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

Indiana Department of Natural Resources,

Division of Forestry, Classified Forest & Wildlands Program

Indiana, USA

SCS-FM/COC-00123N
402 West Washington Street, Room W296
Indianapolis, Indiana, 46204
Brenda Huter, BHuter@dnr.IN.gov
http://www.in.gov/dnr/forestry/4801.htm

CERTIFIED	EXPIRATION
15 March 2015	14 March 2020

DATE OF FIELD AUDIT
13-16 November 2017
DATE OF LAST UPDATE
9 January 2018

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

SCSglobal SERVICES
Setting the standard for sustainability™

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

Foreword

Cycle in annual surveillance audits				
☐ 1st annual audit	☐ 2nd annual audit	☒ 3rd annual audit	☐ 4th annual audit	☐ Other (*expansion of scope, Major CAR audit, special audit, etc.*):
Name of Forest Management Enterprise (FME) and abbreviation used in this report:				
Indiana Department of Natural Resources (DNR), Division of Forestry (DOF); FME; Indiana Classified Forests and Wildlands Certified Group (ICFCG).				

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

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

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

Organization of the Report

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

Table of Contents

Commented [EIJ1]: Update at finalization

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY

1. General Information

1.1 Annual Audit Team

Auditor Name:	Beth Jacqmain	**Auditor role**:	Lead Auditor
Qualifications:	Beth Jacqmain is a Certification Forester with SCS Global Services. Jacqmain has MS Forest Biology from Auburn University and a BS Forest Management from Michigan State University. Jacqmain is Society of American Foresters (SAF) Certified Forester #1467, with 20+ years' experience in the forestry field including private corporate, private consulting, and public land management. Jacqmain is a qualified ANSI RAB accredited ISO 14001 EMS Lead Auditor and is a SCS qualified FSC Lead Auditor for Forest Management/Chain of Custody. Jacqmain has audited and led FSC certification and precertification evaluations, harvest and logging operations evaluations, and has participated in joint SFI and American Tree Farm certifications. Jacqmain is a 9 year member of the Forest Guild and 20 year adjunct-Faculty with Itasca Community College, Natural Resources Department. Jacqmain's experience is in forest management and ecology; the use of silviculture towards meeting strategic and tactical goals; forest timber quality improvement, conifer thinning operations, pine restoration, and fire ecology in conifer dominated systems.		

1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation

A. Number of days spent on-site assessing the applicant:	4
B. Number of auditors participating in on-site evaluation:	1
C. Additional days spent on preparation, stakeholder consultation, and post-site follow-up:	1
D. Total number of person days used in evaluation:	**5**

1.3 Standards Employed

1.3.1. Applicable FSC-Accredited Standards

Title	Version	Date of Finalization
FSC US Forest Management Standard, V1-0, Family Forest Indicators (FM)	V1-0	2010
FSC Standard for Group Entities, FSC-STD-30-005	V1-9	2009
FSC Trademark Standard, FSC-STD-50-001	V1-2	2010
All standards employed are available on the websites of FSC International (www.fsc.org), the FSC-US (www.fscus.org) or the SCS Standards page (www.scsglobalservices.com/certification-standards-and-program-documents). Standards are also available, upon request, from SCS Global Services (www.SCSglobalServices.com).		

1.3.2. SCS Interim FSC Standards

Title	Version	Date of Finalization
SCS COC indicators for FMEs	V6-0	

This SCS Interim Standard was developed by modifying SCS' Generic Interim Standard to reflect forest management in the region and by incorporating relevant components of the Draft Regional / National Standard and comments from stakeholders. More than one month prior to the start of the field evaluation, the SCS Draft Interim Standard for the country / region was sent out for comment to stakeholders identified by FSC International, SCS, the forest managers under evaluation, and the National Initiative. A copy of the standard is available at www.scsglobalservices.com/certification-standards-and-program-documents or upon request from SCS Global Services (www.SCSglobalServices.com).

2 Annual Audit Dates and Activities

2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities

Date: 13 November, Monday	
FMU/Location/ sites visited	**Activities/ notes**
District 15 Office	Opening Meeting: Introductions, client update, review audit scope, audit plan, intro/update to FSC and SCS standards and protocols, review of open CARs/OBS, final site selection or adjustments. Reviewed documents including training records confirming up to date.
Ferris Property: 89-0034 (existing)	1. New management activity – trail maintenance. Group member and son on-site for interview. Inspected trail running adjacent to West Fork of the White Water River. Landowner/group member described buffer requirements for harvest done over 10 years prior. 2. Invasives treatment done for honeysuckle in 2012 over 10 acres. Cut and spray of invasive done under cost-share program. 3. Planted warm season grasses on 33 acre 2 seasons prior and plan to burn within next few years. 4. Planting area of 1,800 seedlings planting 2007 of burr oak, Shumard oak, and walnut planted following TSI girdling of mid-story stems done in 2006. 5. Historic - Old Canal system diversion channels and locks.
Wilson Trust: 89-0092 (existing)	Salvage and walnut harvest in 30 acres of mixed hardwoods. District forester noted failure to notify DNR of cutting 3 days prior as required by procedures. Interviewed harvest operator on-site, no equipment. Discussed Timber Buyers qualifications requirements. Reviewed procedures for opening sales, document availability, safety information and training, fuel and maintenance practices. Documents reviewed: State Form 53174 (1-07), Timber Sale Visitation and Evaluation Record; Classified Forest and Wildlife Reinspection report.
Campbell Property: 89-177 (existing)	Examined area in 2nd year of treatment for bush honeysuckle on 7.7 acres. Cut stump and foliar treatment of glyphosate, some basal bark treatments. Growing season application, done after other hardwood species lost leaves and dormant to minimize damage to non-target species. Detailed 10 year prescription plan done as part of Soil and Water Conservation District document called "Practice Plan – Invasive Plant Species Control and Follow Up". Under plan treatment to be repeated every year for 3 years followed by 7 years additional monitoring with treatment as needed. FMP examined, done in 2013.
Eastern Whitewater	Examined tree planting done under new FMP completed in June 2017. Reforestation on old field 87 acres. Planted mixed hardwoods including 4 oak species, black walnut, Tulip poplar, shagbark hickory, and black cherry. Species

Valley Land Trust, Inc. (new)	mix as determined to meet conditions for federal "Bat mix" under the SAFE program, State Acres for Wildlife Enhancements, a CRP cost-share program, CP-38-C to provide habitat for Indiana Bat. CRP is for tree establishment with weed control for 15 years. Document: Forest Stand Report done 5/15/17. To meet qualifications for CRP tree establishment the District Forester developed a Tree Planting Plan developed Sep 2016 for the 87 acres.
Date: 14 November, Tuesday:	
District 3	
Sorg: 02-0127	Planting on 11 acres done in 2013. Part of federal cost-share program, CP-38-C. In this case required 30% red and white oak, 10% shagbark hickory, with 8 species minimum. Species mix dependent on soil composition. Seedlings from state Vallonia Nursery. CRP program required planting plan done by forestry consultant and included care/tending through 2015 including weed/thistle control. Plan checked. Discussion: BMP, enforcement actions.
Hoffman Trust: 02-0030	Thinning completed in central mixed hardwood, objective to produce high quality, veneer and dimensional lumber trees on 35 acres. Sale closed out BMPs inspected. Sale marked by logger 2016, pre-harvest meeting with District Forester with inspection of trees marked. Harvested December 2016 into 2017. Management activity in 2017 brush piled for wildlife. EAB already through area. Adjacent sale (02-0054) BMPs reviewed and inspection documents reviewed. Minor issued identified (skid trail damage noted but not in violation of BMPs). Discussions: Insect and disease, landowner extension handouts; EAB; snag safety.
District 12	
Wass Trust: 01-0124	Entry for thinning/crop tree release on 14.5 acres, harvest completed few weeks ago, 2017. Stand marked for ~~\~~sustainability and future tree growth/high quality sawlogs. Ash had been removed via firewood cutting by landowner in previous entries. Re-entry cycle about 12-15 years. Thinning opened some areas of mid-story trees. Regeneration and abundant coarse woody debris. Discussion: Every 5-7 years in program a re-inspection is done.
Thompson: 90-0034	Harvest done Jan-Feb 2016 on 15 acres. Salvage harvest in mixed hardwood following 80 years of no management. Thinned removing over-mature, damaged, dying or low quality. Marked by consulting forester. Snags, abundant woody debris.
Harmon: 90-0083 (new)	Mixed hardwood stand, about 15 acres. Walked property with landowner (interview). Newly enrolled property in program. No management activity since enrollment but had prior thinning in 2013. Abundant natural regeneration, snags, and wildlife cavity trees observed.
Date: 15 November, Wednesday	
District 14	
Long: 07-0030	Planted area, 30 acres of old ag field. Established 1999 with bottomland mix of species for floodplain site. Swamp chestnut, swamp white, cherry bark, and other wetland oak species. Forest sprayed in 1998 prior to planting. Owner/group member has periodically conducted TSI girdling and felling of undesired species throughout the last 17 years. FMP was out of date however, confirmed it is in process of revision and updating now.
Long: 07-0165	Planted 2014 with bottomland hardwood mix following harvest in 2015 of all silver maple.

Godinet: 07-0057	Management activities included harvest, invasives treatment, and TSI. Extensive trails on property, FMP DF made recommendations for seedling on trails. Harvest in 2013 with failure to provide prior notification. No CAR in file nor was a CAR issued by the forester.
Wallow Hollow (TNC)	About 130 acres managed by The Nature Conservancy and subject to a Legacy Program conservation easement. Purchased from private landowner. Management activities included understory thinnings, TSI, deer enclosures and invasives treatments.
Woodhouse: 07-0196	Recent trail and brush piling for wildlife. Road improvements, individual tree salvage harvests, cut vines (hand, no chemicals), culvert installations under guidance by consulting foresters. Owner/landowner has attended classes and extension courses around land management. Homestead sites with old cisterns, protected from logging and flagged for safety.
Woodhouse: 07-0195	Invasives control along trails, all done by hand (no chemicals). Recent trail and brush piling for wildlife.
Woodhouse: 07-0197	Larger patch of salvage from wind blowdown event. Invasives control along trails, all done by hand (no chemicals). Recent trail and brush piling for wildlife.
Date: 16 November, Thursday	
DNR Office, Indianapolis	Document reviews/staff interviews, as needed.
DNR Office, Indianapolis	Closing Meeting and Review of Findings: Convene with all relevant staff to summarize audit findings, potential non-conformities and next steps

2.2 Evaluation of Management Systems

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

3. Changes in Management Practices

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

☒ Significant changes occurred since the last evaluation that may affect the FME's conformance to FSC standards and policies (*describe*):

The Classified Forests certification program now requires at least one person on-site during harvests that has logger qualification trainings which include BMP and another required, core class.

4. Results of the Evaluation

4.1 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations

	Finding Number: 2016.1
Select one: ☐ **Major CAR** ☐ **Minor CAR** ☒ **Observation**	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	☐ Pre-condition to certification ☐ 3 months from Issuance of Final Report ☐ Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) ☒ Other deadline (specify): *none, non-binding*
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US Forest Management Standard 6.3.h
Issue: Although several examples of aggressive control efforts were observed during the audit, some sites inspected had abundant presence of invasives. Invasive non-native plant species, such as honeysuckle, autumn olive and buckthorn, to name a few, are commonly present and generally expanding in their presence throughout Indiana forest systems. While the task of limiting the spread of these and other species identified in the Classified Forests and Wildlife certified group is challenging, there remain opportunities for DoF field personnel and managers to continue placing emphasis on and effort at monitoring and limiting the ongoing spread of invasive non-native plant species across the certified group properties.	
Observation: DNR should continue to ensure implementation of management practices that minimize the risk of invasive establishment, growth, and spread; eradication or control of established invasive populations when feasible.	
FME response *(including any evidence submitted)*	Stewardship Plans. Training. Field Inspections.
SCS review	SCS reviewed property forest management plans and implementation during the 2017 audit. Every property visited had forest management plans which were examined and confirmed to provide specific assessment and treatment recommendations to implement to minimize invasive establishment, growth, and spread as well as established invasive species when feasible. The following sites were inspected and had active management activities prescribed for reducing or otherwise managing invasive non-native plant species including: 89-0034, 89-0177, 90-0083.
Status of CAR:	☒ Closed ☐ Upgraded to Major ☐ *Other decision (refer to description above)*

	Finding Number: 2016.2
Select one: ☐ **Major CAR** ☐ **Minor CAR** ☒ **Observation**	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	☐ Pre-condition to certification ☐ 3 months from Issuance of Final Report ☒ Next audit (within 12 months of report finalization) ☐ Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US Forest Management Standard 6.6.a
Non-Conformity *(or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations)*: A banned chemical, flumioxazin, was used by a group member to control invasives during the last year. The certificate holder, DNR, is confirming details of use on certified land because there were several cases of group member (private landowner) reported use that had actually occurred on the residential portions of their property that *are not under the scope of the certificate*. If non-conformance is confirmed, the DNR provides information and education to the landowner and informs of the need to discontinue use either by interview or by issue a non-conformance notice (letter), per current procedures that will "withdraw for cause" those members who repeat non-conformances. Examples of routine and standard issuance of these non-conformances and examples were provided of members either voluntarily withdrawing or released ("withdraw for cause") from the program. It was confirmed during the audit that these procedures are being followed, including newly established procedures for issuing non-conformance educational letters. The DNR should confirm that new procedures for ensuring compliance are completed and confirm that the certificate remains in conformance with this Indicator.	
Corrective Action Request *(or Observation)*: The DNR should continue practices and procedures that ensure no products on the FSC list of Highly Hazardous Pesticides are used.	
FME response *(including any evidence submitted)*	DNR followed up with the landowner/member after receiving report of highly hazardous chemical. The landowner was informed of chemical use requirements and agreed to discontinue use. The landowner will now use mechanical means to treat their lands.
SCS review	The DNR used existing procedures and systems for this issue to ensure conformance of the group member to FSC requirements that no products on the FSC list of Highly Hazardous Pesticides are used. Observation is closed, 11/17/2016.
Status of CAR:	☒ Closed ☐ Upgraded to Major ☐ *Other decision (refer to description above)*

	Finding Number: 2016.3
Select one: ☐ **Major CAR** ☒ **Minor CAR** ☐ **Observation**	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	☐ Pre-condition to certification ☐ 3 months from Issuance of Final Report ☒ Next audit (within 12 months of report finalization) ☐ Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US Forest Management Standard 9.1.c
Non-Conformity *(or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations)*: One site inspected had an herbicide spray used for invasives with a HCVF site nearby, and although not impacting the attributes defining the HCVF, management strategies and protective measures specific to the defining attributes were unknown by the forestry consultant conducting the management activities. At a second site, an invasive species was present within the HVF that likely poses a risk to designated HCV attributes and there were no management strategies clearly identified relative to those defined HCVF attributes. Protection measures as presented by DNR are usually written in broad terms, making it difficult for field foresters to identify specific management strategies that would be taken due to the HCVF presence, as opposed to standard protection measures (as an example, rare species protection). Existing HCVF management planning documents are currently undergoing proposals and revision, which provides an opportunity to address these concerns. The management plan and relevant operational plans must describe the measures necessary to ensure the maintenance and/or enhancement of all high conservation values present in all identified HCVF areas, including the precautions required to avoid risks or impacts to such values. The DNR's identification of management strategies and protection measures related to high conservation values must be described and summarized.	
Corrective Action Request *(or Observation)*: A summary of the assessment results and management strategies must be included in the management plan summary that is made available to the public.	
FME response *(including any evidence submitted)*	IDNR submitted the document, *ICFCG HCVF Assessment and Mgmt summary.docx.* Procedures instituted.

