

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

---

## *State of Maryland DNR – Forest Service*

Maryland, USA

### **SCS-FM/COC-00069P**

580 Taylor Ave, E1  
Annapolis, MD 21401

Jack Perdue, Forest Resource Planning, [jack.perdue@maryland.gov](mailto:jack.perdue@maryland.gov)  
<http://dnr.maryland.gov/forests/>

CERTIFIED	EXPIRATION
29/April/2014	28/April/2019

DATE OF FIELD AUDIT
24-27/April/2017
DATE OF LAST UPDATE
10 June 2017

SCS Contact:

**Brendan Grady** | Director  
Forest Management Certification  
+1.510.452.8000  
[bgrady@scsglobalservices.com](mailto: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](http://www.SCSglobalServices.com)

## Foreword

Cycle in annual surveillance audits				
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <sup>st</sup> annual audit	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <sup>nd</sup> annual audit	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 <sup>rd</sup> annual audit	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 <sup>th</sup> annual audit	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (expansion of scope, Major CAR audit, special audit, etc.):
Name of Forest Management Enterprise (FME) and abbreviation used in this report:				
State of Maryland DNR – Forest Service (MD DNR, DNR or FME)				

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 .....	4
1.3 Standards Employed .....	4
2 ANNUAL AUDIT DATES AND ACTIVITIES.....	5
2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities .....	6
2.2 Evaluation of Management Systems .....	15
3. CHANGES IN MANAGEMENT PRACTICES .....	15
4. RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION .....	15
4.1 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations .....	15
4.2 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations .....	23
5. STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS .....	26
5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted .....	26
5.2 Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Responses from the Team, Where Applicable .....	26
6. CERTIFICATION DECISION .....	29
7. CHANGES IN CERTIFICATION SCOPE .....	29
8. ANNUAL DATA UPDATE .....	33
8.1 Social Information .....	33
8.2 Annual Summary of Pesticide and Other Chemical Use .....	33
SECTION B – APPENDICES (CONFIDENTIAL) .....	36
Appendix 1 – List of FMUs Selected for Evaluation .....	36
Appendix 2 – List of Stakeholders Consulted.....	36
Appendix 3 – Additional Audit Techniques Employed .....	36
Appendix 4 – Pesticide Derogations .....	36
Appendix 5 – Detailed Observations.....	36
Appendix 6 – Chain of Custody Indicators for FMEs .....	69
SCS TRADEMARK ANNEX FOR FMES: FSC TRADEMARKS, FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2 .....	70
Using the FSC labels on products.....	74

## SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY

### 1. General Information

#### 1.1 Annual Audit Team

<b>Auditor Name:</b>	Kyle Meister	<b>Auditor role:</b>	FSC Lead Auditor
<b>Qualifications:</b>	<p>Kyle Meister is a Senior Certification Forester with SCS Global Services. He has been with SCS since 2008 and has conducted FSC FM pre-assessments, evaluations, and surveillance audits in Brazil, Panama, Mexico, Costa Rica, Bolivia, Indonesia, India, Japan, New Zealand, Spain, and all major forest producing regions of the United States. He has conducted COC assessments in Oregon, Pennsylvania, North and South Carolina, West Virginia, Georgia, and California. Mr. Meister has successfully completed CAR Lead Verifier, ISO 9001:2008 Lead Auditor, and SA8000 Social Systems Introduction and Basic Auditor Training Courses. He holds a B.S. in Natural Resource Ecology and Management and a B.A. in Spanish from the University of Michigan; and a Master of Forestry from the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies.</p>		
<b>Auditor Name:</b>	Tucker Watts	<b>Auditor role:</b>	SFI Lead Auditor
<b>Qualifications:</b>	<p>Tucker Watts has over 30 years’ experience in forest management, primarily in the southern U.S. He worked for many years for International Paper Company, first as a land management and procurement forester, then as an analyst, and finally as an environmental manager with considerable involvement in forest certification. Tucker has a BS in Forestry from Louisiana Tech, and MS in Forestry from Mississippi State University, and an MBA from Centenary College. He has participated in many forestry organizations, notably as a Trainer in the Louisiana Master Logger Program, as a team member for “Recommended Forestry Best Management Practices for Louisiana” and on various SFI State Implementation Committees. Tucker is trained as a Tree Farm Group Certification Auditor and has experience in SFI and FSC auditing from both sides, as an auditor and as the management representative of an organization being audited. Audit experience includes audits of pulp and paper mills, container and box companies, printers, distributors, and audits of recovered fiber and recycled content.</p>		

