



Surveillance Audit Report

Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Standard

October 28, 2013

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

B. Scope: The Sustainable Forestry Initiative program including land management operations on approximately 156,815 acres of Indiana State Forests and related sustainable forestry activities. The scope of the SFI Program includes Objectives 1-7 and 14-20. The SFI 2010-2014 Standard certification number is NSF-SFIS- 6L841.

- No Change
 Changed (see Section H, revised scope statement noted on FRS)

C. NSF Audit Team:

Lead Auditor: Mike Ferrucci FSC Auditors: Dave Wager,

D. Audit Dates: October 7-9, 2013

E. Reference Documentation:

2010-2014 SFI Standard®; 2008-2012 Strategic Plan, Wildlife Strategy

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

- Acceptable with no non-conformances; or
 Acceptable with a minor non-conformance that should be corrected before the next regularly scheduled surveillance visit;
 Not acceptable with one or two major non-conformances - corrective action required;
 Several major non-conformances - the certification may be canceled unless immediate action is taken

G. Changes to Operations or to the SFI Standard:

Are there any significant changes in operations, procedures, specifications, FRS, etc. from the previous visit? Yes No

H. Other Issues Reviewed:

Yes No Public report from previous audit(s) is posted on SFB web site.
2011 and 2012 Audit Reports on website.

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

Yes No The program is a Multi-site Organization:

Multi-Site Organization: A n organization having an identified central function (hereafter referred to as a central office — but not necessarily the headquarters of the organization) at which certain activities are planned, controlled or managed and a network of local offices or branches (sites) at which such activities are fully or partially carried out. Source: SFI Requirements, Section 9, Appendix: Audits of Multi-Site Organizations

**I. Corrective Action Requests: (see also Appendix IV)
Correct Action Requests issued this visit:**

Corrective Action Plan is not required.

Corrective Action Plan is required within sixty days of this visit (for Minor Non-conformances).

CARs will be verified during the next Surveillance Audit.

Corrective Action Plan is required within thirty days of this visit (for Major Non-conformances).

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

At the conclusion of this Surveillance Audit visit, no CARs remain open and three (3) Opportunities for Improvement (OFIs) were identified.

J. Future Audit Schedule:

Follow-up or Surveillance Audits are required by the 2010-2014 Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard ®. The next audit is scheduled for October 14, 2014 and will be a Recertification Audit; the recertification process must be completed before January 29, 2015.

Appendices:

Appendix I: Surveillance Notification Letter and Audit Schedule

Appendix II: Public Surveillance Audit Report

Appendix III: Audit Matrix

Appendix IV: Form for Reporting Certification in North America (not included – no changes)

Appendix I



Surveillance Notification Letter and Audit Schedule



September 25, 2013

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

Re: Confirmation of SFI and FSC 2013 Annual Surveillance Audits, Indiana DNR

Dear Ms. Huter:

We are scheduled to conduct the Annual Surveillance Audits of the Indiana DNR on Monday October 7 through Wednesday October 9. The audit will commence with an opening meeting at your field office at the Morgan Monroe State Forest. It will conclude with a closing meeting tentatively scheduled for October 17 at 2:30 p.m. at the Greene Sullivan State Forest. Additional information regarding the itinerary is provided in the attached "General Audit Schedule".

This is a partial review of your SFI and FSC Programs to confirm that are in conformance with the requirements and to review past CARs. The audit team includes Dave Wager, FSC Lead auditor and Mike Ferrucci, SFI Lead Auditor. During the audit we will focus on the following:

SFI Program:

- Review of any changes within DNR pertinent to the certification.
- Review progress on achieving SFI objectives and performance measures and the results of the management review of your SFI Program;
- Evaluate your conformance with the SFI multi-site requirements (provided separately).
- Review select criteria from the SFI program, including select components of Objectives 2 through 7 as encountered at the field sites; Objectives 14-20; and other issues as determined by the Lead Auditor. The auditor will attempt to cover all requirements not covered during the 2012 SFI 2010-2014 Standard Surveillance Audit.

FSC Program:

- Review of any changes within DNR (e.g., staffing, land acquisitions, planning documents) that are pertinent to the certification.
- An assessment of the status of outstanding Corrective Action Requests (CARs).
- An assessment of selected forests against a portion of the FSC-US Forest Management Standard (v1.0). Operations will be assessed against Criteria and Indicators of the standard where non-conformances were observed in the previous audit, as well as other Criteria and Indicators, as determined by the SCS auditor.

The audit focus for 2013 includes Criteria: 1.1.-1.6, 2.3, 3.2, 4.2, 4.4, 5.3, 5.6, 6.1-6.10, and 9.4

Logistics

- As during prior audits, we should plan to have lunch on site whenever possible.
- We will travel in your vehicle(s) during the audit, and will not have our own transportation. As agreed your team will pick us up and return us to the airport (or hotel).
- We ask that you provide hardhats and other required safety gear for the team if we visit active logging jobs.

Documentation Requested

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

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

Finally, please remind all involved staff that the auditors do not intend for them to spend large amounts of time making copies. A more efficient approach is to copy a few key documents (3 copies please) while having the files available for review as needed.

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

Multi-Site Sampling

In your program your central office has general control and authority over the separate state forests. I am not required to physically visit your central office provided the audit information is made available during the audit (paper or electronic copies). The sampling plan requires visits to 3 state forests (Morgan Monroe, Owen Putnam, and Greene Sullivan). The first was selected because there are stakeholder issues, and the other two were selected randomly, in part. Sites to be reviewed within each forest were primarily selected randomly.

Please email any questions to both of us. We are looking forward to this audit.

Sincerely yours,



Mike Ferrucci, SFI Lead Auditor, NSF-ISR
mferrucci@iforest.com
203-887-9248



Dave Wager, FSC Lead Auditor
dave@wiserverforestry.com
510-708-0397

General Audit Schedule

Sun Oct 6 – Travel

Auditors will fly into Indianapolis

Lodging (arranged by auditors):

- Radisson Indianapolis Airport
2500 South High School Road, Indianapolis, Indiana, 46241 317-244-3361
- Monday morning auditors will be ready to be picked up by 7:15 am

Mon Oct 7 – Morgan Monroe State Forest

| | | |
|---------|-----------|--|
| 8:30 am | 1.5 hours | Morgan Monroe Office: Opening Meeting with Indy staff present |
| | 6 hours | Audit of Morgan Monroe and Yellowwood Properties - focusing on timber sales in the backcountry area |
| 4:30 pm | | Daily briefing |

Lodging (arranged by DNR):

- McCormick's Creek State Park, Spencer, IN

Tue Oct 8- Owen Putnam

| | |
|--------------------|----------------------------------|
| 8:30 am to 4:30 pm | Full day of auditing Owen Putnam |
| 4:30 pm | Daily briefing |

Lodging (arranged by DNR):

- McCormick's Creek State Park, Spencer, IN

Wed Oct 9- Greene Sullivan

| | |
|-----------|--------------------------|
| 9-1:30 | Audit of Greene Sullivan |
| 1:30-2:30 | Auditor deliberation |
| 2:30 pm | Closing meeting |

Indiana DNR will provide transportation back to Indianapolis airport from Greene Sullivan

Appendix II



Public SFI Surveillance Audit Report

The SFI Program of the Indiana Division of Forestry has achieved continuing conformance with the SFI Standard®, 2010-2014 Edition, according to the NSF-ISR SFIS Certification Audit Process. NSF-ISR initially certified Indiana Division of Forestry to the SFIS in 2006 and recertified it in 2011. This report describes the second Surveillance Audit since the 2011 recertification. This audit was designed to focus on changes in operations, the management review system, and efforts at continuous improvement. In addition, a subset of SFI requirements were selected for detailed review. The program is being audited under the standard audit approach. The next Surveillance Audit is scheduled for October 2013.

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

“The Indiana state forest system consists of about 156,815 acres in 10 administrative units, located in 23 different counties within the state. The administrative units range in size from 300 acres to 50,000 acres and are primarily located in the southern one half of Indiana. Indiana’s Division of Forestry Properties contain about 3% of the total forestland in Indiana; most of the remainder is in private ownership. Each Indiana Division of Forestry Property is managed as a multiple-use facility, providing numerous benefits including timber production, forest management demonstration areas, outdoor recreation, wildlife habitat and watershed protection through an integrated management program. The Indiana State Forest system was established in 1903 and has been actively managed to provide the above benefits continuously since that time.”

SFIS Audit Process

The audit was performed by NSF-ISR on October 7-9, 2013 by an audit team headed by Mike Ferrucci, SFI Lead Auditor and Dave Wagner, FSC Lead Auditor. Audit team members fulfill the qualification criteria for conducting SFIS Certification Audits contained in the Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Audit Procedures and Qualifications (SFI APQ) 2010-2014 Edition. The objective of the audit was to assess continuing conformance of the firm’s SFI Program to the requirements of the Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Standard, 2010-2014 SFI Edition. The scope of the SFIS Audit included the entire state forest system, but this review included field sites at three state forests: Morgan-Monroe State Forest, Owen-Putnam State Forest, and Greene-Sullivan State Forest. Forest practices that were the focus of field inspections included those that have been under active management over the past three years, in order to include planned, ongoing, and completed operations. Practices conducted earlier were also reviewed as appropriate (regeneration and BMP issues, for example).

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

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

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

The review was governed by a detailed audit protocol designed to enable the audit team to determine conformance with the applicable SFI requirements. The process included the assembly and review of audit evidence consisting of documents, interviews, and on-site inspections of ongoing or completed forest practices. Documents describing these activities were provided to the auditor in advance, and a sample of the available audit evidence was designated by the auditor for review.

The possible findings of the audit include Full Conformance, Major Non-conformance, Minor Non-conformance, Opportunities for Improvement, and Practices that Exceeded the Basic Requirements of the SFIS.

