

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

Ohio DNR Division of Forestry

SCS-FM/COC-00130N

ODNR-Division of Forestry
2045 Morse Road, Bldg H-1
Columbus, Ohio 43229-6693
Chad.Sanders@dnr.state.oh.us

CERTIFIED	EXPIRATION
6 January 2011	5 January 2016

DATE OF FIELD AUDIT
23-25 October 2013
DATE OF LAST UPDATE
10 March 2014

SCS Contact:

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

SCS global
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			
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 st annual audit	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 nd annual audit	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 rd annual audit	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 th annual audit
Name of Forest Management Enterprise (FME) and abbreviation used in this report:			
Ohio Department of Natural Resources, Division of Forestry (ODNR)			

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

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

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

Organization of the Report

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

Table of Contents

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY	4
1. GENERAL INFORMATION	4
1.1 Annual Audit Team.....	4
1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation	5
1.3 Standards Employed	5
2 ANNUAL AUDIT DATES AND ACTIVITIES	5
2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities	5
2.2 Evaluation of Management Systems	8
3. CHANGES IN MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	9
4. RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION.....	9
4.1 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations	9
4.2 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations	11
5. STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS	13
5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted	13
5.2 Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Responses from the Team, Where Applicable	14
6. CERTIFICATION DECISION	14
7. CHANGES IN CERTIFICATION SCOPE	14
8. ANNUAL DATA UPDATE	18
8.1 Social Information.....	18
8.2 Annual Summary of Pesticide and Other Chemical Use	19
SECTION B – APPENDICES (CONFIDENTIAL).....	20
Appendix 1 – List of FMUs Selected For Evaluation.....	20
Appendix 2 – List of Stakeholders Consulted.....	20
Appendix 3 – Additional Audit Techniques Employed.....	21
Appendix 4 – Pesticide Derogations	21
Appendix 5 – Detailed Observations.....	21
Appendix 6 – Chain of Custody Indicators for FMEs.....	27

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY

1. General Information

1.1 Annual Audit Team

Auditor Name:	Brendan Grady	Auditor role:	FSC Lead Auditor
Qualifications:	Mr. Grady is the Director, Forest Management Certification for SCS. In that role, he provides daily management and quality control for the program. He participated as a team member and lead auditor in forest certification audits throughout the United States, Europe, and South East Asia. Brendan has a B.S. in Forestry from the University of California, Berkeley, and a Juris Doctorate from the University of Washington School of Law. Brendan is a member of the State Bar of California, and was an attorney in private practice focusing on environmental law before taking his current role at SCS.		
Auditor Name:	Mike Ferrucci	Auditor role:	Team Auditor, FSC; Lead Auditor SFI
Qualifications:	<p>Mike Ferrucci is the SFI Program Manager for NSF – International Strategic Registrations and is responsible for all aspects of the firm’s SFI Certification programs. He is qualified as a RAB-QSA Lead Auditor (ISO 14001 Environmental Management Systems), as an SFI Lead Auditor for Forest Management, Procurement, and Chain of Custody, as an FSC Lead Auditor Forest Management and Chain of Custody, as a Tree Farm Group Certification Lead Auditor, and as a GHG Lead Auditor. Mike has led Sustainable Forest Initiative (SFI) certification and precertification reviews throughout the United States. He has also led or participated in joint SFI and Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) certification projects in nearly one dozen states and a joint scoping or precertification gap-analysis project on tribal lands throughout the United States. He also co-led the pioneering pilot dual evaluation of the Lakeview Stewardship Unit on the Fremont-Winema National Forest.</p> <p>Mike Ferrucci has 33 years of forest management experience. His expertise is in sustainable forest management planning; in certification of forests as sustainably managed; in the application of easements for large-scale working forests, and in the ecology, silviculture, and management of mixed species forests, with an emphasis on regeneration and management of native hardwood species. Mike has conducted or participated in assessments of forest management operations throughout the United States, with field experience in 4 countries and 33 states. Mike has been a member of the Society of American Foresters for over thirty-five years. He is Past Chair of the SFI Auditor’s Forum. Mike is also a Lecturer at the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, where he has taught graduate courses and workshops in forest management, harvesting operations, professional forest ethics, private forestry, and financial analysis.</p>		

1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation

A. Number of days spent on-site assessing the applicant:	3
B. Number of auditors participating in on-site evaluation:	2
C. Additional days spent on preparation, stakeholder consultation, and post-site follow-up:	1
D. Total number of person days used in evaluation:	7

1.3 Standards Employed

1.3.1. Applicable FSC-Accredited Standards

Title	Version	Date of Finalization
FSC US Forest Management Standard	1.0	July 2010
All standards employed are available on the websites of FSC International (www.fsc.org), the FSC-US (www.fscus.org) or the SCS Standards page (www.scsglobalservices.com/certification-standards-and-program-documents). Standards are also available, upon request, from SCS Global Services (www.SCSGlobalServices.com).		