#### 1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation

A. Number of days spent on-site assessing the applicant:	3.5
B. Number of auditors participating in on-site evaluation:	2
C. Additional days spent on preparation, stakeholder consultation, and post-site follow-up:	0
<b>D. Total number of person days used in evaluation:</b>	<b>7</b>

#### 1.3 Standards Employed

##### 1.3.1. Applicable FSC-Accredited Standards

Title	Version	Date of Finalization
FSC-US Forest Management Standard	V1-0	July 8, 2010
All standards employed are available on the websites of FSC International ( <a href="http://www.fsc.org">www.fsc.org</a> ), the FSC-US		

([www.fscus.org](http://www.fscus.org)) or the SCS Standards page ([www.scsglobalservices.com/certification-standards-and-program-documents](http://www.scsglobalservices.com/certification-standards-and-program-documents)). Standards are also available, upon request, from SCS Global Services ([www.SCSglobalServices.com](http://www.SCSglobalServices.com)).

### 1.3.2. SCS Interim FSC Standards

Title	Version	Date of Finalization
SCS FSC Chain of Custody Indicators for Forest Management Enterprises	V6-0	December 2016
<p>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 <a href="http://www.scsglobalservices.com/certification-standards-and-program-documents">www.scsglobalservices.com/certification-standards-and-program-documents</a> or upon request from SCS Global Services (<a href="http://www.SCSglobalServices.com">www.SCSglobalServices.com</a>).</p>		

## 2 Annual Audit Dates and Activities

---

## 2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities

Complex	Location	Acres	Activity	Note	Audit team notes
<b>Monday April 24 - Afternoon Sites</b>					
NA	FME offices	NA	Opening meeting	Introductions, FME update, review audit scope, audit plan, intro/update to FSC and SCS standards and protocols, review of open CARs/OBS, final site selection	Significant progress in updating the forest inventory and modeling was recently completed in the Eastern Region.
WR25	Tankard	29.0	Reforestation	complete	Natural regeneration of loblolly pine attempted, but did not meet stocking requirements of 300 trees per acre in all areas of the stand. So replanting was conducted on 7 X 10 spacing followed by a herbicide application to release pines. Individual retained legacy hardwood and pines were GPS'd and provided to herbicide applicator. Very little damage to non-target species, as confirmed in application flight lines and application records. Property boundaries on four sides of the timber sale left with a buffer of screen trees that function as legacy trees. Green-up witness in adjacent stands. Applicators license for Glenn Martin witnessed. Contacts contain required elements.
WR25	Tankard Tract, Stand 11	26.8	Herbicide Application	8oz Arsenal+2.5 oz Herbimax	

WR25	WR25 Tankard, S11	33.5	Final Harvest	99% complete	Legacy and seed trees consisting of pond pine and oak GPS'd and marked with blue paint. Roads matted to protect access. Ditches are clean and stream is free flowing. Stand will be left to regenerate and no seed trees are to be removed. No-harvest areas mapped and equipment limited to skid trails. Buffer left along road for aesthetic management. Green-up requirements met by adjacent stands. Future habitat for Delmarva Fox Squirrel (DFS) and Forest Interior Dwelling Species. Lower elevation site, so operations required dryer conditions. Contacts contain required elements.
P02	Furnace	447.0	Rx Burn	60% complete	Complex of beach dunes with habitat and potential habitat for RTE plants and insects. Observation of habitat management, including deer-exclusion devices. Discussion of habitat and population monitoring and prescribed fire rotation to manage for a mosaic of habitat over time and space. Review of burn plan, prescribed fire safety, training & qualifications. Discussion on collaboration with other government agencies and TNC on prescribed fire.
P02	Nazareth Church T8, s10&14	14.4	Final Harvest	50% complete	Retention of pond pine and short-leaf pine, all GPS'd. 90 year-old regenerated after agricultural abandonment. Observation of SMZ with harvest exclusion and equipment exclusion buffers. Good distribution and use of slash to cover skid trails. Observation of historic cultural site and protection measures. Temporary bridge will be used to cross creek.