Overview of Audit Findings

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

2013 Opportunities for Improvement

Three (3) opportunities for improvement were identified:

- SFI Indicator 2.3.4 requires "Post-harvest conditions conducive to maintaining site productivity (e.g. limited rutting, retained down woody debris, minimized skid trails)." There is an opportunity to improve practices in the area of limited rutting.
- SFI Indicator 2.3.5 requires "Retention of vigorous trees during partial harvesting, consistent with scientific silvicultural standards for the area." There is an opportunity to improve protection of residual trees during harvesting.
- SFI Indicator 2.3.6 requires "Criteria that address harvesting and site preparation to protect soil productivity." Criteria for rutting/compaction exist, but may not be providing adequate protection to soils. See Opportunities for Improvement listed under SFI Indicator 2.3.4 above.

The two (2) opportunities for improvement from the 2012 audit were also reviewed, confirming continuing improvements to the program:

- In 2012 there was an opportunity to improve that program participants are knowledgeable about climate change impacts on wildlife, wildlife habitats and conservation of biological diversity through international, national, regional or local programs and communicate this information to staff (15.3.2). Interviews with central office and state forest staff indicate an increased level of awareness. New efforts included several slides in the annual certification and training webinar and providing links and direction to use the USFS website.
- In 2012 there was an opportunity to improve contractor education and training efforts that are sufficient to their roles and responsibilities (16.1.4). Indiana Division of Forestry revised the “Timber Sale Pre-Harvest Conference Form” to allow closer tracking of training of loggers with an additional section for “Verification of Training”.

2013 Exceptional Practices

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

The Indiana Division of Forestry has an exceptional program to retain stand-level wildlife habitat elements in accordance with scientific information. Notes: The written criteria are well-crafted, comprehensive, and understood by foresters responsible for marking or for approving timber harvests. These guidelines are regularly reviewed and updated to reflect current understanding and changing regulatory requirements, particularly with respect to habitat for the endangered Indiana bat. Implementation is strong.

SFI Indicator 5.4.1 involves “Provide recreational opportunities for the public...”

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

SFI Indicator 6.1 “Program Participants shall identify special sites and manage them in a manner appropriate for their unique features.”

The Indiana Division of Forestry has an exceptional program to identify special sites on state forests and manage them in a manner appropriate for their unique features.

General Description of Evidence of Conformity

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Objective 4. Conservation of Biological Diversity including Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value To manage the quality and distribution of wildlife habitats and contribute to the conservation of biological diversity by developing and implementing stand- and landscape-level measures that promote habitat diversity and the conservation of forest plants and animals, including aquatic species.

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

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

Summary of Evidence – DOF provides excellent recreational opportunities for the public including walking and horse trails, camping and access to lakes and ponds.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

To broaden the practice of sustainable forestry by encouraging the public and forestry community to participate in the commitment to sustainable forestry, and publicly report progress.

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

Objective 18: Public Land Management Responsibilities -

To support and implement sustainable forest management on public lands.

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

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

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

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

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

Relevance of Forestry Certification

Third-party certification provides assurance that forests are being managed under the principles of sustainable forestry, which are described in the Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard as:

1. Sustainable Forestry

To practice sustainable forestry to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs by practicing a land stewardship ethic that integrates reforestation and the managing, growing, nurturing, and harvesting of trees for useful products with the conservation of soil, air and water quality, biological diversity, wildlife and aquatic habitat, recreation, and aesthetics.

2. Responsible Practices

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

3. Reforestation and Productive Capacity

To provide for regeneration after harvest and maintain the productive capacity of the forestland base.

4. Forest Health and Productivity

To protect forests from uncharacteristic and economically or environmentally undesirable wildfire, pests, diseases, and other damaging agents and thus maintain and improve long-term forest health and productivity.

5. Long-Term Forest and Soil Productivity

To protect and maintain long-term forest and soil productivity.

6. Protection of Water Resources

To protect water bodies and riparian zones.

7. Protection of Special Sites and Biological Diversity

To manage forests and lands of special significance (biologically, geologically, historically or culturally important) in a manner that takes into account their unique qualities and to promote a diversity of wildlife habitats, forest types, and ecological or natural community types.

8. Legal Compliance

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

9. Continual Improvement

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

Source: Sustainable Forestry Initiative® (SFI) Standard, 2005–2009 Edition

For Additional Information Contact:

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

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

Appendix III



Audit Matrix

NSF-ISR SFI 2010-2014 MATRIX

Findings and Instructions:

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| C | Conformance |
| Exr | Exceeds the Requirements |
| Maj | Major Non-conformance |
| Min | Minor Non-conformance |
| OFI | Opportunity for Improvement (can also be in Conformance) |
| NA | Not Applicable |
| Likely Gap * | Likely Gap Against 2010-2014 SFIS* |
| Likely Conf. * | Likely Conformance With 2010-2014 SFIS* |
| | * formerly used for transition issues; Gap columns retained for use during Baseline Audits. |
| Auditor | Optional; may be used for audit planning. |
| 10, 11 | Date Codes, for example: 12= Oct. 2012; 13=Oct. 2013 |
| Other | Words in <i>italics</i> are defined in the standard. |

Objective 1. Forest Management Planning

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

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|---|---------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 1.1 | <i>Program Participants shall ensure that forest management plans include long-term harvest levels that are sustainable and consistent with appropriate growth-and-yield models.</i> | NB | 12 | | | | | | |
| Notes | <p>While this requirement was not planned for complete review during 2013 Surveillance Audit, the stand-level “Resource Management Guides” were confirmed for each timber harvest selected for field review.</p> <p>Confirmed the Indiana State Forests Environmental Assessment 2008-2027: Increased Emphasis on Management & Sustainability of Oak-Hickory Communities On the Indiana State Forest System. December 2008.</p> | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement (Performance Measures bold) | Auditor | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--|--|---------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|--|----|----|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 1.1.1 | <p>Forest management planning at a level appropriate to the size and scale of the operation, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. a long-term resources analysis; b. a periodic or ongoing forest inventory; c. a land classification system; d. soils inventory and maps, where available; e. access to growth-and-yield modeling capabilities; f. up-to-date maps or a geographic information system; g. recommended sustainable harvest levels for areas available for harvest; and h. a review of non-timber issues (e.g. recreation, tourism, pilot projects and economic incentive programs to promote water protection, carbon storage, bioenergy feedstock production, or biological diversity conservation, or to address climate-induced ecosystem change). | MF | 13 | | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | <p>13 While this requirement was not planned for complete review during 2013 Surveillance Audit, the stand-level “Resource Management Guides” were confirmed for each timber harvest selected for field review. These guides included sufficient information to find conformance with items b, c, d, f, and h. Items a, e, and g were not comprehensively reviewed.</p> <p>12 a. DOF maintains a long-term resource analysis through its Strategic Plans, which are updated at 5-year intervals. Landscape-level objectives for forest management have been established in the current plan;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. DOF uses FIA data and its own CFI plots to maintain a forest inventory system; c. DOF uses a tract and stand based land classification system d. DOF uses NRCS soil classification data and maps; e. See 1.1.3; f. DOF maintains topo maps and GIS with forest inventory, wildlife, harvests, and other information; g. DOF has documented its sustainable harvest levels in its production forests; and h. Non-timber issues are addressed and include recreation, wildlife and T/E considerations. | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.1.2 | Documentation of annual harvest trends in relation to the sustainable forest management plan in a manner appropriate to document past and future activities. | NB | 12 | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|---|----------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>Notes</i> | 12 2012-2012 FY Timber Sales Target shows annual harvest trends. Reviewed summaries for 2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012 and 2012-2013. | | | | | | | | |
| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
| <i>1.1.3</i> | A forest inventory system and a method to calculate growth and yield. | NB | 12 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | 12 A continuous forest inventory plan is in the 5 th year of a 5 year cycle where 1/5 of the land base is inventoried each year. After the 5 th year is completed, DOF will remeasure the plots allowing for growth computation. Growth is currently being determined based on 3 methods: 1) there are 50 FIA plots across the state forests where growth can be calculated, 2) the 2005 system wide inventory is compared to the inventories done in the 1980s and 3) Increment borings were collected during the 2005 SWI and growth was estimated using the Burrel-Ashley system. All 3 methods yielded basically the same growth rate and the cutting budget is set at 50% of that growth rate. | | | | | | | | |
| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit-or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
| <i>1.1.4</i> | Periodic updates of forest inventory and recalculation of planned harvests to account for changes in growth due to productivity increases or decreases (e.g. improved data, long-term drought, fertilization, climate change, forest land ownership changes, etc.). | NB | 12 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | 12 Inventory = CFI. Recalc allowable cut is based on previous growth/yield data as described in 1.1.3 and is allocated to each forest based on the 2005 SWI figures. These figures are then adjusted based on salvage cuts with the intent being to not over harvest any particular forest. | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|---|---------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
| <i>1.1.5</i> | Documentation of forest practices (e.g., planting, fertilization, and thinning) consistent with assumptions in harvest plans. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |

| | |
|--------------|---|
| <i>Notes</i> | <p>13, 12 Review of tracts files for forests visited indicates they have summary of activities. Also forester inspects activity, completes Purchase Order Approval and turns it into HQ so the contractor can be paid.</p> <p>13 One key forest practice driving projected growth and thus the timing of re-entry cycles involves stocking control through removal of undesirable trees. Auditors observed many marked but uncut trees in completed harvest areas. Indiana Division of Forestry personnel described planned TSI treatments, but older treatments were not visited to confirm. This area should receive further scrutiny during the 2014 Re-Certification Audit.</p> |
|--------------|---|

Objective 2. Forest Productivity.