2 Annual Audit Dates and Activities

2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities

Date: Wednesday October 23, 2013	
FMU / Location / sites visited	Activities / notes
Chillicothe Regional Office	<p>Opening Meeting, Program Overview</p> <p>Changes since last audit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Law enforcement is now handled through the parks department, with linkages between Ohio Division of Forestry administrators at the district level and Law Enforcement Supervisors at the district level within parks • Very minor land purchase and trades; still 200,000 acres • Oil and gas drilling is still under consideration; some activity with oil/gas pipelines • New annual work plan each year; new wilderness plan • Proposed revision to management of the backcountry area on the Shawnee State Forest; designated in 1999, closed public vehicle travel roads, walk-in only at the time, have since considered re-opening road, but based on public input (against) the proposal was table and the road will remain closed. Ohio Division of Forestry has decided to revisit the issue when the back country management plan is next revised (not scheduled for revision).
Zaleski State Forest	<p>Site #1, Compartment A 16, Sale Agreement #1224 Reviewed cutting section 3, clearcut with retention blocks, and Cutting Section 4, thinning. Documentation followed Ohio State Forest Land Management Manual and included BMPs and requirements for trained logger.</p> <p>Site #2, Fire and Fire Surrogate Study, Long Ridge State Forest Road</p>

	<p>Site #3, Long Ridge State Forest Road: Built and maintained to meet BMPs.</p> <p>Site #4, Compartment B 6, Sale Agreement #1317 Deferment harvest 29 acres, 272 mbf, 675 tons. BMPs are required by contract and were installed on site, including waterbars and brush on skid roads, stabilized crossing of intermittent stream by removing culvert and fill, restoring channel, smoothing banks and applying straw and seed. Interviewed harvesting contractor confirming sale supervision by Ohio Division of Forestry and that he has a current Ohio Master Logger certification.</p> <p>Site #5, Compartment B 13/14, Ten-Spot Road This multiple cutting unit sale is prepared but not yet advertised for sale. Reviewed marking in two units: a 9-acre clearcutting unit with retention along the drainage, and a unit marked as a light intermediate thinning to maintain oak in a vigorous condition.</p> <p>Site #6, Dolittle Plantation: Some portions of this reserved site were planted in 1908; the site has signs, trails, and some of the largest, tallest pine trees in Ohio.</p>
<p>Date: Thursday October 24, 2013</p>	
<p>FMU / Location / sites visited</p>	<p>Activities / notes</p>
<p>Shawnee State Forest</p>	<p>Site #1, Pond Run State Forest Road #1 Culvert #28 replacement as part of a large project implemented by the Ohio DOT. A double-wall, smooth-interior plastic culvert replaces the previous metal pipe which had corroded. The headwall for the culvert is robust and was constructed by pouring cement into forms.</p> <p>Site #2, Compartments B20 and B21, Sale #1216 Completed 43 acres of clearcuts with retention in 3 cutting sections. Auditors reviewed documentation against the requirements in the Ohio State Forest Land Management Manual and confirmed that guidelines were followed, including retention patches.</p> <p>Site #3, Road 23 providing access to Sale #1404 Herbicide treatment using glyphosate to control invasive bush honeysuckle. Low volume application by low-pressure spraying glyphosate to recently-cut stumps. Confirmed training, assessment, suitable methods of application, and post-treatment records.</p> <p>Site #4, Sale #1404 Recently sold timber in multiple units, some modified to protect potential rattlesnake habitat following consultation with specialists from the Division of Wildlife. Review of maps showing initial harvest layout and then the revised harvest layout confirmed that one unit</p>

	<p>was removed from treatment and other units had their boundaries modified to implement suggestions from specialists.</p> <p>Site #5, Upper Twin Road Viewed two different land management zones, wilderness and backcountry management, from a state forest road. Visually there is no apparent difference, as both areas appeared natural.</p> <p>Site #6, Lampblack Road Culvert replacement and maintenance on the Lampblack Bridle Trail/Service Road that is used for horseback riding, walking, and for access for property management. The gate is opened during deer gun season for hunters to use this road. Inspected a culvert needing replacement due to corrosion of bottom; this culvert was not replaced as part of the recent, large project because another culvert that had failed was replaced instead. The headwalls for several other replacement culverts were observed; all are high-quality and quite robust.</p> <p>Site #7, Lampblack Road Viewed an impressive, large box-culvert replacement allowing a large intermittent stream to flow un-obstructed.</p> <p>Site #8, Wolf Den Lake Timber Sale The marked thinning in Cutting Section #2 was closely reviewed. This is one unit of a large, multi-unit timber sale under preparation. Contractors marked this unit, which was approved as meeting the written prescription of thinning to basal area 88; the area is zoned for selection silviculture. The marking met specifications, but opportunities to remove undesirable seed sources and to release existing desirable oak seedlings were not taken, possibly because of confusion between thinning and selection treatments.</p> <p>Site #9, Wolf Den Lake Timber Sale Confirmed recognition of and protections for a special site, the ruins of a Civilian Conservation Corp (CCC) camp.</p> <p>Site #10, Fire Salvage Project Area Auditors had concerns about the methods for evaluating the regeneration on this site. A salvage clearcut on about 300 acres was conducted in 2010 following ice damage and a severe wildfire. There has been no assessment of the regeneration nor is there a plan to ensure desirable regeneration within 5 years.</p>
Date:	
FMU / Location / sites visited	Activities / notes
Hocking State Forest	<p>Site #1 (Sale # 1313) Completed deferment harvest, retaining 20-40 basal area on site. Site concerns over gas line crossing - logging equipment required to</p>