SCS review	SCS reviewed the Management summary document confirming that management plans and approaches are now described and summarized. Interview with Certification Coordinator and Forest Stewardship Coordinator confirmed a process has been developed for making HCV management plans more readily available to District Foresters. The Nature Preserve is responsible for identifying or reviewing proposed areas to be designated as state Nature Preserves (HCVFs). The Regional Ecologists with NP annually monitor those HCVFs. Nature Preserves also develops Master Plans with input by owners. When HCVFs are not Nature Preserves, the Stewardship Plan includes HCVF management descriptions. The Certification Coordinator is in process of gathering copies of NP Master Plans, Ownership Plans, for example those done by The Nature Conservancy, and Stewardship Plans so they are more readily available to District Foresters. All plans must be consistent with Nature Preserve Master Plans when they apply.
Status of CAR:	☒ Closed ☐ Upgraded to Major ☐ *Other decision (refer to description above)*

	Finding Number: 2016.4
Select one: ☐ **Major CAR** ☐ **Minor CAR** ☒ **Observation**	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	☐ Pre-condition to certification ☐ 3 months from Issuance of Final Report ☒ Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) ☐ Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC Standard for Group Entities, 3.1.v
Non-Conformity *(or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations)*: 2015: Training in respect to this is planned but not completed. During field interviews, one district forester pointed out that internal CARs can be entered in the tract record but not in the landowner record, making it difficult for foresters in other counties to learn if a landowner has been previously issued a CAR elsewhere for a nonconformity. DNR is considering changes in the landowner database to allow CAR tracking across properties. 2016 update: DNR provided relevant training and all foresters interviewed during the course of the audit confirmed knowledge of the process. Inspections of forester maintained records confirmed that District Foresters are applying and following through on these procedures recording information for tracts inspected within their Districts. However, internal analysis of the tracking system identified a need to record nonconformities (CARs) across Districts but this change has not been completed.	
Corrective Action Request *(or Observation)*: DNR should complete system database changes to track internal CARs across Districts and begin implementation.	
FME response *(including any evidence submitted)*	Database changes were completed and training for entering CARs has begun.

SCS review	SCS reviewed and confirmed changes were completed and database tracking for internal CARs by tract and landowner is functional.
Status of CAR:	☒ Closed ☐ Upgraded to Major ☐ *Other decision (refer to description above), see new OBS 2016.*

	Finding Number: 2016.5
Select one: ☐ **Major CAR** ☐ **Minor CAR** ☒ **Observation**	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	☐ Pre-condition to certification ☐ 3 months from Issuance of Final Report ☐ Next audit (within 12 months of report finalization) ☒ Other deadline (specify): *None, non-binding*
FSC Indicator:	FSC Standard for Group Entities, 5.1.ii
Non-Conformity *(or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations)*: The DNR demonstrates clear and notable commitment to providing training for staff and group certificate members. A new training tab was created to record training in the central database, INFRMS, under training for landowners and staff. However, not all staff records were up to date. Of those checked during the 2016 audit, 2/3rd had training records not updated since 2013. Interviewed foresters have maintained individual records training, or were able to describe training opportunities, but they were not up to date in the official database. The DNR should update training records per administrative procedures developed for updating training records in the central database, INFRMS.	
Corrective Action Request *(or Observation)*: This group management must maintain complete and up-to-date records of training provided to staff or Group members.	
FME response *(including any evidence submitted)*	Training records were provided in database. Changes were made to performance evaluations procedures in 2017 that now includes 20 hours of training for District Foresters.
SCS review	Training records were reviewed for several District Foresters during the audit confirming training records were up to date. Topics for trainings included NCS Young Forest Initiative, CFM Section meeting, Indiana SAF fall meeting, SAF winter meeting, Division meetings, Tree Farm Inspector training, forest pathogens training, Hardy Lake Field Day for Adult Landowners (DNR staff hosted training collaborative with SWCD), and Historic forest training (Hoosier Hills).
Status of CAR:	☒ Closed ☐ Upgraded to Major ☐ *Other decision (refer to description above)*

	Finding Number: 2016.6
Select one: ☐ **Major CAR** ☐ **Minor CAR** ☒ **Observation**	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	☐ Pre-condition to certification ☐ 3 months from Issuance of Final Report ☐ Next audit (within 12 months of report finalization) ☒ Other deadline (specify): *None, non-binding*
FSC Indicator:	FSC Standard for Group Entities, 5.1.vi
Non-Conformity *(or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations)*: The DNR instituted new procedures to record issuing educational notices of non-conformances in response to a Major CAR issued in 2015. During the 2016 audit, there were multiple examples of correct implementation and all interviews with staff consistently confirmed knowledge and awareness of new procedures. However, during the audit there was a member non-conformance discovered during an inspection that resulted in a notice being sent, but its issuance was not entered into the official database records. The DNR should consistently record non-conformance notice letters in INFRMS as "actions taken to correct non-compliances" in accordance with newly established procedures.	
Corrective Action Request *(or Observation)*: Records should continue to demonstrate the implementation of any internal control or monitoring systems including records of internal inspections, non-compliances identified in such inspections, actions taken to correct any such non-compliance.	
FME response *(including any evidence submitted)*	Updated database with field for CARs when such CARs are issued.
SCS review	SCS examined withdrawal records confirming that CARs are being issued and enforcement completed. SCS reviewed folders of sites visited in the field. There were examples of educational CARs issued and confirmed those issued CARs were in the database. However, this procedure and database are still new and this Observation will remain open to confirm full implementation at next audit.
Status of CAR:	☐ Closed ☐ Upgraded to Major ☒ *Other decision (refer to description above)*

4.2 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations

	Finding Number: 2017.1
Select one: ☐ **Major CAR** ☐ **Minor CAR** ☒ **Observation**	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	☐ Pre-condition to certification/recertification ☐ 3 months from Issuance of Final Report ☐ 12 months or next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) ☒ Observation – response is optional ☐ Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	5.1.a
Background/Justification: With the planned retirements in late 2017 and 2018, DoF has is an anticipated 25% vacancy rate in District Foresters (DF). Additional changes include assigning several districts to various forestry staff to cover vacancies. The DNR has been filling some open vacancies, for example three new District Foresters were hired in 2017. However, the DNR has not provided evidence that a systematic management review of program service demands relative to District Forester capacity has been done, nor that such review is planned. Although the DNR is currently in conformance with the standard and able to meet this indicator, the issue of how investment/reinvestment in forester capacity to implement core management activities could be non-conformant in future years if capacity does not meet demand.	
Corrective Action Request *(or Observation)*: The manager demonstrates capability to implement core management activities, including all those environmental, social and operating costs, required to meet this Standard, and investment and reinvestment in forest management.	
FME response *(including any evidence submitted)*	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	☐ Closed ☐ Upgraded to Major ☐ *Other decision (refer to description above)*

	Finding Number: 2017.2
Select one: ☐ **Major CAR** ☐ **Minor CAR** ☒ **Observation**	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	☐ Pre-condition to certification/recertification ☐ 3 months from Issuance of Final Report ☐ 12 months or next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) ☒ Observation – response is optional ☐ Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	7.3.a

Background/Justification: The DNR ensures frequent training opportunities are available for forestry staff and such training was confirmed via inspections of the training database, interviews with staff, and implementation of activities designed to meet forest management plans. However, DNR has a number of new staff or and outdated topic trainings including the following: 1) Rutting guidelines – A few foresters when interviewed in the field were uncertain of the conditions which qualify as rutting. 2) Old growth - The last training for District Foresters around recognizing old growth was in 2013. 3) The new CARs system for District Forester's initial training has been held. Implementation is underway and full implementation should be completed.	
Observation: The DNR should continue to ensure workers are qualified to properly implement the management plan; All forest workers are provided with sufficient guidance and supervision to adequately implement their respective components of the plan.	
FME response *(including any evidence submitted)*	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	☐ Closed ☐ Upgraded to Major ☐ *Other decision (refer to description above)*

	Finding Number: 2017.3
Select one: ☐ **Major CAR** ☐ **Minor CAR** ☒ **Observation**	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	☐ Pre-condition to certification/recertification ☐ 3 months from Issuance of Final Report ☐ 12 months or next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) ☒ Observation – response is optional ☐ Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	7.4.a
Background/Justification: The UMP plan was updated 2016 but the updated version is not yet updated online.	
Observation: While respecting landowner confidentiality, the management plan or a management plan summary that outlines the elements of the plan described in Criterion 7.1 is available to the public either at no charge or a nominal fee.	
FME response *(including any evidence submitted)*	The DNR posted the updated plan 21 November 2017 and notified SCS by email.
SCS review	It was confirmed the audit plan was updated and publicly posted to the DNR website here, http://www.in.gov/dnr/forestry/files/fo-ICFCG_Umbrella_plan.pdf. With the updated plan now publicly available this CAR is closed. Beth Jacqmain, 21 November 2017.

Status of CAR:	☒ Closed ☐ Upgraded to Major ☐ *Other decision (refer to description above)*

5. Stakeholder Comments

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

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

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

5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted

Academic
Contractors

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

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

SCS received anonymous stakeholder input during the audit which is treated as general stakeholder input in the table below.

☐ *FME has not received any stakeholder comments from interested parties as a result of stakeholder outreach activities during this annual audit.*	
Stakeholder comments	**SCS Response**
Economic concerns	

Social concerns	
Why are private lands certified? What possible benefit is gained to justify the costs?	Indiana has some of the most valuable agricultural land in the USA. Without the tax incentive, many private landowners would convert forests to agricultural and other "higher and better" uses. Since there are no payments to private landowners for ecosystem services such as watershed protection, wildlife habitat, carbon sequestration, biodiversity, etc., the tax incentive program helps private landowners maintain forest cover and habitat types that provide such ecosystem services. The taxpayer receives benefits in the form of reduced drinking water treatment costs, improved habitat for game species, and, most importantly, the regular flow of timber which supports a large primary and secondary processing industry. Thus the tax investment is recovered in ecosystem services, value-added industry, and jobs. It is important to note that there are a variety of reasons to become FSC certified. The Indiana DNR describes the overall goal of certifications is that it, "ensures wood products from State Forests are grown in a sustainable and well-managed manner. The ability to offer "green-certified" wood products is becoming increasingly important, especially to overseas markets." (http://www.in.gov/dnr/forestry/7532.htm). The area of lands that are FSC certified globally and in the United States are described below. International FSC Certification Statistics as of December 2017, https://ic.fsc.org/file-download.facts-figures-december-2017.a-3083.pdf: • Total certified area (land) globally is 78,982,763 acres (195,170,660 ha) • Number of countries with active certificates is 84 • Total number of certificates is 1,526 • Total Chain of Custody certificates (wood/fiber purchasers or supply chain) occur in 121 countries for a total of 33,550 Chain of Custody certificates. US FSC Certification Statistics as of June 2017, https://us.fsc.org/en-us/what-we-do/facts-figures: • 35,552,573 acres certified in the US • 168,621,038 acres certified in the US and Canada • 4,083 companies Chain-of-Custody certified in the US • 4,939 companies Chain-of-Custody certified in the US and Canada
Environmental concerns	

6. Certification Decision

The certificate holder has demonstrated continued overall conformance to the applicable Forest Stewardship Council standards. The SCS annual audit team recommends that the certificate be sustained, subject to subsequent annual audits and the FME's response to any open CARs.	**Yes** ☒ **No** ☐
Comments: The DNR continues to operate under a lean program with staff that demonstrates exceptional commitment to the program and their responsibilities to steward forest resources. Notably the DoF staff work in a highly integrated manner with wildlife biologists and other specialists within other divisions to maintain up-to-date knowledge of insects, diseases and other threats to forest resources; and work with other divisions within the state such as the Nature Preserves program.	

7. Changes in Certification Scope

Any changes in the scope of the certification since the previous audit are highlighted in yellow in the tables below.

Name and Contact Information

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

FSC Sales Information

☒ *FSC Sales contact information same as above.*			
FSC salesperson			
Address		**Telephone**	
		Fax	
		e-mail	
		Website	

Scope of Certificate

Certificate Type	☐ Single FMU	☐ Multiple FMU
	☒ Group	
SLIMF (*if applicable*)	☐ Small SLIMF certificate	☐ Low intensity SLIMF certificate
	☒ Group SLIMF certificate	

# Group Members (*if applicable)*	7,491 landowners		
Number of FMUs in scope of certificate	9,996 FMU		
Geographic location of non-SLIMF FMU(s)	*Latitude & Longitude:*		
Forest zone	☐ Boreal	☒ Temperate	
	☐ Subtropical	☐ Tropical	
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is:		**Units: ☐ ha or ☒ ac**	
privately managed	501,481		
state managed			
community managed			
Number of FMUs in scope that are:			
less than 100 ha in area	9,841	100 - 1000 ha in area	155
1000 - 10 000 ha in area		more than 10 000 ha in area	
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is included in FMUs that:		**Units: ☐ ha or ☒ ac**	
are less than 100 ha in area	442,006		
are between 100 ha and 1000 ha in area	59,475		
meet the eligibility criteria as *low intensity* SLIMF FMUs	Group member parcels meet the definition of SLIMF FMUs, either due to size, all member parcels are less than 1000 hectares.		
Division of FMUs into manageable units:			
Most FMUs are small enough in size that individual properties are not further divided into management units – some larger properties have stands delineated, with varying management and harvests planned by stand type.			