P02	Nazareth Church T4 S1,4,8&10-Honeywell	118.0	1st Thinning	20% complete	Sales from four fiscal years lumped into one to enhance bidding process. Boundaries marked with yellow pain and placards. Observation of SMZ, which was allowed to be thinned to 70 BA (60 BA is allowed). Intended to be future DFS core area. Discussion on use of monitoring results to update management strategy and plans. Man-made ditch buffered. Discussed buffering requirements for man-made ditches. Minor skinning of residual trees. Debris used to stabilize skid trails.
<b>Tuesday April 25 - Group 1 Sites</b>					
	FME Offices			Document and record review, and employee interviews	Review of training, complaints, stakeholder communications, ownership, and lease records.
	Parker Forestry			Document and record review, and employee interviews	Review of contracts, harvest records (including COC for stumpage, lump-sum, and gatewood), post-harvest monitoring, chemical use
W17	R F Richardson, Stand 1	35.8	Natural Regeneration	complete	2015 regeneration survey following clearcut and to check survival of overstory retention (oak and pine); 2,000 trees per acre, but some patchiness to regeneration so site was treated with an aerial spray to reduce broadleaf and herbaceous competition; post-spray regeneration of loblolly was 2,500-3,000 trees per acre, which likely will require a pre-commercial thinning, but no supplemental planting. Discussion on repairing ruts and site preparation options.

W21	Louis Horner Tract Stands 6,11 & 16	62.3	1st Thinning	complete	Objective to enhance FIDS habitat and protect natural temporal stream connected to perennial tidal stream within coastal protection zone. Observation of hardwood riparian forest (protected area) and stream crossing with 16" culvert, currently covered with leaves, but water is still flowing freely. Discussion on culvert sizing, invasive species control and prevention. Observation of historic site, skid trails, property boundaries, and residual stand, all of which are in good condition. Thinned to 90 BA.
W23	Greenhill Complex, Stands 17, 20,23 & 28	205.0	1st Thinning	45% complete	Future DFS core area, no other special features. Thinned to 90 BA. Skid trails covered with slash and evidence that mats were used in sensitive sections of trails. Little to no residual stand damage. Gatewood sale.
	Warrington Tract		1st Thinning	15% complete	Stumpage sale in which operations were stopped by logging crew due to wet conditions. Observation of hardwood swamp, which was not entered or harvested. Use of slash on skid trails. Some slash has been piled, but likely will be distributed over the site when operations resume. Discussion on the effects of age classes and timber quality on potential timber markets.
<b>Tuesday April 25 - Group 2 Sites</b>					

WR10	Corddry Tract, Stand 12	92.4	1st Thinning	60% complete	Erosion and Sedimentation Plan discussed. No entrance into area. Bridge used for crossing. Bridge has been removed and area stabilized. Density reduced to 70 BA. Tree selection for thinning well done.
WR09	Perkins Tract, Stand 3	36.7	Herbicide Application	16oz Arsenal+2oz Escort+2.5oz Herbimax	Shelterwood cut in 2011. Low seed fall and understocked regeneration. Chemical site preparation 8/16. Witnessed and discussed Spill Management and Application Plan. Ditches buffered during spray. Over-spray on adjacent neighbor. Claim discussed and settled with landowner. Seed trees will be removed, soil scarified and planted.
WR11	Shockley	24.7	Afforestation	complete	Afforestation of agriculture field. Witnessed Reforestation Plan. Powerline buffered for trees. Hand planting at 7 X 10 spacing. Survival of 485 trees per acre. Boundary lines are clearly visible.
WR01	Timmons-Donaway Tract, Stands 3&7	54.6	1st Thinning	complete	Erosion and Sedimentation Plan reviewed and discussed. Tract check for endangered species. Thinning to 70-0 basal area goal. No cut buffer for SMZ. Man-made ditches have been buffered with no entry. Timbers used to cross ditch. Banks are clean and stabilized. Minor skinning of residual stand. Tree selection during thinning improves stand health. No rutting.
<b>Wednesday April 26 - Group 1 Sites</b>					

