample	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Near other sampled FMU
		<input type="checkbox"/> Stakeholder issue	<input type="checkbox"/> Other: Tree planting, Audubon lands, herbicide use, archeological sites.
Plantation Forest Management			
NA		<input type="checkbox"/> Random sample	<input type="checkbox"/> Near other sampled FMU
		<input type="checkbox"/> Stakeholder issue	<input type="checkbox"/> Other:

Appendix 2 – Evaluation of Management Systems

SCS conducted the audit from October 19-22, 2012 with Dave Wager as the lead auditor. 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 and lists of management activities were provided to the auditors during the audit, and a sample of the available field sites was selected by the audit team for review. The selection of field sites for inspection was based upon the risk of environmental impact, special features, past non-conformances/observations, and other factors. During the audit, the audit team reviewed a sample of the available written documentation as objective evidence of FSC conformance. Documents that were reviewed during this audit included management plans, group procedures, timber sale inspection forms, responses to corrective action requests, among other policies, procedures and records.

The auditor determined whether or not there was conformance with each of the indicators being assessed during this audit. The auditor also selected and interviewed contract loggers, DoF employees, and IGF group members to assess conformance with the FSC standards.

Appendix 3 – List of Stakeholders Consulted

List of FME Staff Consulted

Name	Title	Contact	Consultation method
Phil Wagner	Asst. State Forester	pwagner@dnr.in.gov	Field consultation, meeting

Brenda Huter	Forest Stewardship Coordinator	bhuter@dnr.in.gov	Field consultation, meeting
Carl Hauser	District Forester; D-10	dhauser@dnr.in.gov	Field consultation
Scott Haulton	Forestry Wildlife Specialist	shaulton@dnr.in.gov	Field consultation
Abby Irwin	District Forester, D-9	abirwin@dnr.in.gov	Field consultation
Gretchen Herbaugh	District Forester, D-16	gherbaugh@dnr.in.gov	Field consultation
Robert McGriff	District Forester, D-6	rmcgriff@dnr.in.gov	Field consultation
Don Stump	District Forester	dstump@dnr.in.gov	Field consultation
Jayson Waterman	District Forester	jwaterman@dnr.in.gov	Field consultation
John Seifert	State Forester	jseifert@dnr.IN.gov	Field consultation, meeting

List of other Stakeholders Consulted

Name/ Title	Organization	Contact	Consultation method
Stan Wher	Individual	NA	Field consultation
Tom Rathert, Consulting Forester	Rathert Forestry	NA	Field consultation
Bill Sigmund	Individual	NA	Field consultation
Nate Yazel, Wildlife Biologist	Individual	NA	
Phil Baxter, Manager	Baxter mill	NA	Field consultation
Carl Wilms, Resident Manager	Audubon Society	NA	Field consultation

Appendix 4 – Additional Audit Techniques Employed

No additional audit techniques were employed.

Appendix 5 – Pesticide Derogations

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

Appendix 6 – Detailed Observations

Evaluation year	FSC P&C Reviewed
2009	All – Certification Evaluation
2010	Open CAR/OBS: 1.1, 1.6, 2.1, 3.1, 5.1, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 7.1, 7.3, 8.1, 6.9, and 8.3. GAP Assessment to new FSC-US Standard: 1.2, 1.4, 1.6, 2.1, 3.1, 3.2, 4.2, 4.4, 5.5, 5.6, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.6, 6.8, 6.10, 7.1, 8.1, 8.2, and 9.1.
2011	FSC-STD-30-005 (V1-0), 1.3, 1.5, 2.2, 2.3, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.3, 4.5, 6.6, 6.7, 6.9, 7.1, 7.2, and 7.4.
2012	4.2, 5.1-5.5, 6.5, 6.9, 6.10, 9.1, 9.2, 9.3, 9.4
2013	
2014	Recertification Evaluation

C= Conformance with Criterion or Indicator

NC= Non-Conformance with Criterion or Indicator

NA = Not Applicable

NE = Not Evaluated

FSC-US Forest Management Standard (v1.0)