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

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit -or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|--|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 2.1 | Program Participants shall promptly reforest after final harvest. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| Notes | See indicators below. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit -or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|--|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 2.1.1 | Designation of all harvest areas for either natural regeneration or by planting. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| Notes | 13 The Management Guides for each tract clearly state the preferred regeneration method, which is primarily natural regeneration under the selection system of silviculture. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit -or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|---|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 2.1.2 | Reforestation, unless delayed for site-specific environmental or forest health considerations or legal requirements, through planting within two years or two planting seasons, or by planned natural regeneration methods within five years. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| Notes | 13 Reforestation is accomplished by natural regeneration with occasional supplemental planting of native species where warranted. One planting site was visiting, but this was afforestation (planting of a former agricultural field). | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit -or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|---|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 2.1.3 | Clear criteria to judge adequate regeneration and appropriate actions to correct understocked areas and achieve acceptable species composition and stocking rates for both planting and natural regeneration. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | <p>PowerPoint presentation includes these criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Successful regeneration required within 5 years. • Natural Regeneration • 1,000 native species seedlings/acre • Tree plantings • 400 stems of native species/acre • Management guides should include regeneration expectation statement <p>Indiana Division of Forestry provided an example a sample management guide with statement about regeneration expectation. Confirmed these comments in the silvicultural prescription statements on pages 7 & 8 of the Draft Resource Management Guide for Yellowwood State Forest: Compartment: 7 Tract 2.</p> <p>12 INDOF has revised its procedures to include acceptable stocking levels as well as a process to sample survival stocking.</p> | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit -or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|--|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 2.1.4 | Minimized plantings of exotic tree species, and research documentation that exotic tree species, planted operationally, pose minimal risk. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | 13 INDOF doesn't plant exotic trees. | | | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|--|----|----|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2.1.5 | Protection of desirable or planned advanced natural regeneration during harvest. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | 13 Site visits to completed timber harvests indicate advanced regeneration is not adversely impacted during harvest. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit -or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|---|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 2.1.6 | Planting programs that consider potential ecological impacts of a different species or species mix from that which was harvested. | NA | | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | Planting is not done to change forest composition but to maintain it. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit -or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|---|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 2.1.7 | Afforestation programs that consider potential ecological impacts of the selection and planting of tree species in non-forested landscapes. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | Indiana Division of Forestry plants a small area of non-forested land, and never in non-forested landscapes. When it does plant former farmland it plants only local indigenous species, mostly oak. One planting site was reviewed; on this site most planted trees were oaks, with walnut also planted. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit -or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|-----|---|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 2.2 | Program Participants shall minimize chemical use required to achieve management objectives while protecting employees, neighbors, the public and the environment, including wildlife and aquatic habitats. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |

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

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|---|---------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 2.2.1 | Minimized chemical use required to achieve management objectives. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | A review of records of chemical applications in 2012 showed a relatively low proportion of the certified area is treated with chemicals each year. Most treatments are to control invasive species or aquatic weeds. There were only 5 acres of weed control (pesticide application) associated with tree planting, using a total of 0.2 gallons of Oust (Sulfometuron-methyl). | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|---|---------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 2.2.2 | Use of least-toxic and narrowest-spectrum pesticides necessary to achieve management objectives. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | Pesticide records (2013 Pesticide Application Record, Greene-Sullivan State Forest) show that chemicals are generally used to control invasive species and/or hardwood brush. Round-up and triclopyr are most commonly used. Triclopyr is often associated with control of Japanese Knotweed. A review of records of chemical applications in 2012 for the entire Indiana State Forest System showed similar trends. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|--|---------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 2.2.3 | Use of pesticides registered for the intended use and applied in accordance with label requirements. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | Pesticide records (2013 Pesticide Application Record, Greene-Sullivan State Forest) show that chemicals and needs match. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|---|----------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 2.2.4 | Use of integrated pest management where feasible. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|---|----------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 2.2.5 | Supervision of forest chemical applications by state- or provincial-trained or certified applicators. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | <p>Owen-Putnam State Forest: Indiana Division of Forestry provides training to staff every November/December; Owen-Putnam State Forest staff (resource manager and property manager) attended this training and maintain their pesticide cards. 2013 training is scheduled for November 22.</p> <p>On Greene-Sullivan State Forest Tom Tomkins, Resource Specialist has the Pesticide Applicators CORE training (8 contact hours done on 3.12.13)</p> | | | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|---|----|----|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2.2.6 | <p>Use of management practices appropriate to the situation, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. notification of adjoining landowners or nearby residents concerning applications and chemicals used; b. appropriate multilingual signs or oral warnings; c. control of public road access during and immediately after applications; d. designation of streamside and other needed buffer strips; e. use of positive shutoff and minimal-drift spray valves; f. aerial application of forest chemicals parallel to buffer zones to minimize drift; g. monitoring of water quality or safeguards to ensure proper equipment use and protection of streams, lakes and other water bodies; h. appropriate storage of chemicals; i. filing of required state or provincial reports; and/or j. use of methods to ensure protection of threatened and endangered species. | MF | 13 | | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | Interviews with Indiana Division of Forestry personnel indicate that such measures are followed, and many such requirements are specified in the contract used when the work is done by outside firms. | | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> | |
|--------------|---|---------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--|
| 2.3 | Program Participants shall implement forest management practices to protect and maintain forest and soil productivity. | MF | 13 | | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | See indicators below. | | | | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|---|----|----|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2.3.1 | Use of soils maps where available. | NB | 12 | | | | | | |
| Notes | <p>13 Not reviewed during 2013 Surveillance Audit.</p> <p>12 Review of Management Guides for all timber harvests visited indicates soils maps are used and the soil information is thoroughly discussed in the write-up.</p> <p>12 Soils mapping is available on GIS, and is of high quality. Interviews with resource specialists indicates soils maps are used during tract level planning in a variety of ways, including stand delineation, gross site index estimates, and on occasion, to plan for seasonal harvests mitigation and BMP planning (e.g. highly erosive soils).</p> | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|---|---------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 2.3.2 | Process to identify soils vulnerable to compaction, and use of appropriate methods to avoid excessive soil disturbance. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| Notes | Use of soil surveys in tract planning (pre-harvest), planned skid trails and BMPs confirmed by review of the Resource Management Guide. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|--|---------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 2.3.3 | Use of erosion control measures to <i>minimize</i> the loss of soil and site <i>productivity</i> . | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| Notes | <p>Indiana Division of Forestry has a policy to use the state BMPs which have guidelines to prevent erosion.</p> <p>Site visits did not identify erosion issues.</p> | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|-------|---|---------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 2.3.4 | Post-harvest conditions conducive to maintaining site productivity (e.g. limited rutting, retained down woody debris, minimized skid trails). | MF | 13 | | | | 13 | | |

| | |
|--------------|---|
| <i>Notes</i> | <p><u>There is an opportunity to improve practices in the area of limited rutting.</u></p> <p>13 Some sites visited during the audit had areas with rutting sufficient for localized impact on the roots of trees and soil properties.</p> <p>12 DOF has a policy to use the state BMPs which have guidelines to prevent erosion.</p> <p>12 Site visits did not identify erosion issues.</p> |
|--------------|---|

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | C | EXR | Maj | Min | OFI | Likely Gap * | Likely Conf. * |
|-------|---|---------|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--------------|----------------|
| 2.3.5 | Retention of vigorous trees during partial harvesting, consistent with scientific silvicultural standards for the area. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |

| | |
|--------------|---|
| <i>Notes</i> | <p><u>There is an opportunity to improve protection of residual trees during harvesting.</u></p> <p>Confirmed by field observations that measures are taken to mark trees for removal based on scientific principles and good silvicultural practices. Some harvest sites inspected have considerable residual stem damage in places.</p> <p>12 Review of State Forest Procedures Manual/ Silvicultural Guide – Hardwood Management Section encourages the retention of sound vigorous trees.</p> <p>12 Site visits indicated vigorous trees are retained.</p> |
|--------------|---|

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | C | EXR | Maj | Min | OFI | Likely Gap * | Likely Conf. * |
|-------|---|---------|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--------------|----------------|
| 2.3.6 | Criteria that address harvesting and site preparation to protect soil productivity. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |

| | |
|--------------|---|
| <i>Notes</i> | <p><u>13 Criteria for rutting/compaction exist, but may not always provide adequate protection to soils. See Opportunities for Improvement listed under SFI Indicator 2.3.4 above.</u></p> <p>12 Managers have the authority and responsibility to halt logging activities.</p> <p>12 Reviewed Resource Management Guides for evidence that site-specific harvest criteria are included. BMPs are the main tool, and these are rigidly enforced.</p> |
|--------------|---|

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|---|---------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 2.3.7 | Road construction and skidding layout to minimize impacts to soil productivity and water quality. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | Owen-Putnam State Forest reports that few new roads are constructed. Indiana Division of Forestry rarely builds new roads. Site visits indicate it also gravels existing roads as needed. Roads/fire lanes are routinely gated, and access is controlled. This results in reduced need for road re-construction and lowered impacts to the environment. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|---|---------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 2.4 | Program Participants shall manage so as to protect forests from damaging agents, such as environmentally or economically undesirable wildfire, pests, diseases and invasive exotic plants and animals, to maintain and improve long-term forest health, productivity and economic viability. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | See indicators below. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|---|---------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 2.4.1 | Program to protect forests from damaging agents. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | Foresters are quite familiar with their forests and conduct informal recon to assess forest health. Owen-Putnam State Forest reports mortality of elm (Dutch Elm Disease) and tulip-poplar (dieback and decline). | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|--|---------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 2.4.2 | Management to promote healthy and productive forest conditions to minimize susceptibility to damaging agents. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | <p>Periodic selection harvests are used to control stocking and remove unhealthy trees.</p> <p>Owen-Putnam State Forest: The 6,500 acres of operable, productive forest are treated on roughly a 15-year cutting cycle. Confirmed by field observations that the indicator is met.</p> | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|--|---------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 2.4.3 | Participation in, and support of, fire and pest prevention and control programs. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | <p>Fire-fighting equipment is available on the Owen-Putnam State Forest for use by state forest staff, and if requested, by local fire departments. Staff of Owen-Putnam State Forest is available to assist local fire fighters.</p> <p>15% of revenues from state forest timber sales are provided to county government, and half of this is to be dedicated to the volunteer fire departments. Rob Duncan met with the volunteer fire departments early in 2013 when the check for 2012 was presented. Confirmed press clipping covering the event: “Owen Volunteer Fire Departments Receive DNR Timber Sale Profits” 02.13.13; the photo shows a check for \$19,099.15 from State of Indiana to Owen County.</p> | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|--|---------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 2.5 | Program Participants that deploy improved planting stock, including varietal seedlings, shall use sound scientific methods. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | <p>All seed is collected in Indiana, including some from the state’s seed orchards and grown in the Indiana State Nursery located in Vallonia, IN. The nursery’s manager has college training, considerable experience, and a strong reputation throughout the mid-west.</p> | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|--|---------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 2.5.1 | Program for appropriate research, testing, evaluation and deployment of improved planting stock, including varietal seedlings. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | See notes under Performance Measure 2.5 above. | | | | | | | | |