	<p>cross in only a single place. Discussed watercourse crossings, installation of a temporary bridge over a perennial stream. Discussed buffer requirements and definitions of ephemeral streams. Presence of rock outcroppings, review of special site designations.</p> <p><i>Site #2 (Need compartment ID)</i> Active logging operation in four separate planted pine stands. Harvest was clearcut without retention in attempt to convert site back to hardwood species mix. Parcel was recently acquired by the state. Logging equipment used cut-to-length system with self-loading forwarder. Review of BMPs, particularly soil protection from harvesting equipment. Use of pole bridge crossing over riparian zone, tops matted down in forwarder roads. Interview with logger, reviewed training procedures, harvesting techniques.</p> <p><i>Site #3 (Need compartment ID)</i> Review of regeneration present in 9 year old clearcut with retention. Oaks present throughout and are beginning to out-compete other hardwoods. Discussion of silvicultural techniques.</p> <p><i>Site #4 (Slump Rock)</i> Rock Climbing/Rappelling area. Largest concentration of rock climbing opportunities in the state. This particular state forest has the heaviest recreation use. Buckeye trail (state trail system) runs throughout forest and adjacent to rock climbing area. Discussed recreation management, possible conflicts between user groups.</p> <p><i>Site #5 Bridle Trail and Buckeye Trail</i> Confirmed management to accommodate varied uses and trails in reasonably-good condition.</p> <p><i>Site #6, Compartment B-10</i> Prepared sale – marked but uncut stand. Multiple different cutting units, including deferment harvest and selection. Selection primarily focused on removing pine component which was beginning to reach maturity. Old homestead site and cellar hole present within the harvest area, had been buffered out. Confirmed that considerable care was taken with sale layout to buffer the bridle trails from much of the proposed harvest activity.</p>
Hocking State Forest	Closing Meeting

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

No major changes occurred in ODNR’s management practices over the past year. The main administrative change was that law enforcement is now being handled through the parks department, with linkages between Ohio Division of Forestry administrators at the district level and Law Enforcement Supervisors at the district level within parks.

4. Results of the Evaluation

4.1 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations

Finding Number: 2012.1	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator: FSC-US indicator 8.3.a	
Non-Conformity: Timber sale documentation (sale advertisements, contracts) use the claims “FSC Pure” and “100% FSC Pure,” instead of the correct claim: FSC 100%.	
Corrective Action Request: FME must ensure that its use of the FSC claim is updated to current language.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	ODNR provided updated documentation showing the correct claim on its timber sale documentation.
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2012.2	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	

FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator: FSC-US indicator 6.10.c	
Background: ODNR is investigating development of gas rights on state forest lands, although no new gas extraction facilities have been developed. In particular, extraction using hydraulic fracturing (or fracking) will require installation of concrete pads and associated equipment up to approximately 5 acres each. This activity would constitute a conversion of forestland to non-forest use, and thus is permissible only if it meets the test in Criterion 6.10. Planned fracking pads would be limited in total area and would not be placed in HCVF areas. However it is unclear how the proposed conversion would result in “clear, substantial, additional, secure, long term forest conservation benefits across the FMU,” as required by the standard.	
Observation: Prior to construction of any fracking pads, ODNR should consider how the forest conversion will result in additional conservation benefits.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	The oil and gas development project was put on hold over the past year, with no new efforts taken by ODNR to investigate these potential opportunities. No drilling or associated development has occurred.
SCS review	This observation should be closed since no activities related to oil and gas development have occurred. The advice contained in the observation remains valid should this process be resumed in the future.
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2012.3	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator: FSC-US indicator 9.4.a	
Background: While planning additional ATV trails on Maumee state forest, trails were laid out to avoid an area of oak savannah marked by the forest manager as “potential HCVF.” Trails were also laid out to avoid a designated lupine HCVF site. After the initial HCVF assessment and designation was conducted prior to certification, there does not appear to be a clear way to evaluate newly identified sites such as this one for formal designation (or rejection) of HCVF status.	
Observation: ODNR should develop a system for assessing whether additional areas on the forest should receive HCVF designation.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	A process is in place for dealing with zone revisions, contained in chapter 3 of the land management manual. The same process would be used for HCVF designations and changes.