Production Forests

Timber Forest Products	**Units: ☐ ha or ☒ ac**
Total area of production forest (i.e. forest from which timber may be harvested)	495,335
Area of production forest classified as 'plantation'	
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by replanting or by a combination of replanting and coppicing of the planted stems	
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by natural regeneration, or by a combination of natural regeneration and coppicing of the naturally regenerated stems	495,335
Silvicultural system(s)	**Area under type of management**
Even-aged management	10%
Clearcut (clearcut size range)	
Shelterwood	
Other:	
Uneven-aged management	90%
Individual tree selection	
Group selection	
Other:	

☐ Other (e.g. nursery, recreation area, windbreak, bamboo, silvo-pastoral system, agro-forestry system, etc.)	
The sustainable rate of harvest (usually Annual Allowable Harvest or AAH where available) of commercial timber (m3 of round wood)	Average annual cut of approximately 30 million board feet (Doyle)
Non-timber Forest Products (NTFPs)	
Area of forest protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for the production of NTFPs or services	0
Other areas managed for NTFPs or services	0
Approximate annual commercial production of non-timber forest products included in the scope of the certificate, by product type	0
Explanation of the assumptions and reference to the data source upon which AAH and NTFP harvest rates estimates are based:	
The DOF conducts an annual analysis of the most current 5 years of FIA data for the plots located on Classified Forest & Wildlands tracts. This analysis is supplemented with a Continuous Forest Inventory (CFI) being developed on ICFCG parcels, with similar protocols as those used for the state forest CFI program.	
Species in scope of joint FM/COC certificate: (*Scientific / Latin Name* and Common / Trade Name)	
Acer spp	Maple: sugar, red, black,silver, boxelder
Aesculus spp	Ohio,yellow
Ailanthus altissima	tree of heaven
Asimina triloba	pawpaw
Betula nigra	river birch
Carya spp	Hickory:bitternut,mockernut,shagbark, red, pignut, shellbark, pecan
Carpinus caroliniana	Hornbeam
Catalpa speciosa	catalpa
Celtis occidentalis	hackberry
Cercis canadensis	eastern redbud
Cladrastis kentukea	yellowwood
Cornus florida	flowering dogwood
Cratagus spp	hawthorns
Diospyros virginiana	persimmon
Fagus grandifolia	merican beech
Fraxinus spp.	Ash: white, green, pumpkin, black, blue
Gleditsia triacanthos	honey locust
Gymnocladus dioica	Kentucky coffee-tree
Juglans spp	black walnut, butternut
Juniperus virginiana	red cedar
Larix laricina	tamarack
Liquidamber styraciflua	sweet gum
Liriodendron tulipifera	yellow-poplar
Maclura pomifera	Osage orange
Magnolia acuminata	cucumber magnolia
Morus spp	mulberry

Nyssa sylvatica	black gum
Ostrya virginiana	Eastern hophornbeam (ironwood)
Paulownia tomentosa	royal paulownia
Picea abies	Norway spruce
Pinus spp	Pine: white, red, Scotch, Virginia, shortleaf, jack, loblolly
Plantanus occidentalis	sycamore
Populus spp.	large-toothed aspen, quaking aspen, cottonwood
Prunus serotina	black cherry
Quercus spp.	Oaks: white, red, black, scarlet, post, bur, swamp chestnut, swamp white, chestnut, chinkapin, shingle, black jack, cherry bark, pin, shumard, overcup, northern pin
Robinia pseudoacacia	black locust
Salix nigra	black willow
Sassafras alfidum	sassafras
Taxodium distichum	bald cypress
Tilia Americana	basswood
Tsuga Canadensis	eastern hemlock
Ulmus spp	elms

FSC Product Classification

Timber products		
Product Level 1	**Product Level 2**	**Species**
W1 Rough Wood	W1.1 Roundwood	All
W1 Rough Wood	W1.2 Fuelwood	All
W3 Wood in chips or particles	W3.1	All
Non-Timber Forest Products		
Product Level 1	**Product Level 2**	**Product Level 3 and Species**
NONE		

Conservation Areas

Total area of forest and non-forest land protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for conservation objectives:	0 ha recorded; some lands, however, may informally be managed primarily for conservation values, but the majority of Classified Forests are available for harvest; within the overall program, Classified Wildlands are specifically managed for conservation values, but the FSC group certification applies specifically to Classified Forests.

High Conservation Value Forest / Areas

High Conservation Values present and respective areas: **Units:** ☐ **ha or** ☒ **ac**

Code	HCV Type	Description & Location	Area
HCV1	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity	State Nature Preserves located within group	6,146

	values (e.g. endemism, endangered species, refugia).		
HCV2	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant large landscape level forests, contained within, or containing the management unit, where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance.	Large block forests in ag dominated landscapes	43,597
HCV3	Forests or areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems.	S1, S2 communities across state. Old growth, and hemlock stands.	10,590
HCV4	Forests or areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g. watershed protection, erosion control).		
HCV5	Forests or areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g. subsistence, health).		
HCV6	Forests or areas critical to local communities' traditional cultural identity (areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in cooperation with such local communities).		
Total Area of forest classified as 'High Conservation Value Forest / Area'			60,333*

*Note: Note: There is some double counting of acres when land may fall into more than on HCFV type.

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

☐ *N/A – All forestland owned or managed by the applicant is included in the scope.*	
☒ *Applicant owns and/or manages other FMUs not under evaluation.*	
☐ *Applicant wishes to excise portions of the FMU(s) under evaluation from the scope of certification.*	
Explanation for exclusion of FMUs and/or excision:	Participants in the Classified Forests and Wildlands Program have the option to opt out of the certified group. Some percentage of landowners have opted out of the certificate and are not included in this scope.
Control measures to prevent mixing of certified and non-certified product (C8.3):	Those landowners who have opted out of the group may still conduct timber sales, but do not have access to the CoC information or certificate codes and cannot make certified sales.

	Sales and loads are never mixed between certified and non-certified landowners.

Description of FMUs excluded from, or forested area excised from, the scope of certification:		
Name of FMU or Stand	**Location (city, state, country)**	**Size (☐ ha or ☒ ac)**
Uncertified Classified Acres (nonforested acres, private landowner declined certification or undecided)	Statewide	298,836

8. Annual Data Update

8.1 Social Information

Number of forest workers (including contractors) working in forest within scope of certificate (differentiated by gender):		
14 of male workers	9 of female workers	
Number of accidents in forest work since last audit:	**Serious:** 0	**Fatal:** 0

8.2 Annual Summary of Pesticide and Other Chemical Use

☐ *FME does not use pesticides.*

Commercial name of pesticide / herbicide	**Active ingredient**	**Quantity applied annually (kg or lbs)**	**Size of area treated during previous year**	**Reason for use**
2,4-D	2,4-D		1,685	Invasive species control; TSI
Pathway	2,4-D , picloram		839	Invasive species control; TSI; Grapevine control
Triplet	2,4-D, dicamba, R-2-(2-methyl 4-chlorophenoxy) proponic acid		235	Invasive species control; Grapevine control
Crossbow	2,4-D; triclopyr		3,248	Invasive species control; TSI; Grapevine control
Milestone	aminopyralid		2,104	Invasive species control
Stinger	clopyralid			Invasive species control
Banvel	dicamba		775	Invasive species control; TSI; Grapevine control
Fusilade	fluazifop-P-butyl		58	

Accord, Aquaneat, Cornerstone, GlyStar Plus, Makaze, Rodeo, Roundup	glyphosate		9	Invasive species control; TSI; Grapevine control, Warm season grass planting
Arsenal, Habitat, Polaris, Stalker	Imazapyr		266	Invasive species control
Tordon	Picloram		4,642	Invasive species control; TSI; Grapevine control
Poast	sethoxydim		304	Invasive species control
Simazine	simazine		6	Tree planting
Oust	sulfometuron methyl		82	Tree planting; Invasive species control
Element; Bayer Brush; Garlon; Pathfinder	triclopyr		4,047	Invasive species control; TSI; Grapevine control

SECTION B – APPENDICES (CONFIDENTIAL)

Appendix 1 – List of FMUs Selected For Evaluation

☐ FME consists of a single FMU

☒ FME consists of multiple FMUs or is a Group

SCS staff establishes the design and level of sampling prior to each group or multiple FMU evaluation according to FSC-STD-20-007. A list of the FMUs sampled and the rationale behind their selection is listed below.

FMU Name	FMU Size Category: - SLIMF - non-SLIMF - Large > 10,000 ha	Forest Type: - Plantation - Natural Forest	Rationale for Selection: - Random Sample - Stakeholder issue - Ease of access - Other – please describe
Ferris Property: 89-0034	SLIMF	Natural	Existing, Random (pre-selected, random)
Wilson Trust: 89-0092	SLIMF	Natural	Existing, Random (pre-selected, random)
Campbell Property: 89-177	SLIMF	Natural	Existing, Random (pre-selected, random)
Eastern Whitewater Valley Land Trust, Inc.	SLIMF	Natural	New, planting/spray
Sorg: 02-0127	SLIMF	Natural	Existing, Random (pre-selected, random)
Hoffman Trust: 02-0030	SLIMF	Natural	Existing, Random (pre-selected, random)
Wass Trust: 01-0124	SLIMF	Natural	Existing, Random (pre-selected, random)
Thompson: 90-0034	SLIMF	Natural	Existing, Random (pre-selected, random)
Harmon: 90-0083	SLIMF	Natural	New, Random
Long: 07-0030	SLIMF	Natural	Existing, Random (pre-selected, random)
Long: 07-0165	SLIMF	Natural	Existing, Random (pre-selected, random)
Godinet: 07-0057	SLIMF	Natural	Existing, Random (pre-selected, random)
Wallow Hollow (TNC)	SLIMF	Natural	Existing, Random (pre-selected, random)
Woodhouse: 07-0196	SLIMF	Natural	Existing, Random (pre-selected, random)
Woodhouse: 07-0195	SLIMF	Natural	Existing, Random (pre-selected, random)
Woodhouse: 07-0197	SLIMF	Natural	Existing, Random (pre-selected, random)

Appendix 2 – List of Stakeholders Consulted

List of FME Staff Consulted

DNR staff is available by email with naming convention that is first letter of first name, last name @dnr.in.gov.

Name	Title	Contact Information	Consultation method
Jayson Waterman	District Forester	jwaterman	Opening, field
Maddie Westbrook	District Forester	mwestbrook	Opening, field

Brenda Huter	Stewardship Coordinator	bhuter	Opening, field
John "Jack" Seifert	State Forester	jseifert	Opening, field
John A. Bacone	Director, Division of Nature Preserves	jbacone	Interview office
Thomas Swinford	Assistant Director, Division of Nature Preserves	tswinford	Interview office
Brad Rody	District Forester	brody	Field
Amanda Smith	District Forester	asmith1	Field
Zack Smith	Forest Programs Coordinator	zsmith	Field
Amy Spalding	Assistant District Forester	aspalding	Field
Kristina Kusel	District Forester	kkusel	Field
Sam Kaiser	District Forester	skaiser	Field
Jack Cearley	District Forester	jcearley	Field

List of other Stakeholders Consulted

Name	Organization	Contact Information	Consultation method	Requests Cert. Notf.
Jonathan Ferris	Group member/land owner	765-686-0220	Field Interview	N
Mary Ferris	Group member/land owner	765-686-0220	Field Interview	N
Jared Henderson	DMB Hardwoods	765-465-9413	Field Interview	N
Dan Shaver	Forest Bank Operations Manager The Nature Conservancy Brown County Hills Project	812-374-9441	Field Interview, Email	N
Allen Purcell	The Nature Conservancy		Email	N

Appendix 3 – Additional Audit Techniques Employed

☒ None.