D21	Bell Tract, Stand 2	16.4	1st Thinning	complete	Discussed Erosion and Sedimentation Plan. Residual BA is 67. Some rutting in main skid trail noted in monitoring. Witnessed rutting and discussed rutting policy and handling of issue. Good tree selection.
D10	Huhne Tract Stand 1	79.9	1st Thinning	10% complete	Vernal pools protected with 50' no cut riparian area. Thinning stand to 60 BA. Erosion and Sedimentation Plan developed. Minor rutting. No damage to soil or water. Boundary well defined. SMZ flagged. Good tree selection. Debris used to stabilize skid trails.
D12	Marshyhope Complex Stands 1,2,8,13&15	138.0	1st Thinning	75% complete	High Conservation Area. Critical Area Plan discussed. Erosion and Sedimentation Plan was developed. Access controlled by gate. Debris used for stabilization of skid trails. Good utilization. No rutting observed. Sale area identified with flagging.
D12	Marshyhope Tract Stands 1 & 49	70.2	1st Thinning	complete	Critical Area Plan discussed. Streams buffered. Erosion and Sedimentation Plan completed. Thinning to 61 BA. Virginia Pine corridors remain to protect residuals and provide wildlife habitat. Debris used to stabilize skid trails. Steam buffer identified with flagging. No entrance in buffer. Buffer has been expanded to compensate for sloping toward stream. Interviewed logger on training, safety meetings and PPE.

D12	Marshyhope	129.0	Rx Burn	complete	Prescribed burn conducted for Natural Heritage Commission. Discussed and witnessed Burn Plan. Benefits include wildlife (Turkeys witnessed on site) and fuel reduction. Interaction with private landowners and citizens discussed. Signs placed on road during burn. Sign with contact information remains after burn (Witnessed on site.)
C03	Messenger Tract Stand 4	26.4	1st Thinning	complete	Thinning basal area 67. Debris used to stabilize skid trails. Tree selection improves residual stand.
C03	Messenger Branch	67.0	Rx Burn	complete	Prescribed burn conducted for quail at Idyle Wild Management Area. Discussed and witnessed Burn Plan. Burn will be conducted at 2-3 year intervals. Benefits include wildlife and rare plants. (Turkeys witnessed on site) and fuel reduction. Plans are to expand burning program and develop a 15 year plan.
<b>Wednesday April 26 - Group 2 Sites</b>					
	Powell Tract		Final Harvest	planned, but not harvested	Observation of pre-harvest meeting between forestry and logging contractor. Completion of pre-harvest checklist and map review with logger, discussion of PPE and use of signage near road and trail entrances, use of mats and other BMPs near sensitive areas, location of sensitive resources, etc.

P02	Furnace T126 S3&4	34.0	1st Thinning	complete	FIDS, DFS future core and ESAs present. Observation of protections for vernal pools. Thinned to 66 BA, which just below desired BA range (70-90); however, smaller trees meant that desired trees per acre were met. Discussion of opportunities to collaborate with Natural Heritage staff.
P05	Milburn Lndg T17 S11	4.7	Final Harvest	50% complete	Observation of plantation established in the 1940s with significant hardwood component and large pines. Two ESA types, DFS Future Core, natural stream with SMZ marked with flagging, and recreational trails. Harvest was closed due to wet conditions. All sensitive features were avoided during harvest, including retention trees. Observation of property boundaries, which are noted with yellow paint and/or signage.
P05	Mohr-Milburn Landing T15 S30	35.0	1st Thinning	50% complete	FIDS, perennial stream with 125-150 ft no-cut buffer, DFS Future Core area, thinned to 86 BA, hardwood retention includes yellow poplar and oak. Discussion of stream protections and hardwood utilization, which is limited due to proximity to mills. Observation of property boundaries.

S27	Wells Tract - Stands 2,5&7	238.9	1st Thinning	complete	DFS Future Core area, and 50-ft buffer established around ditch. Thinned to 73 BA. Logger had to pull out due to wet conditions at one point; no major issues with roads and skid trails observed. Second thinnings and final harvest should have opportunities for release and retention of mast-producing species, mainly oaks. Observation of property boundaries.
S53	Handy Tract - Stands 3,6,7,15 &16	137.3	1st Thinning	60 % complete	Four age classes present, but trees are of similar sizes. Thinned to 75 BA. Observation of stand boundaries, which are marked with tape. Discussion on timber markets and the impacts on types of harvest equipment available.