SCS review	The existing procedures for changing and designating changes in zone revisions should be sufficient for this need.
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

4.2 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations

Finding Number: 2013.1	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	5.6.c
<p>Non-Conformity: Shawnee state forest suffered a large (3000 acre) fire in 2009. Mortality was uneven throughout the burned area. ODNR conducted a 300 acre salvage harvest post fire. The concern of the auditors is whether this harvested area is being monitored for regeneration to assess whether or not the stand is returning to desired stocking levels. The standard here requires that "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." Currently no monitoring of the area is planned.</p>	
<p>Corrective Action Request: ODNR shall assess whether or not the logged area within the Shawnee fire is returning to desired stocking levels.</p>	
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2013.2	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	5.6.c
Background: Field reviews of marked areas in Shawnee state forest showed opportunities for improvement. The marking met specifications, but opportunities to remove undesirable seed sources and to release existing desirable oak seedlings were not taken, possibly because of confusion between thinning and selection treatments.	
Observation: ODNR could improve silvicultural prescriptions for partial harvesting and thinning in order to promote oak regeneration.	
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2013.3	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	6.5.e.1.d (APP only) and 6.5.e.2
<p>Non-Conformity: ODNR’s streamside protection zones exist for perennial streams, defined as streams marked on 7.5-minute quad maps. This definition came from the previous Appalachia Regional standard. It is unclear whether standard protection measures exist for what ODNR classifies as ephemeral streams. In the current FSC-US national standard, this indicator requires protections zones for “Outer SMZs (Streamside Management Zones), in addition to inner SMZs are established for all intermittent, and perennial streams, as well as other waters.” Specified protection zone widths are described in 6.5.e.1.a.</p> <p>There is no definition in the standard for ephemeral, the term used by ODNR, but intermittent streams are defined as “mapped or unmapped streams that typically flows for less than twelve months of the year and/or that flows below ground for portions of its length.” Thus it appears there is a category of intermittent streams that are not receiving the SMZ protection measures.</p>	

<p>Minor variations from the stated minimum SMZ widths and layout for specific stream segments, wetlands and other water bodies are permitted in limited circumstances, provided the forest owner or manager demonstrates that the alternative configuration maintains the overall extent of the buffers and provides equivalent or greater environmental protection than FSC-US regional requirements for those stream segments, water quality, and aquatic species, based on site-specific conditions and the best available information. This would require that ODNR develop a written set of supporting information including a description of the riparian habitats and species addressed in the alternative configuration. SCS would have to verify that the variations meet these requirements, based on the input of an independent expert in aquatic ecology or closely related field.</p>	
<p>Corrective Action Request: ODNR shall revise its streamside protection zone measures to account for intermittent streams as defined in the standard. Note that there is an option to depart from the rules in the standard provided under 6.5.e.2, which would require that ODNR develop a written set of supporting information per the requirements of this indicator.</p>	
<p>FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i></p>	
<p>SCS review</p>	
<p>Status of CAR:</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Closed</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i></p>

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

Logging 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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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	
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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments:	

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	Ohio Department of Natural Resources (ODNR)-Division of Forestry		
Contact person	Chad Sanders		
Address	ODNR-Division of Forestry 945 ODNR Mohican Rd., 60 Perrysville, OH 44864	Telephone	419.938.6222 ext 13
		Fax	419.938.3104
		e-mail	Chad.Sanders@dnr.state.oh.us
		Website	http://www.dnr.state.oh.us

FSC Sales Information

FSC salesperson	Chad Sanders
------------------------	--------------

Address	ODNR-Division of Forestry 945 ODNR Mohican Rd., 60 Perrysville, OH 44864	Telephone	419.938.6222 ext 13
		Fax	419.938.3104
		e-mail	Chad.Sanders@dnr.state.oh.us
		Website	http://www.dnr.state.oh.us

Scope of Certificate

Certificate Type	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Single FMU		<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple FMU	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Group			
SLIMF (if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/> Small SLIMF certificate		<input type="checkbox"/> Low intensity SLIMF certificate	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Group SLIMF certificate			
# Group Members (if applicable)	n/a			
Number of FMU's in scope of certificate	1 FMU, divided into 21 "state forest" units, totaling 202,927 acres			
Geographic location of non-SLIMF FMU(s)	Latitude: 82deg 57' 55.45" West Longitude: 40deg 03' 33.61" North			
Forest zone	<input type="checkbox"/> Boreal		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Temperate	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Subtropical		<input type="checkbox"/> Tropical	
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is: Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac				
privately managed				
state managed		199,640 acres		
community managed				
Number of FMUs in scope that are:				
less than 100 ha in area	0	100 - 1000 ha in area	0	
1000 - 10 000 ha in area	0	more than 10 000 ha in area	1	
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is included in FMUs that: Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac				
are less than 100 ha in area		0		
are between 100 ha and 1000 ha in area		0		
meet the eligibility criteria as <i>low intensity</i> SLIMF FMUs		0		
Division of FMUs into manageable units:				
Administrative				
State Forest Units	District	Office	Acres	
Beaver Creek	North		1,107	
Blue Rock	South		4,535	
Blue Rock West	South		689	
Brush Creek	South		13,633	
Chapin Forest				
Reservation	North		369	
Dean	South		2,828	
Fernwood	North	X	3,035	
Gifford	South		314	
Harrison	North		1,363	
Hocking	South		9,276	
Maumee	North	X	3,118	