☐ Additional techniques employed (*describe*):

Appendix 4 – Pesticide Derogations

☒ There are no active pesticide derogations for this FME.		
Name of pesticide / herbicide (active ingredient)		**Date derogation approved**
Condition	**Conformance (C / NC)**	**Evidence of progress**

Appendix 5 – Detailed Observations

Criteria required by FSC at every surveillance audit (*check all situations that apply*)	☒ NA – all FMUs are exempt from these requirements. **SLIMF Certificate** ☐ Plantations > 10,000 ha (24,710 ac): 2.3, 4.2, 4.4, 6.7, 6.9, 10.6, 10.7, and 10.8 ☒ Natural forests > 50,000 ha (123,553 ac) ('low intensity' SLIMFs exempt): 1.5, 2.3, 3.2, 4.2, 4.4, 5.6, 6.2, 6.3, 8.2, and 9.4 ☐ FMUs containing High Conservation Values ('small forest' SLIMFs exempt): 6.2, 6.3, 6.9 and 9.4
Documents and records reviewed for FMUs/ sites sampled	☒ All applicable documents and records as required in section 7 of audit plan were reviewed; or ☐ The following documents and records as required in section 7 of the audit plan were NOT reviewed (*provide explanation*):

Evaluation Year	FSC P&C Reviewed
2015	P1, 6.1, 6.3, 6.5, 7.1, 7.3, 8.2, 8.3, 8.5, 9.1. Group Entity Criteria: C1, C2, C3, C9.
2016	6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5.c, 6.6.a, 7.2, 7.4, and P9 (HCVF); Open OBS/CARs: 6.5.c, 6.6.a, 9.1.a Group Manager: 3.1.V and 5 (Group Records)
2017	P2, P3, 6.3.h, 6.6.a, P7, 9.1.c. FSC Standard for Group Entities: 3.1.v, 5.1.ii, 5.1.vi
2018	
2019	

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

FSC Principles Checklist
FSC Forest Management Standard (v1.0)—United States

REQUIREMENT	C/NC	COMMENT/CAR
Principle #1: Compliance with Laws and FSC Principles **Forest management shall respect all applicable laws of the country in which they occur, and international treaties and agreements to which the country is a signatory, and comply with all FSC Principles and Criteria.**		
1.1 Forest management shall respect all national and local laws and administrative requirements.	NE	
1.2. All applicable and legally prescribed fees, royalties, taxes and other charges shall be paid.	NE	

1.3. In signatory countries, the provisions of all binding international agreements such as CITES, ILO Conventions, ITTA, and Convention on Biological Diversity, shall be respected.	NE	
1.4. Conflicts between laws, regulations and the FSC Principles and Criteria shall be evaluated for the purposes of certification, on a case by case basis, by the certifiers and the involved or affected parties.	NE	
1.5. Forest management areas should be protected from illegal harvesting, settlement and other unauthorized activities.	NE	
1.6. Forest managers shall demonstrate a long-term commitment to adhere to the FSC Principles and Criteria.	NE	
Principle #2: Long-term tenure and use rights to the land and forest resources shall be clearly defined, documented and legally established.		
2.1. Clear evidence of long-term forest use rights to the land (e.g., land title, customary rights, or lease agreements) shall be demonstrated.		
2.1.a The forest owner or manager provides clear evidence of ***long-term*** rights to use and manage the FMU for the purposes described in the management plan.	C	ICFCG's procedures provide a review of a group member's ownership of the FMU. The group member application that addresses this information is maintained in each group member's file at his or her assigned District office. Verified in each property folder visited every site during the 2017 audit.
2.1.b The forest owner or manager identifies and documents legally established use and access rights associated with the FMU that are held by other parties.	C	Use and access rights held by others that impact the landowner's management are recorded in the property deeds and leases. Classified Forest Lands are not otherwise open to the public.
2.1.c Boundaries of land ownership and use rights are clearly identified on the ground and on maps prior to commencing management activities in the vicinity of the boundaries.	C	Auditors observed boundaries to be clearly marked on maps that are recorded as part of each Classified Forest enrollment. The application maps must be made by a licensed surveyor or by the Division of Forestry GIS Specialist. District Foresters are able to prepare general property maps using digital data from the state and/or counties. Boundaries of harvest areas were observed to be well marked in the field.
2.2. Local communities with legal or customary tenure or use rights shall maintain control, to the extent		

necessary to protect their rights or resources, over forest operations unless they delegate control with free and informed consent to other agencies. *Applicability Note: For the planning and management of publicly owned forests, the local community is defined as all residents and property owners of the relevant jurisdiction.*		
2.2.a The forest owner or manager allows the exercise of ***tenure*** and ***use rights*** allowable by law or regulation.	C	The most common example of a right held by an outside party on classified land is a right of way for a power line or gas line. Such rights are noted in the property deeds and are allowed by the owners.
2.2.b In FMUs where tenure or use rights held by others exist, the forest owner or manager consults with groups that hold such rights so that management activities do not significantly impact the uses or benefits of such rights.	C	Although this rarely is necessary, occasionally a landowner will have to notify the local power company of operations using heavy machinery, to ensure underground cable or gas lines are not damaged during harvests.
2.3. Appropriate mechanisms shall be employed to resolve disputes over tenure claims and use rights. The circumstances and status of any outstanding disputes will be explicitly considered in the certification evaluation. Disputes of substantial magnitude involving a significant number of interests will normally disqualify an operation from being certified.		
2.3.a If ***disputes*** arise regarding tenure claims or use rights then the forest owner or manager initially attempts to resolve them through open communication, negotiation, and/or mediation. If these good-faith efforts fail, then federal, state, and/or local laws are employed to resolve such disputes. FF Indicator: Low risk of negative social or environmental impact.	C	No significant disputes were noted by any of the district foresters. Property disputes or use rights are generally the business of the private landowner and the DoF is not often involved.
2.3.b The forest owner or manager documents any significant disputes over tenure and use rights. FF Indicator: Low risk of negative social or environmental impact.	C	No evidence of non-compliance was noted during the field audit. No significant disputes were noted.
Principle #3: The legal and customary rights of indigenous peoples to own, use and manage their lands, territories, and resources shall be recognized and respected.		
3.1. Indigenous peoples shall control forest management on their lands and territories unless they		

delegate control with free and informed consent to other agencies.		
3.1.a Tribal forest management planning and implementation are carried out by authorized tribal representatives in accordance with tribal laws and customs and relevant federal laws.	C	The Potawatomi Indians have a few properties enrolled in the CF&W program. The CF&W program does not have any restrictions that would prevent tribal representatives from carrying out forest management in accordance with tribal laws and customs.
3.1.b The manager of a tribal forest secures, in writing, informed consent regarding forest management activities from the tribe or individual forest owner prior to commencement of those activities.	C	The Potawatomi Indians are the managers of the property and thus informed consent is not necessary.
3.2. Forest management shall not threaten or diminish, either directly or indirectly, the resources or tenure rights of indigenous peoples.		
3.2.a During management planning, the forest owner or manager consults with American Indian groups that have legal rights or other binding agreements to the FMU to avoid harming their resources or rights.	C	The following is a list of Treaties enacted between the US government and Native American Tribes in Indiana. Details of the treaties are available online through the University of Oklahoma's Indian Affairs: Laws and Treaties webpage (digital.library.okstate.edu/kappler/VOL2/toc.htm) August 1795 – Treaty of Greenville June 1803 – Treaty of Fort Wayne August 1804 – Treaty of Vincennes August 1805 – Treaty of Grouseland September 1809 – Treaty of Fort Wayne ("Harrison's Purchase") September 1817 – Treaty with the Wyandots October 1818 – Treaty of St. Mary's August 1821 – Treaty of Chicago October 1826 – Treaty of Mississinewa September 1828 – Treaty of Carey Mission October 1832 – Treaty of Tippecanoe October 1834 – Treaty with the Miami November 1838 – Treaty with the Miami November 1840 – Treaty with the Miami (final secession of native land in Indiana) Although none of the original Native American Nations' landholdings remain in Indiana, the

		Division of Forestry recognizes that this does not preclude the existence of legal or customary rights. No legal or customary rights that would impact ICFCG tracts have yet been identified. If in the future such rights are identified, the Division of Forestry will work with the specific Native American nation to insure the protection of those rights.
3.2.b Demonstrable actions are taken so that forest management does not adversely affect tribal resources. When applicable, evidence of, and measures for, protecting tribal resources are incorporated in the management plan.	C	See 3.2.a
3.3. Sites of special cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance to indigenous peoples shall be clearly identified in cooperation with such peoples, and recognized and protected by forest managers.		
3.3.a. The forest owner or manager invites consultation with tribal representatives in identifying sites of current or traditional cultural, archeological, ecological, economic or religious significance.		
FF Indicator 3.3.a The forest owner or manager maintains a list of sites of current or traditional cultural, archeological, ecological, economic or religious significance that have been identified by state conservation agencies and tribal governments on the FMU or that could be impacted by management activities.	C	Any sites of traditional cultural, archeological, ecological, economic or religious significance are maintained and regulated by the Division of Archaeology and Historic Preservation. Records are store in their database -SHAARD – State Historical Architectural and Archaeological Research Database. Before any major management activity such as a timber harvest, the DoF Forest Archaeologist reviews for known sites and notifies the landowner of the FMU if a site is on the property.
3.3.b In consultation with tribal representatives, the forest owner or manager develops measures to protect or enhance areas of special significance (see also Criterion 9.1).	C	Any sites of traditional cultural, archeological, ecological, economic or religious significance are maintained and regulated by the Division of Archaeology and Historic Preservation.. In 2009 a letter was sent out notifying each group of the State's intention to enter the Classified Forest & Wildlands Program into green certification and asking for comments on the Program or for areas of which they may have concerns due to cultural significance. No negative responses were received.

		If sites of special significance are identified in the future, the Division of Forestry will work with the specific Native American nation to development management recommendations appropriate for the level of detail provided.
3.4. Indigenous peoples shall be compensated for the application of their traditional knowledge regarding the use of forest species or management systems in forest operations. This compensation shall be formally agreed upon with their free and informed consent before forest operations commence.	C	Traditional knowledge is not used by IDOF or group members, as confirmed in interviews with participants and observation of management practices.
Principle #4: Forest management operations shall maintain or enhance the long-term social and economic well-being of forest workers and local communities.		
4.1. The communities within, or adjacent to, the forest management area should be given opportunities for employment, training, and other services.	NE	
4.2. Forest management should meet or exceed all applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of employees and their families.		
4.2.a The forest owner or manager meets or exceeds all applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of employees and their families (also see Criterion 1.1). FF Indicator: Low risk of negative social or environmental impact.	C	Most group members do not hire any employees for forest management work and are thus at low risk for this indicator.
4.2.b The forest owner or manager and their employees and contractors demonstrate a safe work environment. Contracts or other written agreements include safety requirements.	C	It was not possible to view active felling operations during the audit, however, a review of stumps from recently felled trees indicated safe felling techniques. DoF sample language for contracts includes safety requirements. Other evidence of a safe work environment include: No injuries or fatalities have been reported on Classified Lands under scope of the FSC certificate.
4.2.c The forest owner or manager hires well-qualified service providers to safely implement the management plan. FF Indicator: Low risk of negative social or environmental impact.	C	Service providers that are hired include licensed timber buyers, loggers, and professional foresters. As is the case in most industries there is a wide range in the quality of service providers. The 2017 audit indicated that active harvests were typically done well. Audit team concludes low risk of social

		and environmental impact due to small size of properties. See also 7.3.a.
4.3 The rights of workers to organize and voluntarily negotiate with their employers shall be guaranteed as outlined in Conventions 87 and 98 of the International Labor Organization (ILO).	NE	
4.4. Management planning and operations shall incorporate the results of evaluations of social impact. Consultations shall be maintained with people and groups (both men and women) directly affected by management operations.	NE	
4.4.a The forest owner or manager understands the likely social impacts of management activities, and incorporates this understanding into management planning and operations. Social impacts include effects on: • Archeological sites and sites of cultural, historical and community significance (on and off the FMU; • Public resources, including air, water and food (hunting, fishing, collecting); • Aesthetics; • Community goals for forest and natural resource use and protection such as employment, subsistence, recreation and health; • Community economic opportunities; • Other people who may be affected by management operations. A summary is available to the CB.	NA	This is a SLIMF certificate, Family Forest indicators apply.
FF Indicator 4.4.a The forest owner of manager understands the likely social impacts of management activities, and incorporates this understanding into management planning and operations.	C	Confirmed through review of: - Umbrella plan (p.13) - Forest Management Plans for each property visited in 2017 - Indiana BMPs At the individual property level social impacts of management are typically negligible. However, at the level of the entire group, social impacts are significant in terms of jobs created harvesting timber.
4.4.b The forest owner or manager seeks and considers input in management planning from people who would likely be affected by management activities.	C	Audit team determined low risk of negative social or environmental impact given the small size of the property.

FF Indicator: Low risk of negative social or environmental impact.		
4.4.c People who are subject to direct adverse effects of management operations are apprised of relevant activities in advance of the action so that they may express concern.	C	No adverse effects of management observed, as confirmed through field visits and stakeholder interviews.
4.4.d For ***public forests,*** consultation shall include the following components: 1. Clearly defined and accessible methods for public participation are provided in both long and short-term planning processes, including harvest plans and operational plans; 2. Public notification is sufficient to allow interested stakeholders the chance to learn of upcoming opportunities for public review and/or comment on the proposed management; 3. An accessible and affordable appeals process to planning decisions is available. Planning decisions incorporate the results of public consultation. All draft and final planning documents, and their supporting data, are made readily available to the public.	NA	No public forests are part of the program.
4.5. Appropriate mechanisms shall be employed for resolving grievances and for providing fair compensation in the case of loss or damage affecting the legal or customary rights, property, resources, or livelihoods of local peoples. Measures shall be taken to avoid such loss or damage.	NE	
Principle #5: Forest management operations shall encourage the efficient use of the forest's multiple products and services to ensure economic viability and a wide range of environmental and social benefits.		
5.1. Forest management should strive toward economic viability, while taking into account the full environmental, social, and operational costs of production, and ensuring the investments necessary to maintain the ecological productivity of the forest.		
5.1.a The forest owner or manager is financially able to implement core management activities, including all those environmental, social and operating costs, required to meet this Standard, and investment and reinvestment in forest management.	C (OBS)	During the 2017 audit it was discovered that there is an anticipated 25% vacancy rate in District Foresters (DF) with several more positions becoming vacant in late 2017 and in 2018. Additional changes include assigning several districts to various forestry staff to cover vacancies.

		The DNR has been filling some open vacancies, for example three new District Foresters were hired in 2017. However, the DNR has not provided evidence that a systematic management review of program service demands relative to District Forester capacity has been done, nor that such review is planned. Although the DNR is currently in conformance with the standard and able to meet this indicator, the issue of how investment/reinvestment in forester capacity to implement core management activities could be non-conformant in future years if capacity does not meet demand. See OBS 2017.1.
5.1.b Responses to short-term financial factors are limited to levels that are consistent with fulfillment of this Standard.	NE	
5.2. Forest management and marketing operations should encourage the optimal use and local processing of the forest's diversity of products.	NE	
5.3. Forest management should minimize waste associated with harvesting and on-site processing operations and avoid damage to other forest resources.	NE	
5.4. Forest management should strive to strengthen and diversify the local economy, avoiding dependence on a single forest product.	NE	
5.5. Forest management operations shall recognize, maintain, and, where appropriate, enhance the value of forest services and resources such as watersheds and fisheries.	NE	
5.6. The rate of harvest of forest products shall not exceed levels which can be permanently sustained.	NE	
5.6.a In FMUs where products are being harvested, the landowner or manager calculates the sustained yield harvest level for each sustained yield planning unit, and provides clear rationale for determining the size and layout of the planning unit. The sustained yield harvest level calculation is documented in the Management Plan. The sustained yield harvest level calculation for each planning unit is based on:	NA	SLIMF certificate.