Objective 3. Protection and Maintenance of Water Resources

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

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|---|---------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 3.1 | Program Participants shall meet or exceed all applicable federal, provincial, state and local water quality laws, and meet or exceed best management practices developed under Canadian or U.S. Environmental Protection Agency–approved water quality programs. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | See indicators below. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|--|---------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 3.1.1 | Program to implement state or provincial best management practices during all phases of management activities. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | 13 The use of professional foresters to plan and oversee harvests, timber sale contracts with provisions to follow BMPs, pre-harvest meetings between foresters and logging contractors, and the BMP audit system comprise the program. 12 Reviewed “Forest Management and Water Quality in Indiana” by Duane McCoy, IDOF, 8.31.05 which overviews the water quality laws, BMPs, and the Indiana approach, provides scientific citations, and concludes that the combination of mostly partial harvests, uneven-aged silvicultural systems relying mostly on natural regeneration (limited to no site disturbance from site preparation), planned harvests, oversight by foresters, and consistent use of BMPs results in minimal impacts on waters from state timber harvests. | | | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|---|----|----|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 3.1.2 | Contract provisions that specify conformance to best management practices. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | 13 Contracts unchanged from 2012. Confirmed that the Letter of Agreement for Sale of Timber on State Forest Land contains a BMP clause – Item #9. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|---|---------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 3.1.3 | Plans that address wet-weather events (e.g. forest inventory systems, wet-weather tracts, definitions of acceptable operating conditions). | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | 13, 12 Confirmed that the “BMP Field Guide – Road and Trail Maintenance” section provides general guidelines. Managers have the authority and responsibility to halt logging activities. 13 Interviews with Resource Specialists and review of completed Timber Sale Visitation and Evaluations indicate they halt harvesting when wet weather becomes an issue. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|---|---------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 3.1.4 | Monitoring of overall best management practices implementation. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | Monitoring includes at least weekly site inspections with the results documented on the Timber Sale Visitation and Evaluations. Each sale is also officially “closed out” with an inspection a central office forester. Documentation was reviewed for a selection of sites visited during the audit. | | | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|--|----|----|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 3.2 | Program Participants shall have or develop, implement and document riparian protection measures based on soil type, terrain, vegetation, ecological function, harvesting system and other applicable factors. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | BMP evaluation forms and by field observations confirmed excellent results. Also see indicators below. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|---|---------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 3.2.1 | Program addressing management and protection of rivers, streams, lakes, and other water bodies and riparian zones. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | The use of BMPs, the design of all harvest projects by trained foresters, and the review of all projects by supervisory personnel, as well as the regulatory programs of the Division of Water and Department of Environmental Management comprise such a program. Further, there is an internal audit program for BMPs following all timber harvests (see 3.1.4 above). Harvest blocks (generally tracts), ridge-top roads, and skid road systems are designed to avoid stream crossings in most harvests. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|---|---------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 3.2.2 | Mapping of rivers, streams, lakes, and other water bodies as specified in state best management practices and, where appropriate, identification on the ground. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | 13 Harvest site maps and flagging in the field showed locations of streams and stream buffers. 12 Review of GIS indicates water bodies are adequately mapped – generally the 7.5’ USGS topos are used as the base map. There is also a GIS layer of small dug out water holes. | | | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|--|----|----|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 3.2.3 | Implementation of plans to manage or protect rivers, streams, lakes, and other water bodies. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | Confirmed by field observations on all sites visited. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|---|---------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 3.2.4 | Identification and protection of non-forested wetlands, including bogs, fens and marshes, and vernal pools of ecological significance. | NB | 12 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | Not reviewed during 2013 Surveillance Audit. 12 Review by Division of Nature Preserves helps identify these sites in advance of sale planning. Foresters identify such sites on maps and often flag them off from active harvest areas. Confirmed by field observations at all sites visited. | | | | | | | | |

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

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

To manage the quality and distribution of wildlife habitats and contribute to the conservation of biological diversity by developing and implementing stand- and landscape-level measures that promote a diversity of types of habitat and successional stages, and conservation of forest plants and animals, including aquatic species.

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|--|---------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 4.1 | Program Participants shall have programs to promote biological diversity at stand- and landscape-levels. | MF, DW | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | <p>Indiana Division of Forestry is working on its Indiana bat HCP, with a first draft likely sent to the USFWS by June, 2014. They considered adding the Classified Forest Program to the scope, but decided not to do this. The draft HCP includes additional provisions for the division to implement additional conservation measures.</p> <p>Meanwhile Indiana Division of Forestry and the USFWS have agreed to “Indiana Division of Forestry - Interim Forest Management Guidelines For Indiana Bat And Gray Bat”. This document has 5 requirements that apply on all of the state forests, with 2 additional harvest restrictions applicable on forests near bat hibernacula or areas with reproductive areas. This new approach is a refinement of the long-standing “Indiana Department Of Natural Resources - Division Of Forestry Resource Management Strategy For Indiana Bat On Indiana State Forests Revised April 2008” (the strategy).</p> <p>There has recently been a proposed listing of additional bats by the US Fish and Wildlife Service: Northern Long-eared Bats are likely to be listed; Little Brown Bats are not likely to be listed. The Indiana Division of Forestry is well-informed regarding policy and biology associated with bats.</p> | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|--|---------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 4.1.1 | Program to promote the conservation of native biological diversity, including species, wildlife habitats and ecological community types. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |

| | |
|--------------|--|
| <i>Notes</i> | 13 Indiana Division of Forestry employs a full-time wildlife biologist, Scott Haulton. His time is focused on special situations and on the HCP effort for Indiana bat, but he also provides support for regular work activities. The Indiana Division of Forestry has dedicated considerable resources to developing state-of-the-art bat conservation practices. 12 DOF has updated its management unit prescriptions to include areas where late seral ecological communities will be maintained. |
|--------------|--|

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit -or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|--|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 4.1.2 | Program to protect threatened and endangered species. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | A database of known T&E species is checked during tract and sale planning. Results are documented on forms which were reviewed during the audit. When there are “hits” the Indiana Division of Forestry’s Wildlife Biologist is consulted for technical assistance as needed | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit -or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|---|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 4.1.3 | Program to locate and protect known sites associated with viable occurrences of critically imperiled and imperiled species and communities also known as Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value. Plans for protection may be developed independently or collaboratively, and may include Program Participant management, cooperation with other stakeholders, or use of easements, conservation land sales, exchanges, or other conservation strategies. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | The database described above under Indicator 4.1.2 includes G1 and G2 species and communities. | | | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|--|----|--|----|--|--|--|--|--|
| 4.1.4 | Development and implementation of criteria, as guided by regionally appropriate best scientific information, to retain stand-level wildlife habitat elements such as snags, stumps, mast trees, down woody debris, den trees and nest trees. | MF | | 13 | | | | | |
|-------|--|----|--|----|--|--|--|--|--|

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

The written criteria are well-crafted, comprehensive, and understood by foresters responsible for marking or for approving timber harvests. These guidelines are regularly reviewed and updated to reflect current understanding and changing regulatory requirements, particularly with respect to habitat for the endangered Indiana bat. Implementation is strong.

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit -or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|--|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 4.1.5 | Program for assessment, conducted either individually or collaboratively, of forest cover types, age or size classes, and habitats at the individual ownership level and, where credible data are available, across the landscape, and take into account findings in planning and management activities. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| Notes | The Indiana bat strategy as well as individual tract plans demonstrate conformance. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit -or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|---|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 4.1.6 | Support of and participation in plans or programs for the conservation of old-growth forests in the region of ownership. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| Notes | Indiana Division of Forestry annually reviews inventory data (CFI) to locate stands older than 150. These stands are considered for protection; found one recently that is already in a natural area. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit -or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|--|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 4.1.7 | Participation in programs and demonstration of activities as appropriate to limit the introduction, impact and spread of invasive exotic plants and animals that directly threaten or are likely to threaten native plant and animal communities. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | <p>13 Owen-Putnam State Forest has an ongoing TSI contract including some treatment of multi-flora rose and autumn olive.</p> <p>13 Owen-Putnam State Forest described several efforts, including brochures for the public, efforts to re-seed log yards quickly after harvest, annual training, and others.</p> <p>12 DOF has revised its State Forest procedures manual to address invasive species in a more robust manner, including more specific monitoring, control and prevention measures and has prepared a timeline for its implementation.</p> | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit -or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|---|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 4.1.8 | Program to incorporate the role of prescribed or natural fire where appropriate. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | <p>Indiana Division of Forestry has not often used prescribed fire, but there are plans on the Clark State Forest to use prescribed fire to control Virginia Pine and local but prolific Sugar Maple in an area that was salvage-harvested following a tornado-caused wind-throw event.</p> | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit -or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|--|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 4.2 | Program Participants shall apply knowledge gained through research, science, technology and field experience to manage wildlife habitat and contribute to the conservation of biological diversity. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | <p>See indicators below.</p> | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit -or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|---|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 4.2.1 | Collection of information on Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value and other biodiversity-related data through forest inventory processes, mapping or participation in external programs, such as NatureServe, state or provincial heritage programs, or other credible systems. Such participation may include providing non-proprietary scientific information, time and assistance by staff, or in-kind or direct financial support. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| Notes | Resource Management Guides prepared in advance of each timber harvest document the results of a review of the Indiana Natural Heritage Database “to locate and identify any known endangered, threatened or rare (E.T.R.) animal species” (Source: Resource Management Guide Owen-Putnam State Forest Compartment 3, Tract 4, September 2011). | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit -or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|--|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 4.2.2 | A methodology to incorporate research results and field applications of biodiversity and ecosystem research into forest management decisions. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| Notes | Many field foresters and manager are members of professional associations and all attend regular training meetings or workshops. Indiana Division of Forestry employs a full-time wildlife biologist, Scott Haulton, who is responsible for providing current, science-based information regarding wildlife and biodiversity to the organization’s employees. Scott’s current focus is on conservation of bat species and leading the preparation of a Habitat Conservation Plan for bats. | | | | | | | | |