Mohican-Memorial	North	X	4,633	
Perry	South		4,639	
Pike	South	X	11,980	
Vinton Furnace	South		12,332	
Richland Furnace	South		2,504	
Scioto Trail	South	X	9,546	
Shade River	South		2,973	
Shawnee	South	X	64,427	
Sunfish Creek	North		657	
Tar Hollow	South		16,318	
Yellow Creek	North		749	
Zaleski	South	X	28,614	
			199,640	Total DOF State Forests 21 State Forests 1 Forest Reservation managed by third party

Production Forests

Timber Forest Products	Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac
Total area of production forest (i.e. forest from which timber may be harvested)	164,556 acres
Area of production forest classified as 'plantation'	0
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by replanting or by a combination of replanting and coppicing of the planted stems	0
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by natural regeneration, or by a combination of natural regeneration and coppicing of the naturally regenerated stems	164,556 acres
Silvicultural system(s)	Area under type of management
Even-aged management	1,950 acres per year average
Clearcut (clearcut size range)	530 acres per year (17 acre average per site) average.
Shelterwood	320 acres per year average
Other:	1100 acres of intermediate treatments (thinning, or improvement harvests) per year average.
Uneven-aged management	370 acres per year average
Individual tree selection	300 acres per year average
Group selection	70 acres per year average
Other:	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (e.g. nursery, recreation area, windbreak, bamboo, silvo-pastoral system, agro-forestry system, etc.)	
The sustainable rate of harvest (usually Annual Allowable Harvest or AAH where available) of commercial timber (m3 of round wood)	

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	
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:	
Species in scope of joint FM/COC certificate: <i>Scientific/ Latin Name (Common/ Trade Name)</i>	

FSC Product Classification

Timber products		
Product Level 1	Product Level 2	Species
031 Logs/ Wood in the rough	0311 Logs of coniferous wood	
031 Logs/ Wood in the rough	0312 Logs of non-coniferous wood	
Non-Timber Forest Products		
Product Level 1	Product Level 2	Product Level 3 and Species

Conservation Areas

Total area of forest and non-forest land protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for conservation objectives		16156 ac		
High Conservation Value Forest/ Areas				
High Conservation Values present and respective areas:		Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac		
	Code	HCV Type	Description & Location	Area
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV1	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g. endemism, endangered species, refugia).	Cantwell Cliffs area Pine Cr / Conkles Hollow / Crane Hollow Muck Farm prairie remnant Raccoon Creek Bottom Shawnee Wilderness Area Snake Hollow Rock Run	5130 ac
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV2	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant large landscape level forests, contained within, or containing the management unit, where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance.	Raccoon Creek Bottom Muck Farm prairie remnant Shawnee Wilderness Area Oak Openings Restoration	2809 ac
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV3	Forests or areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered	Shawnee Wilderness Area Oak Openings Restoration	6639 ac

		ecosystems.	Mohican zone A - Old Growth Mgmt Mohican zone B- Old Growth Mgmt Mohican zone B - Future Old Growth Mgmt	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV4	Forests or areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g. watershed protection, erosion control).	Beaver Creek watershed Cantwell Cliffs area Pine Cr / Conkles Hollow / Crane Hollow Raccoon Creek Bottom	1571 ac
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV5	Forests or areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g. subsistence, health).	Cultural area	7 ac
<input type="checkbox"/>	HCV6	Forests or areas critical to local communities' traditional cultural identity (areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in cooperation with such local communities).		
Total Area of forest classified as 'High Conservation Value Forest/ Area'				16,156 acres

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

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

8. Annual Data Update

8.1 Social Information

Number of forest workers (including contractors) working in forest within scope of certificate (differentiated by gender):	
75 male workers	18 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

<input type="checkbox"/> <i>FME does not use pesticides.</i>				
Commercial name of pesticide / herbicide	Active ingredient	Quantity applied annually (kg or lbs)	Size of area treated during previous year	Reason for use
Arsenal	Imazapyr	1.25 gallons	15 acres	Invasive Species Control
Roundup	Glyphosate	2.5 gallons	30 acres	Invasive and Herbaceous Weed Control

SECTION B – APPENDICES (CONFIDENTIAL)

Appendix 1 – List of FMUs Selected For Evaluation

FME consists of a single FMU

Appendix 2 – List of Stakeholders Consulted

List of FME Staff Consulted

Name	Title	Contact Information	Consultation method
Gregg Maxfield	District Forester North		
Nate Jester	District Forester South		
Greg Guess	Land Management Administrator		
Chad Sanders	Mohican State Forest		
Dan Balsler	Deputy Chief State Forest		
Dave Glass	Forest Manager, Hocking State Forest		
Charlie Lee	Forester, Hocking State Forest		
Courtney Streithorst	Acting Forest Manager, Zaleski		
Danzel Walker	Forester, Athens Office		
Christopher Kerr	Forest Technician		
Dale Egbert	Shawnee and Brush Creek State Forests Manager		
Jared Craig	Land Management Forester		

List of other Stakeholders Consulted

Name	Organization	Contact Information	Consultation method	Requests Cert. Notf.
Jeff Whitcraft	Whitcraft Logging & Landclearing LLC			
Jimmie White	White's Lumber			

Scott Lewis	District/Wildlife Technician, Scioto Soil and Water Conservation District			
-------------	---	--	--	--

Appendix 3 – Additional Audit Techniques Employed

No additional audit techniques were employed.