## 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 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 evaluator 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 FME's conformance to the FSC standards and policies.

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

## 4. Results of the Evaluation

### 4.1 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations

<b>Finding Number:</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):	
<b>Deadline</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify): no deadline
<b>FSC Indicator:</b>	FSC-US, 6.3.a.1, 6.3.d and 6.3.e
<p><b>Non-Conformity</b> (<i>or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations</i>): According to the FMP interviews with FME staff, native conifer species were likely more prevalent on the landscape than are currently. FME is considering expanding the use of native and non-native conifers on certain areas as a wildlife management component, to restore native species (both conifer and broadleaf), and plan to adapt to climate change and invasive pests/ pathogens.</p> <p>There was one site where native conifer restoration with white pine was written into the site plan option, but FME staff were debating on whether or not to continue with that management trajectory given deer browse pressure. Certain activities observed, specifically retention of hemlock, white</p>	

<p>pitch pine and Virginia pine, within thinning and regeneration harvest units likely contribute to maintaining and/or increasing native conifer cover.</p> <p>However, at the landscape level, FME has not assessed the desired future condition of the native and non-native conifer component, including selection of species that will meet social, economic, and ecological objectives depending on site conditions.</p>	
<p><b>Corrective Action Request (or Observation):</b> FME should consider conducting a landscape-level analysis of native and non-native conifer distribution and develop desired future conditions for their distribution based on variables such as wildlife, restoration, hydrology, adaptation to climate change and pests/pathogens, socioeconomic conditions, etc. Justification for any use of non-native or non-local growing stock should be justified in the analysis.</p>	
<p>Various indicators of Criterion 6.3 may be useful in this assessment; however, of most concern are 6.3.a.1, 6.3.d and 6.3.e.</p>	
<p><b>FME response</b> (including any evidence submitted)</p>	<p>We have begun a conifer analysis for our Western Maryland state forests, beginning with the Green Ridge State Forest. This effort displayed the raw conifer cover at approximately 441 acres. This project has identified individual trees from six-inch resolution imagery, so even in a pure stand of pine the analysis will still show "holes" between the trees. This GIS data layer will show everything over two meters, so smaller plants such as mountain laurel will not be displayed. We will review this draft analysis before running similar tests for the Garrett county state forests.</p> <p>During the past decade, nesting goshawks have been discovered in plantations of red pine. Goshawks had not been seen in Maryland for many years, so this was a pleasant surprise. These stands had been targeted for regeneration, to be replaced with native hardwoods. Since then, our state forest staff has worked with the Natural Heritage Program to identify the stands likely to be attractive to goshawks and actually plan to modify these stands using silvicultural practices to enhance the habit for goshawk. See Potomac Garrett State Forest annual work plan FY 2017, pages 114-115, and Savage River State Forest annual work plan FY 2017, page 78-79.</p> <p>Conifers when present in stands proposed for management are identified and when appropriate, given preference for retention in the next stand. This can be noticed in our recent annual work plans. Review of Potomac Garrett State Forest search for "conifer" will help identify this planned work. This awareness for the need to support landscape and species diversity has been identified with such language: "Where appropriate, dominant and co-dominant trees will be removed through single tree and group selection, to release suitable white pine seedlings and saplings from competition. This will facilitate expansion of the important mixed hardwood/conifer cover type."</p> <p>Red spruce was once an economically important softwood species in Garrett County but has since been harvested to the point on non-existence. Pockets of a few trees are discovered and favored in management practices. Managers have even gone to the point of digging wild seedlings and transplanting them onto the state forests.</p>