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| <p><i>Notes (continued)</i></p> | <p>Summary of bat guidance documents specific to Indiana bat habitat management provided by Indiana Division of Forestry:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The "Strategy..." was the Division's original set of Indiana bat habitat management guidelines, developed back in the late 1990's (1999, I think). The attached version is the version I updated just after I started. I can provide the original version, too, if you're interested. Originally these guidelines applied to the entire state forest system; however, currently the "Strategy..." only applies to state forest property where Indiana bats have not been documented. 2) The "BFO [Bloomington Field Office, USFWS] Forest Management Guidelines..." are currently followed within areas where reproductive records or known hibernacula for Indiana bat occur. These are the generic guidelines the USFWS-BFO developed to address all issues related to forest management and in the state. 3) Finally, the "Interim" guidance is what we recently got approval from USFWS to adopt - it will replace both the "Strategy..." and the "BFO Forest Management Guidance..." It will become the one document that specifically addresses bat habitat management on state forests. This will serve as the guidance we follow on state forests until the HCP is approved and an Incidental Take Permit is granted from USFWS. <p>Also attached is a document describing the habitat suitability models Purdue University is developing for our HCP and Environmental Impact Statement...the modeling is described in sections 1-3 under "Approach". By the way, we were recently granted a two year extension from USFWS for the deliverables mentioned in this document. I expect the habitat suitability models to be completed within the next month and the LANDIS simulation projections this winter.</p> <p>Finally, Mike requested the State Forest Environmental Assessment Carl Hauser and I developed back in 2008...here's the link from our website: http://www.in.gov/dnr/forestry/files/fo-StateForests_EA.pdf. Scott Haulton, Certified Wildlife Biologist <i>Forestry Wildlife Specialist</i> Indiana DNR, Division of Forestry 402 W. Washington St., Rm. W296 Indianapolis, IN 46204 317-234-5725 (voice) 317-233-3863 (fax) http://www.in.gov/dnr/forestry/</p> |
|-------------------------------------|---|

Objective 5. Management of Visual Quality and Recreational Benefits.

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

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|--|---------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>5.1</i> | Program Participants shall manage the impact of harvesting on visual quality. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | See indicators below. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|---|---------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>5.1.1</i> | Program to address visual quality management. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | Sales are planned by professional foresters and then reviewed by very experienced supervisors, also foresters, and by central office specialists prior to approval. All involved have experience with management to protect visual quality. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|---|---------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>5.1.2</i> | Incorporation of aesthetic considerations in harvesting, road, landing design and management, and other management activities where visual impacts are a concern. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | Confirmed by field observations. | | | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|---|----|----|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 5.2 | Program Participants shall manage the size, shape and placement of clearcut harvests. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | Indiana Division of Forestry does not frequently use clearcuts, relying instead on selection silviculture on nearly all of the acres treated. Clearcuts are mostly quite small, often more accurately classified as patch cuts or group-selection openings. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|---|---------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 5.2.1 | Average size of clearcut harvest areas does not exceed 120 acres (50 hectares), except when necessary to meet regulatory requirements or to respond to forest health emergencies or other natural catastrophes. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | Clearcutting is not commonly employed on State Forests. Average clearcut size for 2012, not including patch cut openings, was 40 acres. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|--|---------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 5.2.2 | Documentation through internal records of clearcut size and the process for calculating average size. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | Records, including Resource Management Guides, maps, timber contracts, marking tallies, etc. were quite detailed. All harvests are recorded in databases and maps. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|--|---------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 5.3 | Program Participants shall adopt a green-up requirement or alternative methods that provide for visual quality. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | See indicators below. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|---|---------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 5.3.1 | Program implementing the green-up requirement or alternative methods. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| Notes | Except for salvage harvests, stands are entered on a 15 to 20-year reentry cycle, and clearcutting is not commonly employed. As such the risk of having adjacent clearcuts is very low. Foresters plan to avoid adjacent clearcuts. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|--|---------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 5.3.2 | Harvest area tracking system to demonstrate conformance with the green-up requirement or alternative methods. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| Notes | Records, including Resource Management Guides, maps, timber contracts, marking tallies, etc. were quite detailed. All harvests are recorded in databases and maps. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|---|---------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 5.3.3 | Trees in clearcut harvest areas are at least 3 years old or 5 feet (1.5 meters) high at the desired level of stocking before adjacent areas are clearcut, or as appropriate to address operational and economic considerations, alternative methods to reach the performance measure are utilized by the Program Participant. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| Notes | Not reviewed during 2013 Surveillance Audit because no clearcuts were observed (these are few and far between). | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|--|---------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 5.4 | Program Participants shall support and promote recreational opportunities for the public. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | See indicators below. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|--|---------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 5.4.1 | Provide recreational opportunities for the public, where consistent with forest management objectives. | MF | | 13 | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | <p>Indiana Division of Forestry provides excellent recreational opportunities for the public including walking and horse trails, camping and access to lakes and ponds.</p> <p>Owen-Putnam State Forest has three primary recreational uses: hunting, horseback riding, and primitive camping (3 campgrounds, one of which is a horse camping site).</p> <p>Map: “Current Status Back Country Area Harvests”. Indiana Division of Forestry has been working to address concerns of the Hoosier Hikers (club). Foresters look carefully for evidence of campsites as part of inventory and related fieldwork. John Friedrich provided the background on the development of these areas, which were intended to continue to be managed for multiple uses in conjunction with the authorization of backpack camping. There is no known written prohibition against harvesting in the Back Country Area, and selection harvesting is allowed. Recent inventory data show that the back country tracts on MMSF are quite similar to the rest of the forest in terms of stocking and tree sizes, and are in some cases smaller.</p> | | | | | | | | |

Objective 6. Protection of Special Sites.

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

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|---|---------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 6.1 | Program Participants shall identify special sites and manage them in a manner appropriate for their unique features. | MF | | 13 | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | <p>The Indiana Division of Forestry has an exceptional program to identify special sites and manage them in a manner appropriate for their unique features.</p> <p>See indicators below.</p> | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|---|---------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 6.1.1 | Use of information such as existing natural heritage data, expert advice or stakeholder consultation in identifying or selecting special sites for protection. | MF | | 13 | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | <p>Natural areas are designated as HCVF.</p> <p>An effort is underway on MMSF to locate, map, and generally conserve the largest trees of each species found on the forest.</p> | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|---|---------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 6.1.2 | Appropriate mapping, cataloging and management of identified special sites. | MF | | 13 | | | | | |

| | |
|--------------|---|
| <i>Notes</i> | <p>Special sites reviewed were mapped and protected.</p> <p>Resource Management Guides prepared in advance of each timber harvest document the results of a review of the Indiana Natural Heritage Database “to locate and identify any known endangered, threatened or rare (E.T.R.) animal species”. The guides also describe protection of known cultural resources and the need to contact the division’s forest archeologist if any cultural resources are discovered. Harvest records include documentation describing cultural resources reviews.</p> <p>Interviewed AJ Ariens, Forestry Archeologist, Indiana Division of Forestry.</p> |
|--------------|---|

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

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|--|---------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 7.1 | Program Participants shall employ appropriate forest harvesting technology and in-woods manufacturing processes and practices to minimize waste and ensure efficient utilization of harvested trees, where consistent with other SFI Standard objectives. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | See indicators below. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|-------|--|---------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 7.1.1 | Program or monitoring system to ensure efficient utilization, which may include provisions to ensure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. management of harvest residue (e.g. slash, limbs, tops) considers economic, social and environmental factors (e.g. organic and nutrient value to future forests) and other utilization needs; b. training or incentives to encourage loggers to enhance utilization; c. cooperation with mill managers for better utilization of species and low-grade material; d. exploration of markets for underutilized species and low-grade wood and alternative markets (e.g. bioenergy markets); or e. periodic inspections and reports noting utilization and product separation. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |

| | |
|--------------|--|
| <i>Notes</i> | <p>Harvests reviewed showed careful attention to utilizing logs efficiently, but pulpwood/firewood portions of felled trees, as well as trees not suited to sawtimber were generally left in the stands. Most forests reviewed in the 2013 audit were located far from pulpwood markets.</p> <p>Field observations during audit confirmed residues are scattered, landings are left clean, and the best use of difficult markets (no pulp markets, for example)</p> <p>Firewood sales are employed on occasion to improve utilization</p> <p>Most portions of the state forest system retain large tops during harvest operations to help rebuild forest structure (coarse woody debris) (delete since pre-settlement condition is not a reference condition goal)</p> |
|--------------|--|

Objectives 8. Through 13 are Not Applicable

Objective 14. Legal and Regulatory Compliance.