REQUIREMENT	C/ NC	COMMENT/CAR
C4.2. Forest management should meet or exceed all applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of employees and their families.	C	
4.2.a. The forest owner or manager meets or exceeds all applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of employees and their families (also see Criterion 1.1).	NA	All members are SLIMF
FF Indicator 4.2.a Low risk of negative social or environmental impact.	C	Most group members do not hire any employees for forest management work and are thus at low risk for this indicator.
4.2.b. The forest owner or manager and their employees and contractors demonstrate a safe work environment. Contracts or other written agreements include safety requirements.	C	One site had some unusual cuts on veneer logs that were indicative of some safety concerns. However, no reportable safety incidents were reported to ICF. ICF provides sample language in contracts that addresses safety requirements indirectly. ICF's guidance could be more robust. See OBS 2011.2.
4.2.c. The forest owner or manager hires well-qualified service providers to safely implement the management plan.	NA	All members in ICF meet SLIMF requirements.
FF Indicator 4.2.c Low risk of negative social or	C	Did not observe any sites that indicated unsafe

environmental impact.		implementation of the management plan.
P5 Forest management operations shall encourage the efficient use of the forest’s multiple products and services to ensure economic viability and a wide range of environmental and social benefits.		
C5.1. Forest management should strive toward economic viability, while taking into account the full environmental, social, and operational costs of production, and ensuring the investments necessary to maintain the ecological productivity of the forest.	C	
5.1.a. The forest owner or manager is financially able to implement core management activities, including all those environmental, social and operating costs, required to meet this Standard, and investment and reinvestment in forest management.	C	The intent behind the Classified Forest Program is retention of forestland and long-term forest management. The Division of Forestry has the resources to carry on long-term group management. The program continues to grow in total acres and number of properties enrolled in this program for long-term forest management.
5.1.b. Responses to short-term financial factors are limited to levels that are consistent with fulfillment of this Standard.	C	<p>During the 2012 audit, overall, the trend appeared to be retention of well-stocked stands and modest harvest levels on properties with active forestry. The tax incentives for entry in the program greatly help reduce impacts that short-term financial factors can have on small forest owners.</p> <p>The Classified Forest Program has requirements for maintaining certain stocking levels, and encourages and at times requires TSI work when needed. Some cost share programs are available for TSI work.</p> <p>Hiller Farm LLC had a heavy harvest that approached a high grade in the bottomland section of the harvest. The District Forester was recommending TSI work to ensure the tract returns to a desirable condition. ICF’s follow through with TSI recommendations will be a focus of future surveillance audits.</p>
C5.2. Forest management and marketing operations should encourage the optimal use and local processing of the forest’s diversity of products.	C	
5.2.a. Where forest products are harvested or sold, opportunities for forest product sales and services are given to local harvesters, value-added processing and manufacturing facilities, guiding services, and other operations that are able to offer services at competitive rates and levels of service.	NA	

FF Indicator 5.2.a Low risk of negative social or environmental impact.	C	Most wood is sold locally. IN DoF is also managing a group chain of custody that covers loggers and small mills helping to ensure added value to the resource within the State of Indiana.
5.2.b. The forest owner or manager takes measures to optimize the use of harvested forest products and explores product diversification where appropriate and consistent with management objectives.	C	Most wood is sold locally. IN DoF is also managing a group chain of custody that covers loggers and small mills helping to ensure added value to the resource within the State of Indiana.
5.2.c. On public lands where forest products are harvested and sold, some sales of forest products or contracts are scaled or structured to allow small business to bid competitively.	NA	There is no public land in the CFP.
C5.3. Forest management should minimize waste associated with harvesting and on-site processing operations and avoid damage to other forest resources.	C	
5.3.a. Management practices are employed to minimize the loss and/or waste of harvested forest products.	C	ICF provides group members and consulting foresters with sample timber sale contract language that indirectly covers utilization and residual stand damage by requiring adherence to BMP's. Given poor pulp markets, a common TSI practice is to girdle trees, which have value as standing snags and then additional value when they fall to the ground as downed woody debris. Given the ecological value of this material it is not considered waste.
5.3.b. Harvest practices are managed to protect residual trees and other forest resources, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • soil compaction, rutting and erosion are minimized; • residual trees are not significantly damaged to the extent that health, growth, or values are noticeably affected; • damage to NTFPs is minimized during management activities; and • techniques and equipment that minimize impacts to vegetation, soil, and water are used whenever feasible. 	C	ICF implemented a new rutting standard in 2012. All timber harvests visited during the 2012 audit had been conducted in a manner that protected residual trees and forest resources. Limits to site damage are also included in timber sale contracts through requiring BMP's and other specifications.
C5.4. Forest management should strive to strengthen and diversify the local economy, avoiding dependence on a single forest product.	C	
5.4.a. The forest owner or manager demonstrates knowledge of their operation's effect on the local	C	The auditor recognizes that a primary motivation for forming an FSC group is to provide local opportunities