	<p>Norway spruce has been successfully planted on Savage River State Forest some decades ago. The audit teams have visited these stands and silvicultural work during previous audits. With the success of these plantations and the difficulty of getting red spruce back into the stands, using non-native Norway spruce has been discussed. We have met with the Natural Heritage Program regarding this concept. While they stated that they would not promote planting of non-native species, they could see no reason not allow it. We assured them that any plan for using Norway spruce would not result in large plantations but small pockets. Further discussions will ensue, but the opening dialog has been promising.</p>
<p><b>SCS review</b></p>	<p>SCS verified the goshawk information included in the two AWP. <a href="#">Northern goshawks</a> occur in North America and Eurasia in a variety of forest habitats. Nests may be built in broadleaf or conifer trees depending on factors such as tree size and species composition, canopy closure, adjacent forage areas, and other factors. In the Eastern North America, goshawks may occur in mixed tree species stands. According to interviews with DNR staff, management for goshawks can be compatible with objectives for conifer retention and regeneration, but must be planned in cooperation with Wildlife and Heritage staff. The Red pine stand may be maintained as part of this species’ management. So far, risk of Red pine becoming invasive or causing other effects is very low; Red pine occurs with several of the species of flora and fauna of Western Maryland, though in ecosystems of the Midwest and Northeast of the USA.</p> <p>FME demonstrated a draft of its Norway spruce guidelines, which references a guideline on limited use of this species under specific circumstances as a possible functional surrogate for the loss of Eastern hemlock due to its similar cover type and longevity.</p> <p>FME prepared a summary of historical conifer cover using publications from the Maryland Geological Survey dating between 1900-1916. Conifer densities reported over the counties of the Western Region’s State Forests were lower in that period and that hardwoods dominated. Harvesting of conifers before and during that time, however, likely reduced their abundance and distribution. During the audit, more information was provided by managers in the Western Region:</p> <p><i>Regarding the conifer cover summary, there is no summary available yet that compares the 1900s to today. The 1900 information describes the entire county. At that time, we didn't have the state forest system we have today. Today, we can dissect the county to look at just our state forests, which is what we have done.</i></p> <p><u>Conifer Cover on Western Maryland State Forests</u>  Green Ridge - 441 ac  Savage River - 6,600 ac  Potomac-Garrett - 964 ac</p> <p><i>A 2016 <u>county-wide</u> analysis has not been done, but can be easily within a couple days. It would make an interesting project to see how well the info provided from</i></p>

	<p><i>1900 can be compared to today. We will run that data and make that summary and if it looks like a comparison can be made, will include in the next updates to the long-term management plans.</i></p> <p>While current Sustainable Forest Management Plans and Annual Work Plans for the Western Region contain information about conifer cover and some related objectives, such as Northern goshawk habitat, the recent information added to the analysis is only partially complete and not fully incorporated into the management system. Refer to <b>OBS 2017.1</b>.</p>
<p><b>Status of CAR:</b></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Closed</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i></p>

<b>Finding Number: 2016.2</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):	
<b>Deadline</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify): no deadline
<b>FSC Indicator:</b>	FSC-US, 6.5.d and 6.5.g.
<b>Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):</b>	
<p>Trail funding and/or restrictions on its use may not allow for the timely maintenance and closure needs of existing authorized and unauthorized trails. The audit team observed instances where trail maintenance for existing trails did not occur due to lack of funds or difficulty in obtaining them. There is also some concern from stakeholders on the density of trails, particularly its effect on hunting success. Furthermore, the density of unauthorized trails may result in a loss of productive and protected forest area. Fewer restrictions on use of trail funds may result on greater opportunities for forestry, heritage and recreational staff to collaborate on the protection of sensitive resources at reduced cost while offering user groups a positive recreational experience.</p>	
<b>Corrective Action Request (or Observation):</b>	
<p>Recreational trails and water crossings should be maintained, and/or reconstructed to reduce short and long-term environmental impacts, habitat fragmentation, soil and water disturbance and cumulative adverse effects, while allowing for customary uses and use rights. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• access to all roads and trails (temporary and permanent), including recreational trails, and off-road travel, is controlled, as possible, to minimize ecological impacts;</li> <li>• trail density is minimized;</li> <li>• erosion is minimized;</li> <li>• sediment discharge to streams is minimized;</li> <li>• there is free upstream and downstream passage for aquatic organisms;</li> <li>• impacts of trail systems on wildlife habitat and migration corridors are minimized;</li> <li>• area converted to trails is minimized;</li> <li>• habitat fragmentation is minimized;</li> <li>• unneeded trails are closed and rehabilitated.</li> </ul> <p>Recreation use on the FMU should be managed to avoid negative impacts to soils, water, plants, wildlife and wildlife habitats.</p>	
<b>FME response (including any evidence submitted)</b>	<p>While there is still much work to be done regarding the Western Maryland state forests roads and trails, we have made great progress at the same time. Lost Land Run road project was completed in 2016, at a cost over \$725,000. Next in line for extensive maintenance work are the Gordon Road and Twigg Road projects. The audit team visited these sites as part of a previous audit. This project has been funded at over \$700,000 and will begin engineering, planning and contract release in FY 2018, which begins July 1, 2017.</p> <p>All other state forests road projects have been entered into our Critical Maintenance project queue and are waiting for to be funded.</p>