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

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit-or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|---|----------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 14.1 | Program Participants shall take appropriate steps to comply with applicable federal, provincial, state and local forestry and related social and environmental laws and regulations. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| Notes | Interviews and available information indicate compliance. See indicators below. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit-or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|---------------|--|----------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 14.1.1 | Access to relevant laws and regulations in appropriate locations. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| Notes | Indiana Division of Forestry’s policies and procedures incorporate the laws and regulations. Laws and regulations are available on line. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit-or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|---------------|---|----------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 14.1.2 | System to achieve compliance with applicable federal, provincial, state or local laws and regulations. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| Notes | Indiana Division of Forestry’s policies and procedures incorporate the laws and regulations. Professional foresters, trained on the organization’s policies, plan and oversee activities. Plans and proposed harvests are reviewed by Indiana Division of Forestry senior managers; these managers understand the laws. Harvests reviewed by John Friedrich and other contracts by Dan Ernst. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit -or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|--|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 14.1.3 | Demonstration of commitment to legal compliance through available regulatory action information. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | No regulatory issues were reported by Indiana Division of Forestry or were found on-line. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit- or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|---|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 14.2 | Program Participants shall take appropriate steps to comply with all applicable social laws at the federal, provincial, state and local levels in the country in which the Program Participant operates. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | See indicators below. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit- or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------|--|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 14.2.1 | Written policy demonstrating commitment to comply with social laws, such as those covering civil rights, equal employment opportunities, anti-discrimination and anti-harassment measures, workers' compensation, indigenous peoples' rights, workers' and communities' right to know, prevailing wages, workers' right to organize, and occupational health and safety. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |

| | |
|--------------|--|
| Notes | Confirmed access to these is located in the state employee website. Indiana DNR employs a full-time safety officer who provides guidance and training, mostly in association with annual safety inspections of most work units. Each office has a designated safety officer, and annual training is required for each employee. Much of the training is on-the-job, wherein experienced workers show new workers how to perform their duties safely. Greene-Sullivan State Forest has monthly safety meetings. |
|--------------|--|

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit-or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|---|----------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 14.2.2 | Forestry enterprises will respect the rights of workers and labor representatives in a manner that encompasses the intent of the International Labor Organization (ILO) core conventions. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| Notes | There have not been any ILO-related complaints. If any occur NSF must pass these along to SFI Inc. 12 State employees are not protected by ILO Conventions 87&98. No complaints. | | | | | | | | |

Objective 15. Forestry Research, Science, and Technology.

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

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit-or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|------|---|----------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 15.1 | Program Participants shall individually and/or through cooperative efforts involving SFI Implementation Committees, associations or other partners provide in-kind support or funding for forest research to improve forest health, productivity, and sustainable management of forest resources, and the environmental benefits and performance of forest products. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|---|----------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>Notes</i> | See indicators below. | | | | | | | | |
| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit-or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
| 15.1.1 | Financial or in-kind support of research to address questions of relevance in the region of operations. The research shall include some of the following issues: a. forest health, productivity, and ecosystem functions; b. chemical efficiency, use rate and integrated pest management; c. water quality and/or effectiveness of best management practices including effectiveness of water quality and best management practices for protecting the quality, diversity and distributions of fish and wildlife habitats; d. wildlife management at stand- and landscape-levels; e. conservation of biological diversity; f. ecological impacts of bioenergy feedstock removals on productivity, wildlife habitat, water quality and other ecosystem functions; g. climate change research for both adaptation and mitigation; h. social issues; i. forest operations efficiencies and economics; j. energy efficiency; k. life cycle assessment; l. avoidance of illegal logging; and m. avoidance of controversial sources. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |

| | |
|--------------|--|
| Notes | <p>13 From SFI Annual Report: “The Hardwood Ecosystem Experiment (HEE) is a long-term, large-scale experimental study of forest management and its impact on plants and animals. Project partners include Indiana DNR Division of Forestry, Purdue University Department of Forestry & Natural Resources, Indiana DNR Division of Fish & Wildlife Diversity Section, Indiana DNR Division of State Parks and Reservoirs, Purdue University Department of Entomology, Indiana State University, Ball State University, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Drake University, Indiana University and The Nature Conservancy.”</p> <p>Indiana University has installed a meteorological tower on the Morgan-Monroe State Forest.</p> <p>Many other research projects were described: saw-whet owl, neo-tropical migrants. The Indiana Division of Forestry receives multiple requests each year for research use of state forest lands and has a review and approval process.</p> |
|--------------|--|

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit-or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|---|----------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 15.1.2 | Research on genetically engineered trees via forest tree biotechnology shall adhere to all applicable federal, state, and provincial regulations and international protocols. | NA | | | | | | | |
| Notes | INDOF does not conduct genetic research. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit-or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|--|----------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 15.2 | Program Participants shall individually and/or through cooperative efforts involving SFI Implementation Committees, associations or other partners develop or use state, provincial or regional analyses in support of their sustainable forestry programs. | | | | | | | | |
| Notes | Not reviewed during 2013 Surveillance Audit. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit-or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|---|----------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 15.2.1 | Participation, individually and/or through cooperative efforts involving SFI Implementation Committees and/or associations at the national, state, provincial or regional level, in the development or use of some of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. regeneration assessments; b. growth and drain assessments; c. best management practices implementation and conformance; d. biodiversity conservation information for family forest owners; and e. social, cultural or economic benefit assessments. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | Not reviewed during 2013 Surveillance Audit. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit -or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|--|-----------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 15.3 | Program Participants shall individually and/or through cooperative efforts involving SFI Implementation Committees, associations or other partners broaden the awareness of climate change impacts on forests, wildlife and biological diversity. | MF | 2013 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | See indicators below. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit -or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|--|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 15.3.1 | Where available, monitor information generated from regional climate models on long-term forest health, productivity and economic viability. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| Notes | Information was provided showing that the organization has improved its program for meeting this indicator. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit -or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|---|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 15.3.2 | Program Participants are knowledgeable about climate change impacts on wildlife, wildlife habitats and conservation of biological diversity through international, national, regional or local programs. | MF | 13 | | | | 12 | | |
| Notes | <p>13 Interviews with central office and state forest staff indicate an increased level of awareness. New efforts included several slides in a recent certification and training webinar and providing links and direction to use the USFS web-site.</p> <p>12 Interviews with central office and state forest staff indicate that some of them are aware of climate change impacts on wildlife, including the IU study on Morgan Monroe. The central office has gathered information about climate change impacts but has not communicated this information to staff. This was an Opportunity for Improvement in 2012: “an opportunity to improve that program participants are knowledgeable about climate change impacts on wildlife, wildlife habitats and conservation of biological diversity through international, national, regional or local programs and communicate this information to staff”. Resolved (see above).</p> | | | | | | | | |

Objective 16. Training and Education.

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

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit-or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|--|----------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 16.1 | Program Participants shall require appropriate training of personnel and contractors so that they are competent to fulfill their responsibilities under the SFI 2010-2014 Standard. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| Notes | See indicators below. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit-or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|---------------|---|----------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 16.1.1 | Written statement of commitment to the SFI 2010-2014 Standard communicated throughout the organization, particularly to facility and woodland managers, fiber sourcing staff and field foresters. | NB | 12 | | | | | | |
| Notes | Not reviewed during 2013 Surveillance Audit. 12 Confirmed by review of statement. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit-or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|---------------|---|----------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 16.1.2 | Assignment and understanding of roles and responsibilities for achieving SFI 2010-2014 Standard objectives. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |

| | |
|--------------|---|
| Notes | <p>13 On September 19, 2013 Indiana Division of Forestry conducted a one-hour, section-wide (Property Section) training via webinar covering general management items and certification-related items. PowerPoint included 29 slides</p> <p>12 Brenda Huter is the management representative with overall responsibility for the program including tracking CARs and responses. Field-related objectives are the responsibility of foresters, while the other Objectives are covered by central office.</p> |
|--------------|---|

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|---|---------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 16.1.3 | Staff education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| Notes | <p>12, 13 DNR requires all professional employees to have an average 20 contact hours/year of training. Review of training records, including 2013 YTD, indicates that this requirement is generally exceeded.</p> <p>13 Greene-Sullivan State Forest records of training for Tom Tompkins, Resource Manager and for Steve Siscoe, Property Manager. Training includes cruising, safety, certification, and science-related topics, among others.</p> <p>12 Reviewed training records for each forest (Vadas, Burgess and Jones – Morgan-Monroe/Yellowwood, Martin and Steward – Clark and Werne, Sieg and Segari – Harrison-Crawford) visited and all had adequately documented resource specialists training.</p> | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------|---|---------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 16.1.4 | Contractor education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities. | NB | | | | | 12 | | |

| | |
|--------------|--|
| <i>Notes</i> | <p>13 Confirmed increased attention to this issue. Revised “Timber Sale Pre-Harvest Conference Form” is in place. This form was covered in the PowerPoint webinar and in an email to the resource specialists. Rolled out August 23 with an additional section for “Verification of Training”.</p> <p>12 DOF requires logging contractors to have adequately trained employees. The Pre Harvest Conference Guidelines call for documentation of logger training; however training is not being verified.</p> <p>12 Other contractors are trained as needed by INDOF personnel.</p> <p>In 2012 there was an opportunity to improve contractor education and training efforts that are sufficient to their roles and responsibilities. INDOF requires that loggers have appropriate training but does not have a system in place to verify training.</p> |
|--------------|--|

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit-or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|---------------|---|----------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>16.1.5</i> | Forestry enterprises shall have a program for the use of certified logging professionals (where available) and qualified logging professionals. | NB | 12 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | 12 See 16.4.1. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|--|---------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>16.2</i> | Program Participants shall work individually and/or with SFI Implementation Committees, logging or forestry associations, or appropriate agencies or others in the forestry community to foster improvement in the professionalism of wood producers. | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | Not reviewed during 2013 Surveillance Audit. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Auditor | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|---------------|---|---------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>16.2.1</i> | <p>Participation in or support of SFI Implementation Committees to establish criteria and identify delivery mechanisms for wood producers' training courses that address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. awareness of sustainable forestry principles and the SFI program; b. best management practices, including streamside management and road construction, maintenance and retirement; c. reforestation, invasive exotic plants and animals, forest resource conservation, aesthetics, and special sites; d. awareness of responsibilities under the U.S. Endangered Species Act, the Canadian Species at Risk Act, and other measures to protect wildlife habitat (e.g. Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value); e. logging safety; f. U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety (COHS) regulations, wage and hour rules, and other provincial, state and local employment laws; g. transportation issues; h. business management; i. public policy and outreach; and j. awareness of emerging technologies. | | | | | | | | |
| Notes | Not reviewed during 2013 Surveillance Audit. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit-or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|--|----------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 16.2.2 | <p>Participation in or support of SFI Implementation Committees to establish criteria for recognition of logger certification programs, where they exist, that include:</p> <p>a. completion of SFI Implementation Committee recognized logger training programs and meeting continuing education requirements of the training program; b. independent in-the-forest verification of conformance with the logger certification program standards; c. compliance with all applicable laws and regulations including responsibilities under the U.S. Endangered Species Act, the Canadian Species at Risk Act and other measures to protect wildlife habitat; d. use of best management practices to protect water quality; e. logging safety; f. compliance with acceptable silviculture and utilization standards; g. aesthetic management techniques employed where applicable; and h. adherence to a management or harvest plan that is site specific and agreed to by the forest landowner.</p> | NA | | | | | | | |
| Notes | Indiana does not have a logger certification program. | | | | | | | | |

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

To broaden the practice of sustainable forestry by encouraging the public and forestry community to participate in the commitment to sustainable forestry, and publicly report progress.