economy as it relates to existing and potential markets for a wide variety of timber and non-timber forest products and services.		for value-added processing and manufacturing. Most Classified Forest Program properties are family forest parcels used for hunting and other forms of recreation. For many owners, timber production is not the primary goal of land ownership.
5.4.b The forest owner or manager strives to diversify the economic use of the forest according to Indicator 5.4.a.	C	One of the reasons for seeking certification was to diversify timber economic opportunities for ICF participants. District Foresters often work with landowners to educate them about economic opportunities be it lesser used timber species, methods of selling timber, working forest conservation easements, and others.
C5.5. Forest management operations shall recognize, maintain, and, where appropriate, enhance the value of forest services and resources such as watersheds and fisheries.	C	
5.5.a. In developing and implementing activities on the FMU, the forest owner or manager identifies, defines and implements appropriate measures for maintaining and/or enhancing forest services and resources that serve public values, including municipal watersheds, fisheries, carbon storage and sequestration, recreation and tourism.	C	The primary purpose of the Classified Forest Program is maintaining forest cover, which enhances forest services and resources. During 2012 audit, auditor observed good conformance with maintaining forest services and resources at the tract level.
5.5.b The forest owner or manager uses the information from Indicator 5.5.a to implement appropriate measures for maintaining and/or enhancing these services and resources.	C	This occurs primarily at the tract level through the development and implementation of forest management plans. In the absence of the ICF, only a small percentage of these tracts would likely have management plans.
P6 Forest management shall conserve biological diversity and its associated values, water resources, soils, and unique and fragile ecosystems and landscapes, and, by so doing, maintain the ecological functions and the integrity of the forest.		
C6.5. Written guidelines shall be prepared and implemented to control erosion; minimize forest damage during harvesting, road construction, and all other mechanical disturbances; and to protect water resources.	C	
6.5.a. The forest owner or manager has written guidelines outlining conformance with the Indicators of this Criterion.	C	Adherence to Indiana BMP's is a requirement in timber sale contracts. ICF requires BMP's to be discussed in the pre-harvest meeting. Following completion of the

		<p>timber sale, District Forester reviews harvest for BMPs.</p> <p>See CAR 2012.1 for gap related to follow-through with pre-harvest notification.</p>
6.5.b. Forest operations meet or exceed Best Management Practices (BMPs) that address components of the Criterion where the operation takes place.	C	All forest operations visited during the 2012 audit met BMPs.
<p>6.5.c. Management activities including site preparation, harvest prescriptions, techniques, timing, and equipment are selected and used to protect soil and water resources and to avoid erosion, landslides, and significant soil disturbance. Logging and other activities that significantly increase the risk of landslides are excluded in areas where risk of landslides is high. The following actions are addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slash is concentrated only as much as necessary to achieve the goals of site preparation and the reduction of fuels to moderate or low levels of fire hazard. • Disturbance of topsoil is limited to the minimum necessary to achieve successful regeneration of species native to the site. • Rutting and compaction is minimized. • Soil erosion is not accelerated. • Burning is only done when consistent with natural disturbance regimes. • Natural ground cover disturbance is minimized to the extent necessary to achieve regeneration objectives. • Whole tree harvesting on any site over multiple rotations is only done when research indicates soil productivity will not be harmed. • Low impact equipment and technologies is used where appropriate. 	C	These topics are covered by Indiana BMPs. Harvests inspected at 2012 audit had required BMPs in the timber sale contract.
6.5.d. The transportation system, including design and placement of permanent and temporary haul roads, skid trails, recreational trails, water crossings and landings, is designed, constructed, maintained, and/or	C	Observed generally good conformance with 6.5d requirements at the ICF properties visited in 2012. Examples of conformance included installation of water bars, gating roads, good use of signs to discourage