• documented growth rates for particular sites, and/or acreage of forest types, age-classes and species distributions; • mortality and decay and other factors that affect net growth; • areas reserved from harvest or subject to harvest restrictions to meet other management goals; • silvicultural practices that will be employed on the FMU; • management objectives and desired future conditions. The calculation is made by considering the effects of repeated prescribed harvests on the product/species and its ecosystem, as well as planned management treatments and projections of subsequent regrowth beyond single rotation and multiple re-entries.		
FF Indicator 5.6.a On family forests, a sustained yield harvest level analysis shall be completed. Data used in the analysis may include but is not limited to: - regional growth data; - age-class and species distributions; - stocking rates required to meet management objectives; - ecological and legal constraints; - empirical growth and regeneration data; and, - validated forest productivity models.	C	The DoF has a state wide continuous forest inventory (CFI) system that permits estimates of growth and removal across the Classified Forest & Wildlands Program as a whole. The first baseline cycle has been completed (5 years baseline measurements) and the first year of re-measurements has begun in 2017. Once this data is analyzed, trend data specific to classified forests available will be available. Given the low priority of timber harvesting expressed by most landowners in the classified program, and the anticipated time and expense, individual, property level analysis is not justified, nor useful at this time. The data provided at the state level should provide sufficient assurance of trends on land within the classified program.
5.6.b Average annual harvest levels, over rolling periods of no more than 10 years, do not exceed the calculated sustained yield harvest level.	NA	SLIMF certificate.
FF Indicator 5.6.b. On family forests, harvest levels and rates do not exceed growth rates over successive harvests, contribute directly to achieving desired future conditions as defined in the forest management plans, and do not diminish the long term ecological integrity and productivity of the site.	C	Based on FIA data and measures, at the state level, there is far more growth than removal. This is likely particularly true on group participants' properties, where the emphasis is rarely on removals and most properties are not undergoing regular harvests. The net volume of trees on forest land increased by 5.3

		percent to nearly 10.7 billion ft3 since 2011 (Resource Update FS-127. Newtown Square, PA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northern Research Station. 4 p. 2017, https://www.nrs.fs.fed.us/pubs/54541).
5.6.c Rates and methods of timber harvest lead to achieving desired conditions, and improve or maintain health and quality across the FMU. Overstocked stands and stands that have been depleted or rendered to be below productive potential due to natural events, past management, or lack of management, are returned to desired stocking levels and composition at the earliest practicable time as justified in management objectives.	C	High mortality of Emerald Ash borer infestation is still contributing to many landowners deciding to salvage dying ash or already dead ash where possible.
5.6.d For NTFPs, calculation of quantitative sustained yield harvest levels is required only in cases where products are harvested in significant commercial operations or where traditional or customary use rights may be impacted by such harvests. In other situations, the forest owner or manager utilizes available information, and new information that can be reasonably gathered, to set harvesting levels that will not result in a depletion of the non-timber growing stocks or other adverse effects to the forest ecosystem.	NA	No landowners are making claims for NTFPs
Principle #6: Forest management shall conserve biological diversity and its associated values, water resources, soils, and unique and fragile ecosystems and landscapes, and, by so doing, maintain the ecological functions and the integrity of the forest.		
6.1. Assessments of environmental impacts shall be completed -- appropriate to the scale, intensity of forest management and the uniqueness of the affected resources -- and adequately integrated into management systems. Assessments shall include landscape level considerations as well as the impacts of on-site processing facilities. Environmental impacts shall be assessed prior to commencement of site-disturbing operations.	NE	
6.2 Safeguards shall exist which protect rare, threatened and endangered species and their habitats (e.g., nesting and feeding areas). Conservation zones and protection areas shall be established, appropriate to the scale and intensity of forest management and the uniqueness of	NE	

the affected resources. Inappropriate hunting, fishing, trapping, and collecting shall be controlled.		
6.2.a If there is a likely presence of RTE species as identified in Indicator 6.1.a then either a field survey to verify the species' presence or absence is conducted prior to site-disturbing management activities, or management occurs with the assumption that potential RTE species are present. Surveys are conducted by biologists with the appropriate expertise in the species of interest and with appropriate qualifications to conduct the surveys. If a species is determined to be present, its location should be reported to the manager of the appropriate database.		
FF Indicator 6.2.a If there is a likely presence of RTE species as identified in Indicator 6.1.a then either a field survey to verify the species' presence or absence is conducted prior to site-disturbing management activities, or management occurs with the assumption that potential RTE species are present. Surveys are conducted by biologists with the appropriate expertise in the species of interest and with appropriate qualifications to conduct the surveys. A secondary review of the survey does not need to be included in the process. If a species is determined to be present, its location should be reported to the manager of the appropriate database.	C	DNR procedures specify that Natural Heritage database checks be completed when preparing management plans and prior to a harvest. In all instances 2017 sites visited in the field had FMPs specific to the property and were checked against the Natural Heritage database whether the plan had been developed by a consultant or DNR District Forester. When the Natural Heritage database query indicated possible presence of forest dwelling RTE species, management planning assumed such presence. Auditor observed conformance with these requirements. Through interviews and file reviews, auditor verified District Foresters are using appropriate resources to determine habitat needs of RTE species when there are Natural Heritage occurrences. Many of the Natural Heritage hits are wetland plants that were outside of timber harvest areas.
6.2.b When RTE species are present or assumed to be present, modifications in management are made in order to maintain, restore or enhance the extent, quality and viability of the species and their habitats. ***Conservation zones*** and/or ***protected areas*** are established for RTE species, including those S3 species that are considered rare, where they are necessary to maintain or improve the short and long-term viability of the species. Conservation measures are based on relevant science, guidelines and/or consultation with relevant, independent experts as necessary to achieve the conservation goal of the Indicator.	C	When any landowner management plan is prepared, a check is done against the natural heritage database. When occurrences occur within forested areas, foresters consult DNR resources or consult with DNR staff of appropriate expertise. District Foresters consult with DNR Wildlife when additional information is needed regarding management modification. RTE databases are maintained by the Division of Nature Preserves (DNP). This is the natural heritage database against which requests are made for developing FMPs and revisions every 5 years. The

		Heritage database contains more than 1,000 records of federally endangered species; more than 12,000 records of state-listed species, and more than 1,300 records of high-quality natural communities. It also has records for more than 700 significant natural areas in the state. The DNP uses a continuous inventory process combining qualified expert observations (staff) as well as designed surveys and additional date from Nature Serve. Most Natural Heritage occurrences are within wetland or river corridors that are not impacted by timber harvests. However, when occurrences do occur within forested areas, appropriate actions are taken. Confirmed foresters in District 15, 3, 12, and 14 consult with DNR Wildlife when additional information is needed regarding management modifications.
6.2.c For medium and large public forests (e.g. state forests), forest management plans and operations are designed to meet species' recovery goals, as well as landscape level biodiversity conservation goals.	NA	These are all private family forests.
6.2.d Within the capacity of the forest owner or manager, hunting, fishing, trapping, collecting and other activities are controlled to avoid the risk of impacts to vulnerable species and communities (See Criterion 1.5).	C	As all lands within the program are privately owned, hunting, fishing, etc., is strictly controlled by the owners.
6.3. Ecological functions and values shall be maintained intact, enhanced, or restored, including: a) Forest regeneration and succession. b) Genetic, species, and ecosystem diversity. c) Natural cycles that affect the productivity of the forest ecosystem.		
6.3.a. Landscape-scale indicators		
6.3.a.1 The forest owner or manager maintains, enhances, and/or restores under-represented ***successional*** stages in the FMU that would naturally occur on the types of sites found on the FMU. Where old growth of different community types that would naturally occur on the forest are under-represented in the landscape relative to natural conditions, a portion of the forest is managed to enhance and/or restore old growth characteristics.	C	Early and late successional forest stages are under-represented in the State of Indiana. Via tax incentives, ICFCG encourages landowners to maintain land as forest. ICFCG contributes to moving forest to late successional because a significant percentage of group members do not harvest timber on their properties or use selection harvesting. However, the regeneration harvests necessary to create early successional habitat tend not to be a good fit in economic, ecological, or social terms given the small parcel size.

		Cost share is available through federal programs to plant trees, TSI, invasive control, pollinator habitat, warm season grass planting. A new cost share program is starting in southern Indiana focusing on the development of early successional forest habitat. District Foresters encourage landowners to take steps to regenerate oak and other early successional types. A number of planting sites were visited planted under federal cost-share program (CRP) funds, including the SAFE program for Indiana bats, CP-38-C, to restore ag sites to specific hardwood species mixes considered preferred for potential bat habitat, so-called "Bat Mix". Additionally many landowners plant hardwood species of commercial or special interest. For example sites 89-0034, 89-177, Eastern Whitewater Valley Land Trust, and 02-0127 all had plantings. Nearly all thinned sites had abundant natural regeneration including 02-0030, 01-0124, and 90-0083. Several examples were shown during the 2016 audit as well, where foresters created regeneration gaps for yellow poplar and other early successional species to maintain this diversity within forest stands. In 2017 it is reported that invasive species treatment (winter creeper) is ongoing in the one old growth tract in the group.
6.3.a.2 When a ***rare ecological community*** is present, modifications are made in both the management plan and its implementation in order to maintain, restore or enhance the viability of the community. Based on the vulnerability of the existing community, ***conservation zones*** and/or ***protected areas*** are established where warranted.	C	Rare ecological communities are identified through the Natural Heritage database maintained by the DNP, as described above in 6.2.b. When rare communities are identified for a property, District Foresters will advise landowner to protect that community. Other rare community types, which are not rare enough to be tracked in Natural Heritage database, are identified by District Foresters during property inspections. Given that the majority of silviculture on ICF group members is

		single tree selection, it is unlikely that rare community types would be damaged by logging.
6.3.a.3 When they are present, management maintains the area, structure, composition, and processes of all ***Type 1*** and ***Type 2 old growth***. Type 1 and 2 old growth are also protected and buffered as necessary with conservation zones, unless an alternative plan is developed that provides greater overall protection of old growth values. Type 1 Old Growth is protected from harvesting and road construction. Type 1 old growth is also protected from other timber management activities, except as needed to maintain the ecological values associated with the stand, including old growth attributes (e.g., remove exotic species, conduct controlled burning, and thinning from below in dry forest types when and where restoration is appropriate). Type 2 Old Growth is protected from harvesting to the extent necessary to maintain the area, structures, and functions of the stand. Timber harvest in Type 2 old growth must maintain old growth structures, functions, and components including individual trees that function as refugia (see Indicator 6.3.g). On public lands, old growth is protected from harvesting, as well as from other timber management activities, except if needed to maintain the values associated with the stand (e.g., remove exotic species, conduct controlled burning, and thinning from below in forest types when and where restoration is appropriate). On American Indian lands, timber harvest may be permitted in Type 1 and Type 2 old growth in recognition of their sovereignty and unique ownership. Timber harvest is permitted in situations where: 1. Old growth forests comprise a significant portion of the tribal ownership. 2. A history of forest stewardship by the tribe exists. 3. High Conservation Value Forest attributes are maintained.	C	ICFCG tracts will be continuously assessed for the presence of HCVF, including old growth by District Foresters during regular tract re-inspections and other property visits. Candidate areas will be submitted by the District Forester to the Group Manager who will determine if further evaluation is needed. If further evaluation is warranted, the Group Manager will set up an assessment committee. A day long training for district foresters on the process of identifying old growth was held on September 17 & 18, 2013 focusing in particular on old growth forests. It included a field evaluation of a potential old forest site. Additionally, as discussed during the 2017 audit, trainings within and among IDNR Divisions continue to refresh knowledge about OG and other topics. Interviews with IDNR forestry staff confirmed knowledge of relevant OG topics. Interviews with landowners confirmed their awareness of OG and other protections as part of being in the certified group.

4. Old-growth structures are maintained. 5. Conservation zones representative of old growth stands are established. 6. Landscape level considerations are addressed. 7. Rare species are protected.		
6.3.b To the extent feasible within the size of the ownership, particularly on larger ownerships (generally tens of thousands or more acres), management maintains, enhances, or restores habitat conditions suitable for well-distributed populations of animal species that are characteristic of forest ecosystems within the landscape.	NA	FME only consists of SLIMF FMUs.
6.3.c Management maintains, enhances and/or restores the plant and wildlife habitat of ***Riparian Management Zones (RMZs)*** to provide: a) habitat for aquatic species that breed in surrounding uplands; b) habitat for predominantly terrestrial species that breed in adjacent ***aquatic habitats***; c) habitat for species that use riparian areas for feeding, cover, and travel; d) habitat for plant species associated with riparian areas; and, e) stream shading and inputs of wood and leaf litter into the adjacent aquatic ecosystem.	C	RMZ are protected through implementation of Indiana BMPs. Interviews with foresters, consultants and staff, confirmed knowledge of state BMP requirements. The prevalence of selection harvest systems makes this relatively low risk for reduction of canopy below acceptable levels. Additionally, District Foresters and landowners interviewed were aware of the Indiana Flood Control Act, Indiana Flood Control Act (IC 14-21-1). This Act primarily pertains to streams and rivers with a drainage area larger than one square mile and is administered by the IDNR, Division of Water. Examples of forestry activities that may trigger this law are stream crossings, and leaving logging debris in regulated streams or their floodway. Interviews were notably consistent among all parties regarding the requirements and enforcement of this Act. Additionally, District Foresters interviewed during the 2017 audit were well aware of cost share programs available through federal programs to plant trees, TSI, invasive control, pollinator habitat, warm season grass planting.
Stand-scale Indicators **6.3.d** Management practices maintain or enhance plant species composition, distribution and frequency of	C	Silviculture practices on ICF group members is generally consistent with maintaining plant species composition. ICF members manage for a diversity of species. Indiana has strong timber markets that

occurrence similar to those that would naturally occur on the site.		utilize a diversity of species, e.g., a timber sale in District 12 had over 13 commercial tree species sold.
6.3.e When planting is required, a local source of known provenance is used when available and when the local source is equivalent in terms of quality, price and productivity. The use of non-local sources shall be justified, such as in situations where other management objectives (e.g. disease resistance or adapting to climate change) are best served by non-local sources. ***Native species*** suited to the site are normally selected for regeneration.	C	Artificial regeneration is not a standard practice in Indiana. Most forest regeneration is natural regeneration. Nearly all planting stock comes from the State of Indiana nurseries that use local seed of known provenance to grow trees.
6.3.f Management maintains, enhances, or restores habitat components and associated stand structures, in abundance and distribution that could be expected from naturally occurring processes. These components include: a) large live trees, live trees with decay or declining health, ***snags***, and well-distributed coarse down and dead woody material. ***Legacy trees*** where present are not harvested; and b) vertical and horizontal complexity. Trees selected for ***retention*** are generally representative of the dominant species found on the site.	C	The predominance of selection harvesting, in general serves to maintain existing habitat components and stand structures similar to naturally occurring processes. Abundant snags, legacy trees, vertical and horizontal complexity were observed at all sites inspected during the 2016 audit. Retained trees from selection, thinnings, and intermixed patch cuts produce tree species generally representative of dominant species found on sites and this was observed throughout. One designated HCVF site inspected during the 2016 audit, the Ober Savanna, provided an example of a unique native system that is being restored in collaboration with The Nature Conservancy. IDNR staff notably works with DNP and external conservation groups to appropriately identify, protect, and restore native habitats.
6.3.g.1 In the Southeast, Appalachia, Ozark-Ouachita, Mississippi Alluvial Valley, and Pacific Coast Regions, when ***even-aged systems*** are employed, and during salvage harvests, live trees and other native vegetation are retained within the harvest unit as described in Appendix C for the applicable region. In the Lake States Northeast, Rocky Mountain and Southwest Regions, when even-aged silvicultural systems are employed, and during salvage harvests, live trees and	C	Green Tree Retention Policy (p. 16 of IFC Umbrella Plan). Regeneration harvests greater than 10 acres are very uncommon on ICF properties. No regeneration harvests of this size were visited during audit.