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit -or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|---|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| <i>17.1</i> | Program Participants shall support and promote efforts by consulting foresters, state, provincial and federal agencies, state or local groups, professional societies, conservation organizations, indigenous peoples and governments, community groups, sporting organizations, labor, universities, extension agencies, the American Tree Farm System® and/or other landowner cooperative programs to apply principles of sustainable forest management. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | See indicators below. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit- or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|---------------|--|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| <i>17.1.1</i> | Support, including financial, for efforts of SFI Implementation Committees. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | Jack Seifert, Indiana Division of Forestry interacts the most with Indiana SFI Implementation Committee. Situation from 2012 is unchanged: “SIC has only 1 member –DOF. Meetings done in conjunction with the Indiana Forestry Industry Council. Meet quarterly. Indiana Division of Forestry and IFIC are basically doing the SIC duties” | | | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|--|----|----|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 17.1.2 | Support for the development of educational materials for use with forest landowners (e.g. information packets, websites, newsletters, workshops, tours, etc.). | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| Notes | The private forestry program of Indiana Division of Forestry meets this requirement. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit- or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|--|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 17.1.3 | Support for the development of regional, state or provincial information materials that provide forest landowners with practical approaches for addressing special sites and biological diversity issues, such as invasive exotic plants and animals, specific wildlife habitat, Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value, and threatened and endangered species. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| Notes | The private forestry program of Indiana Division of Forestry meets this requirement. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit- or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|--|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 17.1.4 | Participation in efforts to support or promote conservation of managed forests through voluntary market-based incentive programs such as current-use taxation programs, Forest Legacy Program or conservation easements. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| Notes | Indiana Division of Forestry continues to acquire land, in part using forestry revenues. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit-or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|--|----------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 17.1.5 | Program Participants are knowledgeable about credible regional conservation planning and priority-setting efforts that include a broad range of stakeholders and have a program to take into account the results of these efforts in planning. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | Work done by the wildlife biologist (see Objective 4) meets this indicator. | | | | | | | | |

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

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

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 17.2.1 | Periodic educational opportunities promoting sustainable forestry, such as <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. field tours, seminars, websites, webinars or workshops; b. educational trips; c. self-guided forest management trails; d. publication of articles, educational pamphlets or newsletters; or e. support for state, provincial, and local forestry organizations and soil and water conservation districts. | | | | | | | | |
| Notes | Interviews with Indiana Division of Forestry foresters and administrators confirmed varied efforts to educate the public about state forest management practices and about forestry in general. Indiana Division of Forestry devotes considerable resources to informing the public regarding forestry, including by holding “open houses” at each state forest. These events were described by Indiana Division of Forestry staff, and some documentation examples were reviewed. For example during April, 2013 Owen-Putnam State Forest had an Open House organized around a tree identification event run by the Indiana District Forester (CFM/private lands responsibility). There were 72 people in attendance. Steve Siscoe & GSSF is on the Linton Chamber of Commerce. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit-or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|------|--|----------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 17.3 | Program Participants shall establish, at the state, provincial, or other appropriate levels, procedures to address concerns raised by loggers, consulting foresters, employees, <u>unions</u>, the public or other Program Participants regarding practices that appear inconsistent with the SFI Standard principles and objectives. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |

| | |
|--------------|--|
| <i>Notes</i> | 12, 13 SIC has only 1 member –DOF. Meetings done in conjunction with the Indiana Forestry Industry Council. Meet quarterly. DOF and IFIC are basically doing the SIC duties. |
|--------------|--|

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit-or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|---------------|--|----------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>17.3.1</i> | Support for SFI Implementation Committees (e.g. toll free numbers and other efforts) to address concerns about apparent nonconforming practices. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | Jack Seifert, Indiana Division of Forestry interacts the most with Indiana SFI Implementation Committee. Situation from 2012 is unchanged: “SIC has only 1 member –DOF. Meetings done in conjunction with the Indiana Forestry Industry Council. Meet quarterly. Indiana Division of Forestry and IFIC are basically doing the SIC duties” | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit-or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|---------------|--|----------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>17.3.2</i> | Process to receive and respond to public inquiries. SFI Implementation Committees shall submit data annually to SFI Inc. regarding concerns received and responses. | NB | 12 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | 12 Confirmed by interviews and review of documents from open houses and strategic plan update that there are robust processes in place and that input is considered in the development of plans and in making decisions. | | | | | | | | |

Objective 18. Public Land Management Responsibilities.

To promote and implement sustainable forest management on public lands.

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit -or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|--|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| <i>18.1</i> | Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall participate in the development of public land planning and management processes. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | Indiana Division of Forestry devotes considerable resources to involving and informing the public regarding planning and management decisions. Holding “open houses” or their equivalent at each state forest is the primary mechanism; these events were described by Indiana Division of Forestry staff, and some examples documentation was reviewed. For example during April, 2013 Owen-Putnam State Forest had an Open House organized around a tree identification event run by the Indiana District Forester (CFM/private lands responsibility). There were 72 people in attendance. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit -or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|---------------|---|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| <i>18.1.1</i> | Involvement in public land planning and management activities with appropriate governmental entities and the public. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | <p>13 DOF conducts open houses and/or outreach events at all of the state forests, often in conjunction with other activities. A review of the “Open House Comments – 2012” confirmed tracking method (summary).</p> <p>12 Each Management Guide is open for public review for 30 days.</p> <p>12 Strategic planning is open for public review including public stakeholder meetings.</p> | | | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|--|----|----|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 18.1.2 | Appropriate contact with local stakeholders over forest management issues through state, provincial, federal or independent collaboration. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | <p>13 DOF conducts open houses at various properties.</p> <p>MMSF 2013 Open House was conducted in their new training facility. Advertised in newspaper, on web-site, supplemented by direct mailing to neighbors. The DOF has a system to track comments, including a database and a written summary.</p> <p>12 DOF continually interacts with stakeholders relative to its overall strategic plan and the open comment period for Management Guides.</p> | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit -or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|--|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 18.2 | Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall confer with affected indigenous peoples. | NB | 12 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | Not reviewed during 2013 Surveillance Audit. | | | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|--|----|----|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 18.2.1 | <p>Program that includes communicating with affected indigenous peoples to enable Program Participants to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. understand and respect traditional forest-related knowledge; b. identify and protect spiritually, historically, or culturally important sites; and c. address the use of non-timber forest products of value to indigenous peoples in areas where Program Participants have management responsibilities on public lands. | NB | 12 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | <p>13 Not reviewed during 2013 Surveillance Audit.</p> <p>12 Protecting all know historic and prehistoric archeological sites.</p> <p>12 DOF has contacted both local and federal tribes known to have been active in IN . Several responses were received but no concerns were voiced.</p> | | | | | | | | |

Objective 19. Communications and Public Reporting.

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

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit -or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|---|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| <i>19.1</i> | A Certified Program Participant shall provide a summary audit report, prepared by the certification body, to SFI Inc. after the successful completion of a certification, recertification or surveillance audit to the SFI 2010-2014 Standard. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | See indicators below. | | | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|--|----|----|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 9.1.1 | <p>The summary audit report submitted by the <i>Program Participant</i> (one copy must be in English), shall include, at a minimum,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. a description of the audit process, <i>objectives</i> and scope; b. a description of substitute <i>indicators</i>, if any, used in the audit and a rationale for each; c. the name of <i>Program Participant</i> that was audited, including its SFI representative; d. a general description of the <i>Program Participant's</i> forestland and manufacturing operations included in the audit; e. the name of the <i>certification body</i> and <i>lead auditor</i> (names of the <i>audit team</i> members, including <i>technical experts</i> may be included at the discretion of the <i>audit team</i> and <i>Program Participant</i>); f. the dates the certification was conducted and completed; g. a summary of the findings, including general descriptions of evidence of conformity and any nonconformities and corrective action plans to address them, opportunities for improvement, and exceptional practices; and h. the certification decision. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| Notes | <p>13 Confirmed by review of the SFI Inc. website that the 2012 recertification audit public summary report is present.</p> <p>12 Confirmed by review of the SFI Inc. website that the 2011 recertification audit public summary report is present.</p> | | | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|---|----|----|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 19.2 | Program Participants shall report annually to SFI Inc. on their conformance with the SFI 2010-2014 Standard. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | See indicators below. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit -or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|---------------|---|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| <i>19.2.1</i> | Prompt response to the SFI annual progress report. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | 13 Confirmed by review of report and of the SFI Inc. email receipt that it was completed correctly and submitted on time. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit -or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|---------------|---|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| <i>19.2.2</i> | Recordkeeping for all the categories of information needed for SFI annual progress reports. | NB | 12 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | 12 Review of the report and interviews with personnel about how the data was derived indicates recordkeeping is adequate. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit -or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|---------------|---|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| <i>19.2.3</i> | Maintenance of copies of past reports to document progress and improvements to demonstrate conformance to the SFI 2010-2014 Standard. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | 13 Indiana Division of Forestry has a copy of the 2012 report. 12 Reviewed past copies on file. | | | | | | | | |

Objective 20. Management Review and Continual Improvement.