<p>reconstructed to reduce short and long-term environmental impacts, habitat fragmentation, soil and water disturbance and cumulative adverse effects, while allowing for customary uses and use rights. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • access to all roads and trails (temporary and permanent), including recreational trails, and off-road travel, is controlled, as possible, to minimize ecological impacts; • road density is minimized; • erosion is minimized; • sediment discharge to streams is minimized; • there is free upstream and downstream passage for aquatic organisms; • impacts of transportation systems on wildlife habitat and migration corridors are minimized; • area converted to roads, landings and skid trails is minimized; • habitat fragmentation is minimized; • unneeded roads are closed and rehabilitated. 		<p>unauthorized activity, and avoidance of roads during wet conditions.</p>
<p>6.5.e.1. In consultation with appropriate expertise, the forest owner or manager implements written Streamside Management Zone (SMZ) buffer management guidelines that are adequate for preventing environmental impact, and include protecting and restoring water quality, hydrologic conditions in rivers and stream corridors, wetlands, vernal pools, seeps and springs, lake and pond shorelines, and other hydrologically sensitive areas. The guidelines include vegetative buffer widths and protection measures that are acceptable within those buffers.</p> <p>In the Appalachia, Ozark-Ouachita, Southeast, Mississippi Alluvial Valley, Southwest, Rocky Mountain, and Pacific Coast regions, there are requirements for minimum SMZ widths and explicit limitations on the activities that can occur within those SMZs. These are outlined as requirements in Appendix E.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>IFC participants are encouraged to follow streamside management policies detailed in the Indiana BMPs. Observed conformance with 6.5.e.1 at field sites selected in 2012.</p>
<p>6.5.e.2. Minor variations from the stated minimum</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>Did not observe instances where minor variations were</p>

<p>SMZ widths and layout for specific stream segments, wetlands and other water bodies are permitted in limited circumstances, provided the forest owner or manager demonstrates that the alternative configuration maintains the overall extent of the buffers and provides equivalent or greater environmental protection than FSC-US regional requirements for those stream segments, water quality, and aquatic species, based on site-specific conditions and the best available information. The forest owner or manager develops a written set of supporting information including a description of the riparian habitats and species addressed in the alternative configuration. The CB must verify that the variations meet these requirements, based on the input of an independent expert in aquatic ecology or closely related field.</p>		<p>necessary.</p>
<p>6.5.f. Stream and wetland crossings are avoided when possible. Unavoidable crossings are located and constructed to minimize impacts on water quality, hydrology, and fragmentation of aquatic habitat. Crossings do not impede the movement of aquatic species. Temporary crossings are restored to original hydrological conditions when operations are finished.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>When done in accordance with Indiana BMPs crossings are consistent with FSC requirements. Crossings viewed during 2012 audit were in conformance.</p>
<p>6.5.g. Recreation use on the FMU is managed to avoid negative impacts to soils, water, plants, wildlife and wildlife habitats.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>All recreational activities viewed during the 2012 audit (hiking, hunting, biking, etc) were not negatively impacting forest resources.</p>
<p>6.5.h. Grazing by domesticated animals is controlled to protect in-stream habitats and water quality, the species composition and viability of the riparian vegetation, and the banks of the stream channel from erosion.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Grazing is prohibited on classified forests.</p>
<p>C6.9. The use of exotic species shall be carefully controlled and actively monitored to avoid adverse ecological impacts.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>6.9.a. The use of exotic species is contingent on the availability of credible scientific data indicating that any such species is non-invasive and its application does not pose a risk to native biodiversity.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Several decades ago, exotic red pine was planted and native species were planted outside of their natural ranges in Indiana, such as White pine and black locust. These planted stands are declining and are not typically being regenerated after harvest. ICF group members tend to favor hardwood and a general guideline for</p>