Appendix 4 – Pesticide Derogations

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

Appendix 5 – Detailed Observations

Evaluation Year	FSC P&C Reviewed
2010	All – Certification Evaluation
2011	1.5, 2.3, 3.2, 4.2, 4.4, 4.5, 5.6, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.5, 6.9, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 8.1, 8.2, 8.3, 9.1, and 9.4
2012	P1, P2, 3.2, 4.2, 4.4, 5.6, 6.2, 6.3, 6.9, 8.2, 9.4
2013	1.5, 2.3, 3.2, 4.2, 4.4, 5.6, P6, 8.2, P9
2014	

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

REQUIREMENT	C/NC	COMMENT/CAR
P1 Forest management shall respect all applicable laws of the country in which they occur, and international treaties and agreements to which the country is a signatory, and comply with all FSC Principles and Criteria.		
C1.5. Forest management areas should be protected from illegal harvesting, settlement and other unauthorized activities.	C	A change in ODNR’s law enforcement strategy occurred during the past year. Previously the Division of Forestry had its own law enforcement personnel. Under a reorganization, these officers were reassigned to the parks department, which owns and manages a large portion of state land frequently intermixed with the state forests. The new combined law enforcement staff would also have responsibilities over the state forests. There were concerns from the auditors that this would lead to reduced service from law enforcement staff. But on the contrary, ODNR reports

		<p>that coverage has actually increased, since the officers are part of a larger pool and it is easier to find a more local officer than the previous system of 10 officers covering only state forests but spread throughout the whole state.</p> <p>Most commonly reported illegal activities on the state forests are drinking, drug use, and illegal recreation. The mix of unauthorized activities varies somewhat in the northern region closer to the larger state population areas.</p> <p>Signs and gates were regularly observed to be utilized on the state forests during the field audit.</p>
<p>P2 Long-term tenure and use rights to the land and forest resources shall be clearly defined, documented and legally established.</p>		
<p>C2.3. 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.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>There were no significant disputes over tenure. However, any that did occur would be documented extensively as part of the court process.</p>
<p>P3 The legal and customary rights of indigenous peoples to own, use and manage their lands, territories, and resources shall be recognized and respected.</p>		
<p>C3.2. Forest management shall not threaten or diminish, either directly or indirectly, the resources or tenure rights of indigenous peoples.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>As part of the certification process, ODNR has engaged in active outreach to tribes seeking input on management, although there has not been significant response. There are no recognized tribes in Ohio, and receiving feedback from the tribes has been a challenge.</p> <p>Formal training for the forestry staff was held in the past on interacting with tribes. Ongoing distribution of information continues, although there has been little interest on the part of local American Indian groups, recognized or not.</p> <p>ODNR does have some sites of cultural significance related to indigenous groups on their land. The main strategy is to buffer around burial mounds, exclude equipment but cut trees if possible.</p>
<p>P4 Forest management operations shall maintain or enhance the long-term social and economic well-being of forest workers and local communities.</p>		
<p>C4.2. Forest management should meet or exceed all applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of employees and their families.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Evidence of safety concerns by DOF foresters include an agency hazard reduction program, monthly safety meetings, and a safety officer dedicated to each unit.</p> <p>Standard contract requires use of personal protective equipment. Audit team reviewed contract with R&R Logging. Also, master logger status is required for contractors (which has a safety component).</p>
<p>C4.4. 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.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>DOF holds open houses in order to educate the public about their management activities.</p> <p>The most significant concerns from the public over state forest management were proposed revisions to the Shawnee state forest backcountry management</p>