other native vegetation are retained within the harvest unit in a proportion and configuration that is consistent with the characteristic natural disturbance regime unless retention at a lower level is necessary for the purposes of restoration or rehabilitation. See Appendix C for additional regional requirements and guidance.		
6.3.g.2 Under very limited situations, the landowner or manager has the option to develop a qualified plan to allow minor departure from the opening size limits described in Indicator 6.3.g.1. A qualified plan: 1. Is developed by qualified experts in ecological and/or related fields (wildlife biology, hydrology, landscape ecology, forestry/silviculture). 2. Is based on the totality of the ***best available information*** including peer-reviewed science regarding natural disturbance regimes for the FMU. 3. Is spatially and temporally explicit and includes maps of proposed openings or areas. 4. Demonstrates that the variations will result in equal or greater benefit to wildlife, water quality, and other values compared to the normal opening size limits, including for sensitive and rare species. 5. Is reviewed by independent experts in wildlife biology, hydrology, and landscape ecology, to confirm the preceding findings.	NA	ICF has not had the need to justify a departure to green tree retention requirements.
6.3.h The forest owner or manager assesses the risk of, prioritizes, and, as warranted, develops and implements a strategy to prevent or control ***invasive species***, including: 1. a method to determine the extent of invasive species and the degree of threat to native species and ecosystems; 2. implementation of management practices that minimize the risk of invasive establishment, growth, and spread; 3. eradication or control of established invasive populations when feasible: and, 4. monitoring of control measures and management practices to assess their effectiveness in preventing or controlling invasive species.	C	Interviews with ICF members, District Foresters, and consulting foresters showed a high level of awareness about invasive species. All management plans reviewed contained recommendation for treating invasive species, when they were present. Records reviewed in 2017 included invasive species chemical and mechanical treatment of bush honeysuckle, Japanese stilt grass, ailanthus, Japanese honeysuckle, garlic mustard, and autumn olive. SCS reviewed property forest management plans and implementation during the 2017 audit. Every property visited had forest management plans which were examined and confirmed to provide specific assessment and treatment

		recommendations to implement to minimize invasive establishment, growth, and spread as well as established invasive species when feasible. The following sites were inspected and had active management activities prescribed for reducing or otherwise managing invasive non-native plant species including: 89-0034, 89-0177.
6.3.i In applicable situations, the forest owner or manager identifies and applies site-specific fuels management practices, based on: (1) natural fire regimes, (2) risk of wildfire, (3) potential economic losses, (4) public safety, and (5) applicable laws and regulations.	C	The Division of Forestry, Fire Management Program provides organizational, operational and technical support regarding wildland and prescribed fire management. Indiana Code 14-23-5-1 outlines the Division of Forestry's fire responsibilities. The Division of Forestry assumes Wildland fire responsibilities on ICF properties. The Division usually fulfills this responsibility through Cooperative Agreements with local fire departments to provide initial attack on wildland fires. In 2017 there were 35 tracts reported using prescribed fire. Most fire is used in warm season grass area and not in the forest. One exception is The Nature Conservancy which used fire in savannahs and forest areas.
6.4. Representative samples of existing ecosystems within the landscape shall be protected in their natural state and recorded on maps, appropriate to the scale and intensity of operations and the uniqueness of the affected resources.	NE	
6.5 Written guidelines shall be prepared and implemented to control erosion; minimize forest damage during harvesting, road construction, and all other mechanical disturbances; and to protect water resources.	NE	
6.6. Management systems shall promote the development and adoption of environmentally friendly non-chemical methods of pest management and strive to avoid the use of chemical pesticides. World Health Organization Type 1A and 1B and chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides; pesticides that are persistent, toxic or whose derivatives remain biologically active and	NE	

accumulate in the food chain beyond their intended use; as well as any pesticides banned by international agreement, shall be prohibited. If chemicals are used, proper equipment and training shall be provided to minimize health and environmental risks.		
6.6.a No products on the FSC list of Highly Hazardous Pesticides are used (see FSC-POL-30-001 EN FSC Pesticides policy 2005 and associated documents).	C	2017, see closure of OBS 2016.2 for detail.
FF Indicator 6.6.b All toxicants used to control pests and competing vegetation, including rodenticides, insecticides, herbicides, and fungicides are used only when and where non-chemical management practices are: a) not available; b) prohibitively expensive, taking into account overall environmental and social costs, risks and benefits; c) the only effective means for controlling invasive and exotic species; or d) result in less environmental damage than non-chemical alternatives (e.g., top soil disturbance, loss of soil litter and down wood debris). If chemicals are used, the forest owner or manager uses the least environmentally damaging formulation and application method practical. Written strategies are developed and implemented that justify the use of chemical pesticides. Family forest owners/managers may use brief and less technical written procedures for applying common over-the-counter products. Any observed misuse of these chemicals may be considered as violation of requirements in this Indicator. Whenever feasible, an eventual phase-out of chemical use is included in the strategy.	NE	
6.6.c Chemicals and application methods are selected to minimize risk to non-target species and sites. When considering the choice between aerial and ground application, the forest owner or manager evaluates the comparative risk to non-target species and sites, the comparative risk of worker exposure, and the overall amount and type of chemicals required.	NE	
6.6.d Whenever chemicals are used, a written prescription is prepared that describes the site-specific hazards and environmental risks, and the precautions	NE	

that workers will employ to avoid or minimize those hazards and risks, and includes a map of the treatment area. Chemicals are applied only by workers who have received proper training in application methods and safety. They are made aware of the risks, wear proper safety equipment, and are trained to minimize environmental impacts on non-target species and sites.		
6.6.e If chemicals are used, the effects are monitored and the results are used for adaptive management. Records are kept of pest occurrences, control measures, and incidences of worker exposure to chemicals.	NE	
6.7. Chemicals, containers, liquid and solid non-organic wastes including fuel and oil shall be disposed of in an environmentally appropriate manner at off-site locations.	NE	
6.8. Use of biological control agents shall be documented, minimized, monitored, and strictly controlled in accordance with national laws and internationally accepted scientific protocols. Use of genetically modified organisms shall be prohibited.	NE	
6.9. The use of exotic species shall be carefully controlled and actively monitored to avoid adverse ecological impacts.		
6.9.a The use of ***exotic species*** is contingent on the availability of credible scientific data indicating that any such species is non-invasive and its application does not pose a risk to native biodiversity.	C	ICF does not encourage planting of exotic tree species on group member lands nor does ICF provide any exotic tree species for planting. However, occasionally landowners may plant individual trees such as fruit trees for wildlife but typically such plantings are near homes not under scope.
6.9.b If exotic species are used, their provenance and the location of their use are documented, and their ecological effects are actively monitored.	C	Landowners monitor areas where exotics are used. No examples of exotics use was discovered during the 2017 audit. Natural regeneration is the predominate means of regenerating stands followed by planting of native hardwood mixes.
6.9.c The forest owner or manager shall take timely action to curtail or significantly reduce any adverse impacts resulting from their use of exotic species	C	No use of exotics was discovered during the 2017 audit.
6.10. Forest conversion to plantations or non-forest land uses shall not occur, except in		

circumstances where conversion: **a) Entails a very limited portion of the forest management unit; and b) Does not occur on High Conservation Value Forest areas; and c) Will enable clear, substantial, additional, secure, long-term conservation benefits across the forest management unit.**		
Principle #7: A management plan -- appropriate to the scale and intensity of the operations -- shall be written, implemented, and kept up to date. The long-term objectives of management, and the means of achieving them, shall be clearly stated.		
7.1. The management plan and supporting documents shall provide: **a. Management objectives. b) description of the forest resources to be managed, environmental limitations, land use and ownership status, socio-economic conditions, and a profile of adjacent lands.** **b. Description of silvicultural and/or other management system, based on the ecology of the forest in question and information gathered through resource inventories. d) Rationale for rate of annual harvest and species selection. e) Provisions for monitoring of forest growth and dynamics. f) Environmental safeguards based on environmental assessments. g) Plans for the identification and protection of rare, threatened and endangered species.** **b) h) Maps describing the forest resource base including protected areas, planned management activities and land ownership.** **i) Description and justification of harvesting techniques and equipment to be used.**		
7.1.a The management plan identifies the ownership and legal status of the FMU and its resources, including rights held by the owner and rights held by others.		
FF Indicator 7.1.a A written management plan exists for the property or properties for which certification is being sought. The management plan includes the following components: i. Management objectives (ecological, silvicultural, social, and economic) and duration of the plan.	C	The following collection of documents comprise the Management Plan for IFG members: - Management Plan - Natural Heritage Database documentation - Archeological check documentation - Timber sale contracts - Annual Report for each property

Guidance: Objectives relate to the goals expressed by the landowner within the constraints of site capability and the best available data on ecological, silvicultural, social and economic conditions. ii. Quantitative and qualitative description of the forest resources to be managed, including at minimum stand-level descriptions of the land cover, including species and size/age class and referencing inventory information. Guidance: In addition to stand-level descriptions of the land cover, information in site-level plans may include: landscape within which the forest is located; landscape-level considerations; past land uses of the forest; legal history and current status; socio-economic conditions; cultural, tribal and customary use issues and other relevant details that explain or justify management prescriptions. iii. Description of silvicultural and/or other management system, prescriptions, rationale, and typical harvest systems (if applicable) that will be used. iv. Description of harvest limits (consistent with Criterion 5.6) and species selection. Also, description of the documentation considered from the options listed in Criterion 5.6 if the FMU does not have a calculated annual harvest rate. v. Description of environmental assessment and safeguards based on the assessment, including approaches to: (1) pest and weed management, (2) fire management, and (3) protection of riparian management zones; (4) protection of representative samples of existing ecosystems (see Criterion 6.4) and management of High Conservation Value Forests (see Principle 9). Guidance: Regional environmental assessments and safeguards or strategies to address pest and weed management, fire management, protection of rare, threatened, and endangered species and plant community types, protection of riparian management zones, and protecting representative samples of ecosystems and High Conservation Value Forests may be developed by state conservation agencies. Site specific plans for family forests should		- Classified Forest and Wildlands Database (w/ Mapping System) - IFG Umbrella Plan - Classified Forest & Wildlands Procedure Manual - Indiana Logging and Forestry Best Management Practices – 2005 BMP Field Guide. This collection of documents covers the requirements of 7.1.a. ICF has three main documents that make up the FMP, however, there are several supporting documents to the FMP available to group members in Indiana Department of Forestry publication and websites, such as the Indiana Forestry Exchange (http://www.in.gov/dnr/forestryexchange/default.aspx). The three main FMP documents are: Classified Forest & Wildlands Procedures Manual, dated August 2016 (CFWPM), which is a procedural manual for management of group members; Indiana Classified Forest Certified Group: UMBRELLA MANAGEMENT PLAN, dated November 2010 (UMP), which includes several items that demonstrate conformance to FSC requirements at the group level, and group member eligibility and division of responsibilities; and Stewardship Plan (SP), which serves as the FMU-specific FMP for individual group members. See Site notes. i. Management objectives for the group level and group member level are contained in the Introduction and Management Objectives section of the UMP (p. 13). This includes ecological, silvicultural (referred to as Desired Future Conditions), social, and economic objectives. Specific group member level objectives are included on the first page of each group member's SMP, as well as the Area Description & Management Recommendations section.