		<p>members is to phase out exotic species and native species planted off-site.</p> <p>Exotic species for erosion control are described in the UMP and have been reviewed by DNR botany and ecology staff for invasive qualities. Most are shade intolerant and will die back once an overstory becomes established.</p> <p>The Division of Forestry informs group members about the requirements related to exotic species used through the annual newsletter. District Foresters also monitor for the use of exotic species on group members during inspections.</p>
<p>6.9.b. If exotic species are used, their provenance and the location of their use are documented, and their ecological effects are actively monitored.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>White pine, red pine, and black locust likely come from adjacent states or the few sites in the state where these species naturally occur.</p> <p>The Indiana State Tree nursery grows both red and white pine. Pine is planted as a training tree in hardwood plantings, severely eroded sites, and other harsh planting sites. Most of the pine planted on private land in Indiana would come from the state nursery, which maintains documentation on a given species' provenance.</p>
<p>6.9.c The forest owner or manager shall take timely action to curtail or significantly reduce any adverse impacts resulting from their use of exotic species</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Exotic species currently in use for commercial and management purposes pose few risks for adverse impacts.</p> <p>Observed exemplary efforts at many group member properties (e.g, Wier) at identifying invasives such as stiltgrass and ailanthus.</p>
<p>C6.10. Forest conversion to plantations or non-forest land uses shall not occur, except in circumstances where conversion: a) Entails a very limited portion of the forest management unit; and b) Does not occur on High Conservation Value Forest areas; and c) Will enable clear, substantial, additional, secure, long-term conservation benefits across the forest management</p>	<p>C</p>	

unit.		
6.10.a Forest <i>conversion</i> to non-forest land uses does not occur, except in circumstances where conversion entails a very limited portion of the forest management unit (note that Indicators 6.10.a, b, and c are related and all need to be conformed with for conversion to be allowed).	C	See response to CAR 2011.5
6.10.b Forest <i>conversion</i> to non-forest land uses does not occur on high conservation value forest areas (note that Indicators 6.10.a, b, and c are related and all need to be conformed with for conversion to be allowed).	C	See response CAR 2011.5
6.10.c Forest <i>conversion</i> to non-forest land uses does not occur, except in circumstances where conversion will enable clear, substantial, additional, secure, long term conservation benefits across the forest management unit (note that Indicators 6.10.a, b, and c are related and all need to be conformed with for conversion to be allowed).	C	In most cases, conversions, where the land remains in the program, are for wildlife openings or water ponds. DoF will assess other conversions that may not meet 6.10.c on a case-by-case basis.
6.10.d Natural or semi-natural stands are not converted to plantations. Degraded, semi-natural stands may be converted to restoration plantations.	C	This requirement has been explained to ICF members through newsletters and meetings. Any conversion would be identified and remedied during the pre-harvest meeting.
6.10.e Justification for land-use and stand-type conversions is fully described in the long-term management plan, and meets the biodiversity conservation requirements of Criterion 6.3 (see also Criterion 7.1.l)	C	One of the core objectives of ICF is to keep land forested and avoid conversion to non-forest use. Candidate areas for conversions must be submitted to DoF via CF&W Form 0690. DoF will review these conversions to ensure that they are consistent with 6.10.e. If a conversion occurs it will be documented in the property management plan.
6.10.f Areas converted to <i>non-forest use</i> for facilities associated with subsurface mineral and gas rights transferred by prior owners, or other conversion outside the control of the certificate holder, are identified on maps. The forest owner or manager consults with the CB to determine if removal of these areas from the scope of the certificate is warranted. To the extent allowed by these transferred rights, the forest owner or manager exercises control over the location of surface disturbances in a manner that	C	Candidate areas for conversions must be submitted to DoF via CF&W Form 0690. DoF will review these conversions to ensure that they are consistent with 6.f requirements.

<p>minimizes adverse environmental and social impacts. If the certificate holder at one point held these rights, and then sold them, then subsequent conversion of forest to non-forest use would be subject to Indicator 6.10.a-d.</p>		
<p>P9 Management activities in high conservation value forests shall maintain or enhance the attributes which define such forests. Decisions regarding high conservation value forests shall always be considered in the context of a precautionary approach.</p> <p>High Conservation Value Forests are those that possess one or more of the following attributes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Forest areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant: concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g., endemism, endangered species, refugia); and/or large landscape level forests, contained within, or containing the management unit, where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance b) Forest areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems c) Forest areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g., watershed protection, erosion control) d) Forest areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g., subsistence, health) and/or critical to local communities' traditional cultural identity (areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in cooperation with such local communities). 		
<p>C9.1. Assessment to determine the presence of the attributes consistent with High Conservation Value Forests will be completed, appropriate to scale and intensity of forest management.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>9.1.a. The forest owner or manager identifies and maps the presence of High Conservation Value Forests (HCVF) within the FMU and, to the extent that data are available, adjacent to their FMU, in a manner consistent with the assessment process, definitions, data sources, and other guidance described in Appendix F.</p> <p>Given the relative rarity of old growth forests in the contiguous United States, these areas are normally designated as HCVF, and all old growth must be managed in conformance with Indicator 6.3.a.3 and requirements for legacy trees in Indicator 6.3.f.</p>	<p>NC</p>	<p>See CAR 2012.3 for gap in identifying old growth HCVF.</p> <p>The Division of Forestry used existing data (e.g., the Division of Nature Preserves database for rare plants, animals, and natural communities) to screen group member properties for known or potential HCVF. HCVF attributes are already normally considered as part of the management plan, but the Division will now specifically refer to such sites as HCVF. The Division also developed internal protocols for training District Foresters and other staff in HCVF concepts and landowner training materials related to HCVF will be provided to group members.</p>