		<p>area. This area had been designated in the 90s, as a walk-in area only, closed to public vehicle travel. The proposal had been to dissolve this area, since the management restrictions had already been surpassed by more recent management restrictions. The plan to dissolve the area was tabled after feedback from stakeholders that this area should receive a wilderness designation (a different and higher level of protection that exists elsewhere in Shawnee). It will be revisited during the next revision of the overall management plan for Shawnee State Forest.</p> <p>Direct neighbors are notified prior to site disturbing activities and post cards are mailed prior to fire treatments. Public notices were reviewed by the team, included in all harvest planning documentation.</p> <p>An appeal process has been developed which allows an initial path for dispute resolution prior to engaging the court system. http://ohiodnr.com/Default.aspx?tabid=22749</p>
<p>P5 Forest management operations shall encourage the efficient use of the forest's multiple products and services to ensure economic viability and a wide range of environmental and social benefits.</p>		
<p>C5.6. The rate of harvest of forest products shall not exceed levels which can be permanently sustained.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>ODNR has continued with their plan to increase harvesting across the forest, although harvested rate are still far below growth. Their target is to harvest 40% of growth annually, but still are not meeting this level. Inventory projections are based on an initial inventory done in 2008, with updates done periodically when cruises occur as part of timber management activities.</p> <p>Shawnee state forest suffered a large (3000 acre) fire in 2009. Mortality was uneven throughout the burned area. ODNR conducted a 300 acre salvage harvest post fire. The concern of the auditors is whether this harvested area is being monitored for regeneration to assess whether or not the stand is returning to desired stocking levels. The standard here requires that "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." Currently no monitoring of the area is planned. CAR 2013.1 was issued.</p> <p>DOFs harvest efforts are in line with their Desired Future Condition, namely increasing the presence of oak in throughout the forest. This strategy is to combat the increase in shade tolerant maples that has occurred over the past century displacing higher valued species. The increase in harvest level, naturally favoring more shade intolerant oaks, furthers this goal.</p> <p>Field reviews of marked areas in Shawnee state forest showed opportunities for improvement. The marking</p>

		met specifications, but opportunities to remove undesirable seed sources and to release existing desirable oak seedlings were not taken, possibly because of confusion between thinning and selection treatments. OBS 2013.2 was issued.
P6 Forest management shall conserve biological diversity and its associated values, water resources, soils, and unique and fragile ecosystems and landscapes, and, by so doing, maintain the ecological functions and the integrity of the forest.		
C6.1. Assessment 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 the on-site processing facilities. Environmental impacts shall be assessed prior to commencement of site-disturbing operations.	C	As required by criterion, DOF can broadly be said to have a two pronged approach to environmental impact assessment, a landscape level and an individual harvest unit level. At the individual harvest level, harvesting activities are summarized in annual state forest work plans that are reviewed by DOW biologists. DOF notes that “DOW herpetologists offered insight that resulted in changes to certain units for rattlesnakes. DOW botanist offered comments during HCVF monitoring that resulted in changes to one harvest unit.”
C 6.2. Safeguards shall exist which protect rare, threatened and endangered species and their habitats (e.g., nesting and feeding areas). Conservation zones and protection areas shall be established, appropriate to the scale and intensity of forest management and the uniqueness of the affected resources. Inappropriate hunting, fishing, trapping, and collecting shall be controlled.	C	RTE species are regularly taken into account during the development of management plans. An example examined during this year’s audit was timber sale #1404 on Shawnee state forest. Sale boundaries were modified in consultation with the DOW in order to account for potential rattlesnake habitat. DOF relies on expertise from its sister agency within ODNR, the Division of Wildlife. DOW reviews the annual work plans for the state forests, and then comments on individual harvest plans as necessary. DOW biologists may request a site visit at their discretion, and offer comments on harvesting practices in order to protect rare, threatened and endangered species. Protection of rare biological communities is also listed as one of DNR’s primary landscape level protection goals. Examples include the wet meadow restoration at Maumee State forest in the biologically unique Oak Openings region in Northwest Ohio.
C6.3. 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.	C	ODF has landscape level goals aimed at promoting underrepresented successional stages. In particular there is a focus on recruiting oak forests. Rare ecological communities are protected when identified, such as wet meadows. DOF does not manage any forests that meet old growth definitions due to the land use history in Ohio. Certain state forests have RSA and other reserve areas dedicated to old growth recruitment. DOF Land Management Manual includes legacy tree and retention standards. Observations in the field show that these were followed.
C6.4. 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	C	ODNR conducted an RSA Assessment and the results are outlined in that document. There are 3 on-FMU RSAs that include 2 designated Natural Areas and 1 designated Wilderness. DOF manages the largest GAP