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

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit -or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|---|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 20.1 | Program Participants shall establish a management review system to examine findings and progress in implementing the SFI Standard, to make appropriate improvements in programs, and to inform their employees of changes. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| Notes | See indicators below. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit -or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|---------------|--|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 20.1.1 | System to review commitments, programs and procedures to evaluate effectiveness. Note: For multi-site programs the auditing requirements of Section 9 or the ISO MD-1 requirements must be followed (see Multi-site Checklist); at a minimum internal audits or monitoring that spans all sites and addresses the relevant part of the SFI Standard is expected. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| Notes | System includes an annual management review which covers the SFI Program. It also includes an annual internal audit. This year, it included the Owen Putnam and the Greene-Sullivan state forests and the central office issues such as upcoming updates to the state forest procedures manual and the template for the resource management guides, improvements to public comment, financial issues, HCP, invasive species. | | | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|--|----|----|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 20.1.2 | System for collecting, reviewing, and reporting information to management regarding progress in achieving SFI 2010-2014 Standard objectives and performance measures. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| Notes | Central office personnel review and approve projects, ensuring consistency and that senior management understands progress. For example John Friedrich, Property Specialist reviews all proposed timber sales for completeness of paperwork and overall compliance and maintains overall timber harvest records. Dan Ernst oversees the contracting of other services. The system includes recordkeeping, reviewing and reporting information to the SFI Team. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement | Audit -or | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|---|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 20.1.3 | Annual review of progress by management and determination of changes and improvements necessary to continually improve conformance to the SFI 2010-2014 Standard. | MF | 13 | | | | | | |
| Notes | <p>State Forest Management Review Attendees: John Seifert, State Forester; Dan Ernst, Assistant State Forester (via conference call); Alicia Ariens, Preservation Officer; John Friedrich, Property Specialist; Brenda Huter, Forest Stewardship Coordinator</p> <p>Confirmed by a review of minutes that an annual review occurred September 30, 2013 and was attended by upper management. The review included a review of the SFI Objectives, internal audit results, identifying and summarizing SFI accomplishments and needed improvements and included 2 action items, 2 were carryovers from last year.</p> <p>The process for tracking progress in meeting gaps identified during internal audits is quite informal.</p> | | | | | | | | |

2013 Audit Field Notes and Interviewees

October 7, 2013, Morgan-Monroe State Forest

Brenda Huter, Forest Certification Coordinator, Indiana Division of Forestry

John Seifert, State Forester, Indiana Division of Forestry

Dan Ernst, Assistant State Forester, Indiana Division of Forestry

John Friedrich, Property Specialist, Indiana Division of Forestry

Scott Haulton, Forestry Wildlife Specialist, Indiana Division of Forestry

AJ Ariens, Forestry Archaeologist, Indiana Division of Forestry

Jim Allen, Property Manager, Morgan-Monroe State Forest, Indiana Division of Forestry

Dave Vadas, Morgan-Monroe State Forest, Indiana Division of Forestry

Phil Jones, Morgan-Monroe State Forest

Joshua Kush, Morgan-Monroe State Forest

Stop 1: Completed Timber Sale in Tract 15-10 (Back Country Area).

111-acre single tree selection harvest in south unit of Back Country Area (BCA). Harvest completed in winter 2012-13. Visited the two log landings of the sale and walked approximately 1 mile of trails. Confirmed that no regeneration openings were created in harvest area. Based on inventory and harvest records approximately 18% of the available volume was removed. Confirmed that there was no harvest within the Low Gap Nature Preserve. No new roads were created and BMP's were properly implemented with the exception of the main skid trail that was still being worked by the power company. Plans were in place to put in water bars and other close out measures once the power company completed its work. Japanese stiltgrass was abundant on the NW portion of the sale (see Observation 2013.1).

Stop 2: Single Tree Selection. Tract 09-1.

Stand marked but not yet cut. 130 acre single tree selection sale in northwest portion of Back Country Area (BCA). Sale marked but not yet cut. South portion of tract is hiking trail/road access. Confirmed no new roads and no openings per BCA policy. Some of the large diameter trees that were originally marked to cut were marked to retain because of bat habitat guidelines. Reviewed yard log area and portion of marked sale. Sale is marked to remove approximately 18% of available volume.

Stop 3: Morgan Monroe Training Center

Rehab of old building to provide training center with overnight dorms. Construction was done in cooperation with Department of Corrections workers.

Stop 4: Compartment 19 Duckworth Rd.

13-acre planting (1000 trees per acre with excellent survival) of variety of oak species within an old agricultural field. All local seed sources obtained from state nursery. Herbicide treatment (Oust) prior to planting.

Stop 5: Tract 19-1, and 19-2

198-acre improvement cut. Approximately 23% of volume removed. Combined tract sale in north portion of Ravinia Woods Unit. TSI project planned. Considerable tree damage along main skid trail. Also some damage on secondary skid trails and within the stand (Observation 2013.2).

October 8, 2013, Owen-Putnam State Forest

John Seifert, State Forester, Indiana Division of Forestry
Dan Ernst, Assistant State Forester, Indiana Division of Forestry
John Friedrich, Property Specialist, Indiana Division of Forestry
Scott Haulton, Forestry Wildlife Specialist, Indiana Division of Forestry
Brenda Huter, Forest Certification Coordinator, Indiana Division of Forestry
Bill Gallogly, Property Manager, Owen-Putnam State Forest, Indiana Division of Forestry
Rob Duncan, Forest Resource Specialist, Owen-Putnam State Forest
Ruthie Speas, Office Manager, Owen-Putnam State Forest
Thor Coons, Skidder Operator
Rock Neely, Logging Company Owner/Supervisor

Site #1: Completed Selection Harvest

Site #2: Maintenance Garage

Site #3: Active Harvest, interviews

Site #4: Compartment 7, Tract 4 – partially completed 91-acre improvement harvest and thinning with some selection of mature trees. Sale was halted by Indiana Division of Forestry due to wet conditions and some rutting; sale was halted before significant rutting occurred.

Site #5: Compartment 4, Tract 2 – Completed 91-acre improvement harvest and thinning.

Site #6: Owen-Putnam State Forest Rattlesnake Campground – 11 sites with picnic tables, grills, pit toilets; self-service; well maintained.

Site #7: Pleasant Grove Cemetery Trail (Orange)

Site #8: Circumneutral Seep: RSA / Special Site; protected from harvest.

October 9, 2013, Greene-Sullivan State Forest

John Seifert, State Forester, Indiana Division of Forestry
Dan Ernst, Assistant State Forester, Indiana Division of Forestry
John Friedrich, Property Specialist, Indiana Division of Forestry
Scott Haulton, Forestry Wildlife Specialist, Indiana Division of Forestry
AJ Ariens, Forestry Archaeologist, Indiana Division of Forestry
Brenda Huter, Forest Certification Coordinator, Indiana Division of Forestry
Tom Tompkins, Forest Resource Specialist, Greene-Sullivan State Forest
Phil Jones, Morgan-Monroe State Forest

Site #1: C10T6, 2011 Phragmites Control, adjacent to Bass Lake
Reviewed documentation for Phragmites control carried out by Youth Hoosier Conservation Corp (YHCC).

Glyphosate, 2.75 gallons applied using 5% Rodeo, 0.5% Invade.

Site #2: Japanese Knotweed Control, C2T2

June 2013 control of Japanese knotweed on 2 acre site. Used Garlon 3A (triclopyr) 1.2 gallons, foliar spray, applied garlon at 5% concentration. Chemical and rate determined by forester after trials and researching the most effective rate for killing this aggressive weed. Killed most of it, but some plants still alive in the middle of patch. Plan to treat again in 2014.

Site #3: Compartment 4, Tract 3

Completed 28-acre salvage harvest and recent reclamation project drive by need to re-grade former strip mine to eliminate hazardous highwall along roadside cliff. Resulting area has two ponds, roads, dense grass, and portions may be planted. Approximately 173,000 bf of timber were removed. Two small lakes were reclaimed and stocked with fish. Indiana Division of Forestry is still determining how much of the area to replant to forest.

Site #4: Compartment 4, Tract 3

TSI / invasive plant control. This 60- to 70-year old planted stand of pine, cottonwood, tulip, sycamore, locust, cherry, and walnut was planted with trees and invasive shrubs and vines. This reclaimed site has very challenging terrain (the mining spoils were shaped into short and very steep corrugated mini-ridges). To control invasives they first put in skid roads and then sprayed pesticide from vehicle using power spray unit.

Site #5: Compartment 5, Tract 10

Recently completed 100-acre timber harvest in mixed stand of oak-hickory with white pine and southern pine pockets (Timber sale number 6331301). Also TSI. Confirmed implementation of BMPs and documentation of the Indiana Division of Forestry's timber sale administrative processes. Conservative marking with prescription leaving a lot of quality timber. Good BMP's and low residual stand damage. Stand marked for follow-up TSI work but uncertain if it will be done. Log yard to be converted to day use area for horse trail.

Site #6: Dead End Road, Compartment 5, Tract 9

Well-constructed and maintained, meeting BMPs.

Site #7: Compartment 5, Tract 9

Recently completed (another section of sale described for Site #5) with 3 clearcut patches. Reviewed a 1.6 acre patch where logger left many scattered pole trees. Foresters discussed possibility of using TSI program to complete the opening, focusing on the portions where are mostly open.

Site #8: Horse Camp

Nice facility often used for "day riding" although not intended for that purpose. Facilities include a paved loop road, new outhouses, pull-through camp sites, tables, fire pits and horse hitching structures.

Site #9: Narrow Lake Campground

Several new cabins; discussed challenges in getting approval and the need to generate revenue while meeting citizen demand for more developed facilities (cabins as alternative to tenting/camping).

Appendix IV



Form for Reporting Certification in North America
(not included – no change)