9.1.b. In developing the assessment, the forest owner or manager consults with qualified specialists, independent experts, and local community members who may have knowledge of areas that meet the definition of HCVs.	NA	
FF Indicator 9.1.b In developing the assessment, the forest owner or manager consults with databases, qualified experts, and/or best available research and literature.	C	DoF consulted with the Division of Nature Preserves and surveyed the Natural Preserves database.
9.1.c. A summary of the assessment results and management strategies (see Criterion 9.3) is included in the management plan summary that is made available to the public.	C	The Division of Forestry's Umbrella Management Plan contains a section on HCVF and is available to the public.
C9.2. The consultative portion of the certification process must place emphasis on the identified conservation attributes, and options for the maintenance thereof.	C	
9.2.a. The forest owner or manager holds consultations with stakeholders and experts to confirm that proposed HCVF locations and their attributes have been accurately identified, and that appropriate options for the maintenance of their HCV attributes have been adopted.	C	DoF consulted with the Division of Nature Preserves.
9.2.b. On public forests, a transparent and accessible public review of proposed HCV attributes and HCVF areas and management is carried out. Information from stakeholder consultations and other public review is integrated into HCVF descriptions, delineations and management.	NA	No public forest in ICF.
C9.3. The management plan shall include and implement specific measures that ensure the maintenance and/or enhancement of the applicable conservation attributes consistent with the precautionary approach. These measures shall be specifically included in the publicly available management plan summary.	C	
9.3.a. The management plan and relevant operational plans describe the measures necessary to ensure the maintenance and/or enhancement of all high conservation values present in all identified HCVF areas, including the precautions required to avoid risks	C	Description of HCVF maintenance is found in the ICF Umbrella Plan and group member property management plans- when HCVF is present. See CAR 2012.2 related to gap in identifying HCVF types.

or impacts to such values (see Principle 7). These measures are implemented.		
9.3.b. All management activities in HCVFs must maintain or enhance the high conservation values and the extent of the HCVF.	C	ICF Umbrella Plan requires maintenance/enhancement of HCVF. Did not observe any properties with HCVF to assess maintenance.
9.3.c. If HCVF attributes cross ownership boundaries and where maintenance of the HCV attributes would be improved by coordinated management, then the forest owner or manager attempts to coordinate conservation efforts with adjacent landowners.	C	Where possible District Foresters would coordinate with other adjacent landowners. This will be facilitated by the fact that District Foresters work closely with State and other ICF ownerships.
C9.4. Annual monitoring shall be conducted to assess the effectiveness of the measures employed to maintain or enhance the applicable conservation attributes.	C	
9.4.a. The forest owner or manager monitors, or participates in a program to annually monitor, the status of the specific HCV attributes, including the effectiveness of the measures employed for their maintenance or enhancement. The monitoring program is designed and implemented consistent with the requirements of Principle 8.	NA	
FF Indicator 9.4.a Low risk of negative social or environmental impact for private family forests. Public lands must follow the requirements in Indicator 9.4.a.	C	Monitoring is done by District Foresters during property re-inspections.
9.4.b. When monitoring results indicate increasing risk to a specific HCV attribute, the forest owner/manager re-evaluates the measures taken to maintain or enhance that attribute, and adjusts the management measures in an effort to reverse the trend.	C	This would be accomplished by District Forester during property re-inspections; however, this situation has not arisen.

Appendix 7 – Chain of Custody Indicators for FMEs

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

Appendix 8 – Group Management Program Members

Group Management Criteria not directly assessed during this audit. However, CAR 2012.1 relates to **FSC STD 30-005 Indicator 2.3**