<p>affected resources.</p>		<p>status 1 RSA in the state.</p> <p>A development related to allowed management in the wilderness protected areas occurred during the past year over whether to end the let in burn policy for natural fires in the Shawnee wilderness area. This has been designated as an RSA, and fire suppression in this context could be interpreted as not in keeping with the objectives of the RSA. However, the standard does not specifically address this issue. Also, stakeholder comments from the public were heavily in favor of this change, including from environmental groups. Thus the new policy is still in conformance with the indicator.</p>
<p>C6.5. Written guidelines shall be prepared and implemented to: control erosion; minimize forest damage during harvesting, road construction, and all other mechanical disturbances; and protect water resources.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>ODNR remains in overall conformance with this criterion, however one minor non-conformity was identified.</p> <p>CAR 2013.3 was issued. ODNR’s streamside protection zones exist for perennial streams, defined as streams marked on 7.5-minute quad maps. This definition came from the previous Appalachia Regional standard. It is unclear whether standard protection measures exist for what ODNR classifies as ephemeral streams. In the current FSC-US national standard, this indicator requires protection zones for “Outer SMZs (Streamside Management Zones), in addition to inner SMZs are established for all intermittent, and perennial streams, as well as other waters.” Specified protection zone widths are described in 6.5.e.1.a. See also 6.5.e.2.</p> <p>There is no definition in the standard for ephemeral, the term used by ODNR, but intermittent streams are defined as “mapped or unmapped streams that typically flows for less than twelve months of the year and/or that flows below ground for portions of its length.” Thus it appears there is a category of intermittent streams that are not receiving the SMZ protection measures.</p>
<p>C6.6. 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. WHO Type 1A and 1B and chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides; pesticides that are persistent, toxic or who derivatives remain biologically active and 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.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>All chemicals use is prescreened and approved at the central level to ensure conformance with the highly hazardous list.</p> <p>Most pesticide use surrounds invasive species control. All staff using pesticides receive applicator training. Areas where pesticides can be applied are controlled by applicable management zones. Detailed prescriptions are created prior to spraying, including site inventory, maps, and associated protection measures.</p>
<p>C6.7. 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.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Contractors are trained in spill prevention and clean up. Spill kits are required to be on-site during timber harvesting. Field audits did not identify any improper disposal of fuel or oil.</p>

<p>C6.8. 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.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>No biological control agents are being used on State Forests.</p>
<p>C6.9. The use of exotic species shall be carefully controlled and actively monitored to avoid adverse ecological impacts.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>DOF does not actively use exotic species. Some legacy plantations of pine species not native to the site exist, but they are being phased out through even aged harvests. Former plantations are being regenerated to native hardwood forest.</p>
<p>C6.10. Forest conversion to plantations or non-forest land uses shall not occur, except in circumstances where conversion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Entails a very limited portion of the forest management unit; and b) Does not occur on high conservation value forest area; and c) Will enable clear, substantial, additional, secure, long-term conservation benefits across the forest management unit. 	<p>C</p>	<p>In the past ODNR had considered exploration of oil and gas rights on state forests that are now able to be extracted using hydraulic fracturing (i.e. fracking). OBS 2012. Was issued regarding this. However, the program appears to be on hold, with no developments over the past year. As such the observation is currently closed until the ODNR continues this project.</p>
<p>P8 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.</p> <p><i>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.</i></p>		
<p>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.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Monitoring efforts include the compartment review process, GIS analysis, G&Y, logging inspections, forest health monitoring, and program reports. DOF also supports a variety of ongoing specialized research and monitoring activities at Vinton Furnace State Experimental Forest. Stakeholder comments on DOF management are monitored primarily through open houses and tracking of comments.</p> <p>Audit team reviewed records related monitoring of timber harvests, costs and productivity associated with management, post-harvest monitoring checklists, and road maintenance monitoring forms.</p> <p>Recent examples of more in depth monitoring include a study in journal of wildlife management analyzing the effects of shelterwood harvests on bird communities, which was conducted primarily on DOF managed land.</p>
<p>P9 Management activities in high conservation value forests shall maintain or enhance the attributes which define such forests. Decisions regarding high conservation value forests shall always be considered in the context of a precautionary approach.</p> <p>High Conservation Value Forests are those that possess one or more of the following attributes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Forest areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant: concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g., endemism, endangered species, refugia); and/or large landscape level forests, contained within, or containing the management unit, where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance b) Forest areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems c) Forest areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g., watershed protection, erosion control) d) Forest areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g., subsistence, health) and/or critical to local communities' traditional cultural identity (areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in cooperation with such local communities). 		
<p>C9.1. Assessment to determine the presence of the attributes consistent with High Conservation Value</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>An HCVF assessment was conducted in preparation for the 2010 initial evaluation. In brief, the assessment</p>

<p>Forests will be completed, appropriate to scale and intensity of forest management.</p>		<p>was conducted based on data from the heritage database (since renamed the Ohio Biodiversity database). Areas where identified based on concentrations of hits in the database, and were reviewed with stakeholders.</p>
<p>C9.2. The consultative portion of the certification process must place emphasis on the identified conservation attributes, and options for the maintenance thereof</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>ODNR solicited feedback from the public during its HCVF designation process, including holding public meetings. Direct consultation was done with relevant agencies like DOW in order to identify HCVF.</p>
<p>C9.3. The management plan shall include and implement specific measures that ensure the maintenance and/or enhancement of the applicable conservation attributes consistent with the precautionary approach. These measures shall be specifically included in the publicly available management plan summary.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>HCVF protection measures are described in the 5 year management plans. Protection measures usually involve no entry.</p>
<p>C9.4. Annual monitoring shall be conducted to assess the effectiveness of the measures employed to maintain or enhance the applicable conservation attributes.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Monitoring of HCVF is now being conducted on an annual basis. The team reviewed monitoring reports from the Beaver Creek HCVF area.</p> <p>OBS 2012.3 had been issued and was closed, related to a system for identifying additional HCVF areas. This will be done as part of the normal process for designating forest work zones.</p>

Appendix 6 – Chain of Custody Indicators for FMEs

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