be consistent with such guidance and may reference those works for clarity. vi. Description of location and protection of rare, threatened, and endangered species and plant community types. vii. Description of procedures to monitor the forest, including forest growth and dynamics, and other components as outlined in Principle 8. viii. Maps represent property boundaries, use rights, land cover types, significant hydrologic features, roads, adjoining land use, and protected areas in a manner that clearly relates to the forest description and management prescriptions. Guidance: Property level maps for family forests may be simple and efficient to produce, and may cover only the necessary information needed for management to the FSC-US Family Forest Standard. At the group level, if GIS is used coverage should include protected areas, planned management activities, land ownership, property boundaries, roads, timber production areas, forest types by age class, topography, soils, cultural and customary use areas, locations of natural communities, habitats of species referred to in Criterion 6.2, riparian zones and analysis capabilities to help identify High Conservation Value Forests. Group managers may rely on state conservation agencies for complex GIS services.		ii. The UMP contains a description of the State of Indiana's forest resources (p.p. 9-11), including historical and present day forest cover as a percentage of land cover type. Inventory data references the US Forest Service's Forest Inventory and Analysis (FIA) data. Forest types classified by dominant species were determined through use of the FIA EVALIDATOR 4.0 tool and FIA data. The Property Overview and Area Description & Management Recommendations sections of the SMP contain specific information on species and size/ age class at the stand level for each group member FMU. DNR reports that landowners usually list timber production and harvesting as a low priority. Therefore, the district foresters don't emphasize inventories or other quantitative data collection unless the landowner expresses an interest in timber management. DNR initiated a system wide continuous forest inventory (CFI) that will allow them to estimate growths and removals on a Classified Forest & Wildland wide basis. They are just wrapping up the 6thyear of CFI. Once this data is analyzed, DNR will have trend data specific to classified forests. iii. Typical silvicultural systems and their rationale are described in the UMP (p.p. 14-16). Special management considerations and other management considerations are also in the UMP (p.p. 17-18). Harvest systems are described in the Harvest Equipment section of the UMP (p.18-19). iv and vii. Species selection based on ecological guild (e.g., shade tolerance, conifer vs. hardwood) is covered in the UMP in both the Forest Types (p. 10-11) Forest Growth & Dynamics Monitoring (p.p. 19-20) sections. ICF relies on FIA data to establish sustainable harvest rates and to monitor forest

		growth and dynamics. The volumes and growth rates are included on p. 11 for ICF as a whole. The Resource Description section of the SMP is where FMU-specific inventory information would be documented for individual group members. ICF supplements the FIA program with Continuous Forest Inventory (CFI). Five regions to sample on ICF group member FMUs have been selected. At the group member level, the establishment of an inventory system depends on the size of the tract and the intensity of management (p.p. 19-20 of UMP). Monitoring of growth on small tracts will be based on qualitative factors due to the light intensity of management. Other monitoring protocols are described in the UMP, including: Monitoring of BMPs (p.23), Game Species (p. 28), and nongame species (p. 28-29), cultural resources (p. 31), pests and invasive species (p.p. 31-33), IPM (p. 2934), and use of non-native species (p.35) The ICFCG contains monitoring protocols for monitoring of group member FMUs. vi. At the group level, ICF uses the Indiana DNR, Division of Nature Preserves' Natural Heritage Data Center to assess for the presence of RTE species on group member FMUs (see p. 29 of UMP). In the SMP, RTE species and sensitive habitats would be described in the Sensitive Area/ Species Protection and Management section. viii. A map of the FMU is included as part of the SMP. Group members may also access mapping resources (e.g., NRCS soil mapper) via the Indiana Forestry Exchange Website. ICF also maintains several maps at the state, district, and FMU level that show water courses, land cover, roads, property boundaries, protected areas, etc.).

7.1.b The management plan describes the history of land use and past management, current forest types and associated development, size class and/or successional stages, and natural disturbance regimes that affect the FMU (see Indicator 6.1.a).		
FF Indicator 7.1.b Actions undertaken on the FMU are consistent with the management plan and help to achieve the stated goals and objectives of the plan.	C	DoF continues to work with federal partners to find funding to incentivize landowners to implement more management activities. Young Forests Initiative is a grant cost share program to make openings for younger age classes. Landowners will receive payments for making openings. DoF is also a partner on the Hoosier Hills & Highlands Joint Chief project that if funded will provide money through EQIP to fund control of invasives, planting of oaks, erosion control, riparian buffers, and pruning. The FSC indicator requires that, "Actions undertaken on the FMU are consistent with the management plan and help to achieve the stated goals and objectives of the plan." During the 2017 site visits, nearly all the implemented practices observed by the auditor (harvests, TSI, invasive species control, etc.) were included in the forest management plans. In situations where the owners do something not in the plan, the owner had been sent a notice of nonconformity and corrective actions that are required.
7.1.c The management plan describes: a) current conditions of the timber and non-timber forest resources being managed; b) desired future conditions; c) historical ecological conditions; and d) applicable management objectives and activities to move the FMU toward desired future conditions. FF Indicator: Inapplicable. All requirements have been incorporated into Family Forest Indicator 7.1.a.	NA	All requirements have been incorporated into Family Forest Indicator 7.1.a.
7.1.d The management plan includes a description of the landscape within which the FMU is located and describes how landscape-scale habitat elements described in	NA	All requirements have been incorporated into Family Forest Indicator 7.1.a.

Criterion 6.3 will be addressed. FF Indicator: Inapplicable. All requirements have been incorporated into Family Forest Indicator 7.1.a.		
7.1.e The management plan includes a description of the following resources and outlines activities to conserve and/or protect: • rare, threatened, or endangered species and natural communities (see Criterion 6.2); • plant species and community diversity and wildlife habitats (see Criterion 6.3); • water resources (see Criterion 6.5); • soil resources (see Criterion 6.3); • Representative Sample Areas (see Criterion 6.4); • High Conservation Value Forests (see Principle 9); • Other special management areas. FF Indicator: Inapplicable. All requirements have been incorporated into Family Forest Indicator 7.1.a.	NA	All requirements have been incorporated into Family Forest Indicator 7.1.a.
7.1.f If invasive species are present, the management plan describes invasive species conditions, applicable management objectives, and how they will be controlled (see Indicator 6.3.j). FF Indicator: Inapplicable. All requirements have been incorporated into Family Forest Indicator 7.1.a.	NA	All requirements have been incorporated into Family Forest Indicator 7.1.a.
7.1.g The management plan describes insects and diseases, current or anticipated outbreaks on forest conditions and management goals, and how insects and diseases will be managed (see Criteria 6.6 and 6.8). FF Indicator: Inapplicable. All requirements have been incorporated into Family Forest Indicator 7.1.a.	NA	All requirements have been incorporated into Family Forest Indicator 7.1.a.
7.1.h If chemicals are used, the plan describes what is being used, applications, and how the management system conforms with Criterion 6.6. FF Indicator: Inapplicable. All requirements have been incorporated into Family Forest Indicator 7.1.a.	NA	All requirements have been incorporated into Family Forest Indicator 7.1.a.
7.1.i If biological controls are used, the management plan describes what is being used, applications, and how the management system conforms with Criterion 6.8. FF Indicator: Inapplicable. All requirements have been incorporated into Family Forest Indicator 7.1.a.	NA	All requirements have been incorporated into Family Forest Indicator 7.1.a.
7.1.j The management plan incorporates the results of the evaluation of social impacts, including:	NA	All requirements have been incorporated into Family Forest Indicator 7.1.a.

• traditional cultural resources and rights of use (see Criterion 2.1); • potential conflicts with customary uses and use rights (see Criteria 2.2, 2.3, 3.2); • management of ceremonial, archeological, and historic sites (see Criteria 3.3 and 4.5); • management of aesthetic values (see Indicator 4.4.a); • public access to and use of the forest, and other recreation issues; • local and regional socioeconomic conditions and economic opportunities, including creation and/or maintenance of quality jobs (see Indicators 4.1.b and 4.4.a), local purchasing opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.e), and participation in local development opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.g). FF Indicator: Inapplicable. All requirements have been incorporated into Family Forest Indicator 7.1.a.		
7.1.k The management plan describes the general purpose, condition and maintenance needs of the transportation network (see Indicator 6.5.e). FF Indicator: Inapplicable. All requirements have been incorporated into Family Forest Indicator 7.1.a.	NA	All requirements have been incorporated into Family Forest Indicator 7.1.a.
7.1.l The management plan describes the silvicultural and other management systems used and how they will sustain, over the long term, forest ecosystems present on the FMU. FF Indicator: Inapplicable. All requirements have been incorporated into Family Forest Indicator 7.1.a.	NA	All requirements have been incorporated into Family Forest Indicator 7.1.a.
7.1.m The management plan describes how species selection and harvest rate calculations were developed to meet the requirements of Criterion 5.6. FF Indicator: Inapplicable. All requirements have been incorporated into Family Forest Indicator 7.1.a.	NA	All requirements have been incorporated into Family Forest Indicator 7.1.a.
7.1.n The management plan includes a description of monitoring procedures necessary to address the requirements of Criterion 8.2. FF Indicator: Inapplicable. All requirements have been incorporated into Family Forest Indicator 7.1.a.	NA	All requirements have been incorporated into Family Forest Indicator 7.1.a.
7.1.o The management plan includes maps describing the resource base, the characteristics of general management	NA	All requirements have been incorporated into Family Forest Indicator 7.1.a.

zones, special management areas, and protected areas at a level of detail to achieve management objectives and protect sensitive sites. FF Indicator: Inapplicable. All requirements have been incorporated into Family Forest Indicator 7.1.a.		
7.1.p The management plan describes and justifies the types and sizes of harvesting machinery and techniques employed on the FMU to minimize or limit impacts to the resource. FF Indicator: Inapplicable. All requirements have been incorporated into Family Forest Indicator 7.1.a.	NA	All requirements have been incorporated into Family Forest Indicator 7.1.a.
7.1.q Plans for harvesting and other significant site-disturbing management activities required to carry out the management plan are prepared prior to implementation. Plans clearly describe the activity, the relationship to objectives, outcomes, any necessary environmental safeguards, health and safety measures, and include maps of adequate detail. FF Indicator: Inapplicable. All requirements have been incorporated into Family Forest Indicator 7.1.a.	NA	All requirements have been incorporated into Family Forest Indicator 7.1.a.
7.1.r The management plan describes the stakeholder consultation process. FF Indicator: Inapplicable. All requirements have been incorporated into Family Forest Indicator 7.1.a.	NA	All requirements have been incorporated into Family Forest Indicator 7.1.a.
7.2 The management plan shall be periodically revised to incorporate the results of monitoring or new scientific and technical information, as well as to respond to changing environmental, social and economic circumstances.		
7.2.a The management plan is kept up to date. It is reviewed on an ongoing basis and is updated whenever necessary to incorporate the results of monitoring or new scientific and technical information, as well as to respond to changing environmental, social and economic circumstances. At a minimum, a full revision occurs every 10 years.	C	The most recent versions of the Umbrella Management Plan (UMP) and Stewardship Plan (SP) were modified during the past two years. Information on tree retention, invasive species, and endangered or threatened species (such as bats) are included in recent revisions. DoF is exploring and implementing new digital mapping and planning tools. ICFCG's management planning documents are up-to-date with the requirements of the FSC US standard.

		The Umbrella Plan is updated every 10 years, and property forest management plans are updated every 5 years. Information on tree retention, invasive species, and endangered or threatened species (such as bats) are included. DoF has implemented new digital mapping and planning tools. ICFCG's management planning documents are up-to-date with the requirements of the FSC US standard. The SP template was updated in 2016-2017 to include new language required by USFS grant programs. Training for staff is emphasized to maintain their knowledge base to incorporate into management plans or discussions with landowners. Invasive species control, herbicide applicators license, and bat management are three examples of consistent knowledge demonstrated during interviews and in application during the 2017 audit. Annual meetings are held with a strong training component involving both external and internal experts. These Division meetings brings in external speakers on topics determined by administrative staff and takes in requests for forestry staff. Section meetings, instituted new program training by District Foresters who are considered internal experts. For example, a TSI expert and an urban forester for tree management (hazard trees) were brought in as speakers. District foresters with expertise in herbaceous identification provided trained for other staff foresters. Additionally, DNR started a "traveling forester" program where District Foresters go visit other Districts for cross-training. The training program offered to foresters by the DNR is robust and noteworthy.
7.3 Forest workers shall receive adequate training and supervision to ensure proper implementation of the management plans.		

7.3.a Workers are qualified to properly implement the management plan; All forest workers are provided with sufficient guidance and supervision to adequately implement their respective components of the plan.	C (OBS)	The Division of Forestry has implemented a certification training program for professional foresters and industry. The training reviews Indiana Classified Forest Certified Group policies such as management plans, legacy trees, wildlife trees, BMPs, rutting guidelines, chemical use, shares sales, reporting and conducting a pre-harvest conference. The first training was held in 2015 with 32 participants. After this initial broad scale training, the IDNR has been scheduling one-on-one trainings as needed and as requested. Approximately 25 trainings were held in 2016. Trainings are recorded in spreadsheet, Revision of DNR's pre-harvest assessment to authorize trained consulting foresters to conduct the reviews is improving information sharing. Interviews with consulting foresters and loggers during 2017 that they had received copies of the parcels' plans. See OBS 2017.2 for further detail.
7.4 While respecting the confidentiality of information, forest managers shall make publicly available a summary of the primary elements of the management plan, including those listed in Criterion 7.1.		
7.4.a While respecting landowner confidentiality, the management plan or a management plan summary that outlines the elements of the plan described in Criterion 7.1 is available to the public either at no charge or a nominal fee.	C	The UMP is available on the Indiana Department of Forestry website. The SMP template is available upon request from DNR staff. Other management planning documents are available upon request. These contain the primary elements of C7.1.
7.4.b Managers of public forests make draft management plans, revisions and supporting documentation easily accessible for public review and comment prior to their implementation. Managers address public comments and modify the plans to ensure compliance with this Standard.	C	ICFCG does not have any group members with public FMUs.
Principle #8: Monitoring shall be conducted -- appropriate to the scale and intensity of forest management -- to assess the condition of the forest, yields of forest products, chain of custody, management activities and their social and environmental impacts.		

Applicability Note: On small and medium-sized forests (see Glossary), an informal, qualitative assessment may be appropriate. Formal, quantitative monitoring is required on large forests and/or intensively managed forests.		
8.1 The frequency and intensity of monitoring should be determined by the scale and intensity of forest management operations, as well as, the relative complexity and fragility of the affected environment. Monitoring procedures should be consistent and replicable over time to allow comparison of results and assessment of change.	NE	
8.2. Forest management should include the research and data collection needed to monitor, at a minimum, the following indicators: a) yield of all forest products harvested, b) growth rates, regeneration, and condition of the forest, c) composition and observed changes in the flora and fauna, d) environmental and social impacts of harvesting and other operations, and e) cost, productivity, and efficiency of forest management.		
8.2.a.1 For all commercially harvested products, an inventory system is maintained. The inventory system includes at a minimum: a) species, b) volumes, c) stocking, d) regeneration, and e) stand and forest composition and structure; and f) timber quality.	C	Section "Forest Growth & Dynamics Monitoring" in the group plan describes group manager and group member monitoring roles. In addition to FIA & CFI plot establishment and monitoring, DoF conducts regular BMP monitoring on 10% of reported harvest sites annually. All parcels in the Classified Forest & Wildlands Program are visited and reviewed every five - seven years by a District Forester. Group members are responsible for informal, qualitative monitoring of forest conditions.
8.2.a.2 Significant, unanticipated removal or loss or increased vulnerability of forest resources is monitored and recorded. Recorded information shall include date and location of occurrence, description of disturbance, extent and severity of loss, and may be both quantitative and qualitative.	C	Monitoring of unanticipated loss occurs through: • Indiana DoF Forest Health Surveys (aerial surveys) • Landowner identification resulting in visit from District Forester or consultant. • Forest inventory prior to and following harvest activities • Indiana Conservation Officers investigate cases of timber theft in which unsuspecting landowners are victimized by individuals whose business practices are dishonest or illegal.
8.2.b The forest owner or manager maintains records of harvested timber and NTFPs (volume and product and/or	C	Annual reports collected by DoF from each landowner in the program collect harvest data, including number of trees harvested, board foot

grade). Records must adequately ensure that the requirements under Criterion 5.6 are met.		volume, and species. Although landowners do not always provide the information, an adequate system is in place to monitor annual removals. During 2015 site visits, interviews with two landowners indicated they keep very detailed records of costs and incomes to support cost sharing requests and for tax purposes.
8.2.c The forest owner or manager periodically obtains data needed to monitor presence on the FMU of: 1) Rare, threatened and endangered species and/or their ***habitats***; 2) Common and rare plant communities and/or habitat; 3) Location, presence and abundance of invasive species; 4) Condition of protected areas, set-asides and buffer zones; 5) High Conservation Value Forests (see Criterion 9.4).	C	DoF periodically monitors habitat conditions for all plants and animals as part of its periodic inventory of forest stand types and stocking levels. The location and status of invasive species is routinely monitored by field foresters. DoF works with the Division of Nature Preserves to monitor the condition of protected areas and set-asides.
8.2.d.1 Monitoring is conducted to ensure that site specific plans and operations are properly implemented, environmental impacts of site disturbing operations are minimized, and that harvest prescriptions and guidelines are effective.	C	Such monitoring occurs and is described in the DoF Classified Forest & Wildlands Procedures Manual and the Group Umbrella Plan. A sample of 10% of harvest sites are monitored for BMP impacts annually. All harvest sites are subject to close-out inspections.
8.2.d.2 A monitoring program is in place to assess the condition and environmental impacts of the forest-road system.	C	Such monitoring occurs and is described in the DoF Classified Forest & Wildlands Procedure Manual and the Group Umbrella Plan. All harvest sites are subject to close-out inspections.
8.2.d.3 The landowner or manager monitors relevant socio-economic issues (see Indicator 4.4.a), including the social impacts of harvesting, participation in local economic opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.g), the creation and/or maintenance of quality job opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.b), and local purchasing opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.e).	C	Addressed in the Indiana Statewide Forest Assessment & Strategy. The 2015 DNR Forestry Strategic Plan addresses these requirements.
8.2.d.4 Stakeholder responses to management activities are monitored and recorded as necessary.	C	See Family Forest applicability note and DoF determination of NA.
8.2.d.5 Where sites of cultural significance exist, the opportunity to jointly monitor sites of cultural	C	The Division of Forestry has an archeologist who screens about 150 data requests per year for active management proposals on Classified Forests. DoF

significance is offered to tribal representatives (see Principle 3).		partners with the DNR Division of Historic Preservation and Archeology in outreach to tribal representatives.
8.2.e The forest owner or manager monitors the costs and revenues of management in order to assess productivity and efficiency.	C	Timber management activities on non-industrial properties are structured and monitored to ensure revenue is sufficient to pay for the logging costs and the consulting forester. Land owners use simple cost-benefit calculations to determine efficiency of their overall management choices (i.e., enroll in Classified Forests and manage for timber products). Since DNR is a public agency, its budget and services receive close scrutiny by the state legislature and executive branch. The 2015 Forestry Strategic Plan assesses DoF costs and revenues related to the Classified Forest & WildlandsProgram. Landowners who receive EQIP or CRP cost sharing are subject to USDA audits.
8.3 Documentation shall be provided by the forest manager to enable monitoring and certifying organizations to trace each forest product from its origin, a process known as the "chain of custody."	NE	
8.4 The results of monitoring shall be incorporated into the implementation and revision of the management plan.	NE	
8.5 While respecting the confidentiality of information, forest managers shall make publicly available a summary of the results of monitoring indicators, including those listed in Criterion 8.2.	NE	
Principle #9: Management activities in high conservation value forests shall maintain or enhance the attributes which define such forests. Decisions regarding high conservation value forests shall always be considered in the context of a precautionary approach. **High Conservation Value Forests are those that possess one or more of the following attributes:** **a) Forest areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant: concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g., endemism, endangered species, refugia); and/or large landscape level forests, contained within, or containing the management unit, where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance**		

b) Forest areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems

c) Forest areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g., watershed protection, erosion control)

d) Forest areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g., subsistence, health) and/or critical to local communities' traditional cultural identity (areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in cooperation with such local communities).

Examples of forest areas that *may have* high conservation value attributes include, but are not limited to:
Central Hardwoods:

- Old growth – (see Glossary) (a)
- Old forests/mixed age stands that include trees >160 years old (a)
- Municipal watersheds –headwaters, reservoirs (c)
- Rare, Threatened, and Endangered (RTE) ecosystems, as defined by GAP analysis, Natural Heritage Inventory, and/or the World Wildlife Fund's Forest Communities of Highest Conservation Concern, and/or Great Lakes Assessment (b)
- Intact forest blocks in an agriculturally dominated landscape (refugia) (a)
- Intact forests >1000 ac (valuable to interior forest species) (a)
- Protected caves (a, b, or d)
- Savannas (a, b, c, or d)
- Glades (a, b, or d)
- Barrens (a, b, or d)
- Prairie remnants (a, b, or d)

North Woods/Lake States:

- Old growth – (see Glossary) (a)
- Old forests/mixed age stands that include trees >120 years old (a)
- Blocks of contiguous forest, > 500 ac, which host RTEs (b)
- Oak savannas (b)
- Hemlock-dominated forests (b)
- Pine stands of natural origin (b)
- Contiguous blocks, >500 ac, of late successional species, that are managed to create old growth (a)
- Fens, particularly calcareous fens (c)
- Other non-forest communities, e.g., barrens, prairies, distinctive geological land forms, vernal pools (b or c)
- Other sites as defined by GAP analysis, Natural Heritage Inventory, and/or the World Wildlife Fund's Forest Communities of Highest Conservation Concern (b)

Note: In the Lake States-Central Hardwoods region, old growth (see Glossary) is both rare and invariably an HCVF.

In the Lake States-Central Hardwoods region, cutting timber is not permitted in old-growth stands or forests.

Note: Old forests (see Glossary) may or may not be designated HCVFs. They are managed to maintain or recruit: (1) the existing abundance of old trees and (2) the landscape- and stand-level structures of old-growth forests, consistent with the composition and structures produced by natural processes. *Old forests that either have or are developing old-growth attributes, but which have been previously harvested, may be designated HCVFs and may be harvested under special plans that account for the ecological attributes that make it an HCVF.* *Forest management maintains a mix of sub-climax and climax old-forest conditions in the landscape.*		
9.1 Assessment to determine the presence of the attributes consistent with High Conservation Value Forests will be completed, appropriate to scale and intensity of forest management.	NE	
9.1.c A summary of the assessment results and management strategies (see Criterion 9.3) is included in the management plan summary that is made available to the public.	C	A summary of ecological communities or habitat types identified as HCVF, as well as a process for identifying HCVF as land is added to the certified group, is described in the Umbrella Plan, p.35-38. Although management strategies are generally described and understood there is not a summary of management strategies for HCVF by designated attributes in a summary document available to the public. See closure of OBS 2016.3 for additional detail.
9.2 The consultative portion of the certification process must place emphasis on the identified conservation attributes, and options for the maintenance thereof.	NE	
9.3 The management plan shall include and implement specific measures that ensure the maintenance and/or enhancement of the applicable conservation attributes consistent with the precautionary approach. These measures shall be specifically included in the publicly available management plan summary.	NE	
9.4 Annual monitoring shall be conducted to assess the effectiveness of the measures employed to maintain or enhance the applicable conservation attributes.	NE	
Principle #10: Plantations shall be planned and managed in accordance with Principles and Criteria 1-9, and Principle 10 and its Criteria. While plantations can provide an array of social and economic benefits, and can contribute to satisfying the world's needs for forest products, they should complement the management of, reduce pressures on, and promote the restoration and conservation of natural forests.		

Principle 10 is determined by the audit team to be not applicable to the evaluation of the FME as the type of silviculture practiced on the state forestlands, and the forest conditions that result from these practices, do not meet the FSC definition of "plantation forest management."

Appendix 6 – Chain of Custody Indicators for FMEs

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

Appendix 7 – Group Management Program

Group Conformance Table

Requirement		C/ NC	Comment/CAR
Group Management			
PART 1 QUALITY SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS			
C1 General Requirements		NE	
C2 Responsibilities		NE	
C3 Group entity's procedures			
3.1 The Group entity shall establish, implement and maintain written procedures for Group membership covering all applicable requirements of this standard, according to scale and complexity of the group including:			
I.	Organizational structure;	NE	
II.	Responsibilities of the Group entity and the Group members including main activities to fulfill such responsibilities (i.e. Development of management plans, sales and marketing of FSC products, harvesting, planting, monitoring, etc);	NE	
III.	Rules regarding eligibility for membership to the Group;	NE	
IV.	Rules regarding withdrawal/ suspension of members from the Group;	NE	
V.	Clear description of the process to fulfill any corrective action requests issued internally and by the certification body	C	The issuance of corrective actions and the decisions to create timelines to fulfill them are described beginning on p.7 of the Umbrella Plan. The Guidance table

including timelines and implications if any of the corrective actions are not complied with;		provides further description of how to issue corrective actions for specific nonconformities. In 2015-2016, following the 2015 audit, DNR revised the INFRMs database system to improve tracking of internal CARs. Auditor verified INFRMs implementation in the database for tracking such CARs and **closed OBS 2015.4.**
VI. Documented procedures for the inclusion of new Group members;		This is included in the *Group Enrollment* section of the Umbrella Plan.
VII. Complaints procedure for Group members.		Complaint procedure is in Umbrella Plan.
3.2 The Group entity's procedures shall be sufficient to establish an efficient internal control system ensuring that all members are fulfilling applicable requirements.	NE	
3.3 The Group entity shall define the personnel responsible for each procedure together with the qualifications or training measures required for its implementation.	NE	
3.4 The Group entity or the certification body shall evaluate every applicant for membership of the Group and ensure that there are no major nonconformities with applicable requirements of the Forest Stewardship Standard, and with any additional requirements for membership of the Group, prior to being granted membership of the Group. NOTE: for applicants complying with SLIMF eligibility criteria for size, the initial evaluation may be done through a desk audit.	NE	
C4 Informed consent of Group members	NE	
C5 Group Records		Documents: State Form 52521 CF&WP Annual Report form; Logo approval records by SCS; Off-Product FSC Logo tracking sample; Indiana Classified Forest Certified Group Departure Request Form; FSC information form for landowner members (requirements); State Form 55101 (9-12) Green Certification Benefit Decision – opt in/out form (authorization, agree to comply membership, umbrella plan, FSC.
5.1 The group entity shall maintain complete and up-to-date records covering all applicable requirements of this standard. These shall include:		

NOTE: The amount of data that is maintained centrally by the Group entity may vary from case to case. In order to reduce costs of evaluation by the certification body, and subsequent monitoring by FSC, data should be stored centrally wherever possible.		
i. List of names and contact details of Group members, together with dates of entering and leaving the Group scheme, reason for leaving, and the type of forest ownership per member;	C	Tracked in INFRMS database.
ii. Any records of training provided to staff or Group members, relevant to the implementation of this standard or the applicable Forest Stewardship Standard;	C	This is tracked in INFRMS. Examination in 2016 found that the documentation of trainings has not occurred since 2013 for 2/3 of the staff checked. In 2017, auditor confirmed the database has been appropriately updated. See closure of **OBS 2016.5.**
iii. A map or supporting documentation describing or showing the location of the member's forest properties;	C	The location of group member properties is included on maps within the Umbrella Plan. Group members must have a legal parcel description in order to join the group, thus ensuring that coordinates and area of each FMU are known. Maps of group member properties are also stored in physical files at each District Office. Maps of properties is also available in INFRMS.
iv. Evidence of consent of all Group members;	C	The signature page for consent is stored in each group member's file at district offices. Verified in 2017 by review of folders of the majority of sites visited.
v. Documentation and records regarding recommended practices for forest management (i.e. silvicultural systems);	C	Typical silvicultural systems are described in the UMP , as well as in individual group member stewardship plans. Harvest records are included in Annual Reports. Harvest history is also documented in updates to each group member's SMP.
vi. Records demonstrating the implementation of any internal control or monitoring systems. Such records shall include records of internal inspections, non-compliances identified in such inspections, actions taken to correct any such non-compliance;	C	Annual Reports, correspondence, inspection and re-inspection reports, withdrawal forms, and certification departure requests are stored in district offices for each group member. Inspection and re-inspection reports list identified non-compliances and actions taken to correct non-compliances.
viii. Records of the estimated annual overall FSC production and annual FSC sales of the Group.	C	Tracked through annual reports as entered into INFRMS.
5.2 Group records shall be retained for at least five (5) years.	C	The 5 year requirement is stipulated for COC procedures in the Umbrella Plan for group members conducting certified sales. Procedures stipulate that the

		group entity shall maintain records of Annual Reports for a minimum of 10 years. Some documents (e.g., original application) are kept for 15 years or indefinitely in hard files at each District office.
5.3 Group entities shall not issue any kind of certificates or declarations to their group members that could be confused with FSC certificates. Group member certificates may however be requested from the certification body.	C	ICFCG does not issue any kind of certificates or declarations to its group members that could be confused with FSC certificates.
PART 2 GROUP FEATURES		
C6 Group Size	NE	
C7 Multinational groups	NA	Non applicable, this is a fully US based group with all group member properties located within the state of Indiana.
PART 3 INTERNAL MONITORING		
C8 Monitoring requirements	NE	
C9 Sales of forest products and use of the FSC trademark	NE	

Group Members

Adobe Acrobat Document

1Group Member List – ICFCG