	<p>Each year the state forests are awarded Recreation Trail Grants from the Maryland State Highway Administration. This grant had been capped at \$30,000 per project but has recently been increased to \$40,000. However, this does mean that fewer projects can be funded and these grants have become more competitive.</p> <p>During a recent meeting with the DNR Secretary, Deputy Secretary and Assistant Secretary, funding for state forest roads and trails was discussed as an issue of importance and how this relates to our forest certification program.</p>
<b>SCS review</b>	<p>During discussions with FME staff during the audit, it was clear that little else can be done currently to push for greater flexibility in funding for road and trail maintenance. As the FME details above, collaboration on larger projects already occurs. While progress has been made in communicating the benefits of greater flexibility and collaboration on smaller projects, this may be a long-term effort that requires support from key stakeholders. In the meantime, FME is prioritizing maintenance projects by fixing critical points in the road and trail system, as observed in the field and confirmed in interviews with staff.</p>
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<p><input checked="" 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>

<b>Finding Number: 2016.3</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):	
<b>Deadline</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify): no deadline
<b>FSC Indicator:</b>	FSC-US, 6.9.a
<p><b>Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):</b> During interviews with FME staff, there was discussion on possibly expanding the use of Norway spruce and Red pine to mitigate the loss of native conifers, and to continue to serve as habitat for RTE species. Any expanded use beyond the currently planted area would have to be justified and based on scientific data.</p> <p>Siberian crabapple is no longer produced in the state nursery, but has been used in the past on early successional habitat projects. State seed mixes for use on log landings and other sensitive areas include non-native clovers and grasses. Current recommendations from heritage staff are to avoid use of Siberian crabapple and the seed mix.</p>	
<p><b>Corrective Action Request (or Observation):</b>          The use of exotic species should be contingent on the availability of credible scientific data indicating that any such species are non-invasive and that their application does not pose a risk to native biodiversity, including any significant displacement of native species.</p>	
<b>FME response (including any evidence submitted)</b>	<p>No non-native species have been planted on State Forests in recent years. With the rise of white tail deer populations and the resulting increased pressures on forest regeneration, the difficulty in securing red spruce seedlings and the continued threat on native hemlock from Hemlock Woolly Adelgid, non-native alternatives, specifically Norway spruce, have been considered as a viable option in returning conifers to the forest landscape of Western Maryland. This could be just part of a larger plan which would include favoring native conifers already in the stand and managing already established non-native conifer plantations such as red pine and Norway spruce.</p> <p>See 2016.1 FMU response and <u>Norway Spruce in Forest Management</u>.</p>
<b>SCS review</b>	<p>FME demonstrated a draft of its Norway spruce guidelines, which references a guideline on limited use of this species under specific circumstances as a possible functional surrogate for the loss of Eastern hemlock due to its similar cover type and longevity. Red pine options are discussed in OBS 2016.1. Potential options for expanded use of Norway spruce and Red pine should be incorporated into management planning documents, as is currently underway. Refer to <b>OBS 2017.1</b>.</p>
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

<b>Finding Number: 2016.4</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):	
<b>Deadline</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify): no deadline
<b>FSC Indicator:</b>	FSC-US, 7.1.b, 7.1.c and 7.1.e.
<b>Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):</b>	
<p>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). However, the historical presence of conifers in the management plan could be expanded to include the knowledge presented by local forestry staff during the audit, which could help set the stage for conifer objectives on the landscape.</p> <p>ESA plans may not be being completed on time according to draft annual work plans reviewed. According to these drafts, ESA plans for FY2017 were to be completed over the winter of 2016. A failure to complete these plans may result in limited opportunities to avoid negative impacts to these areas, especially where active management may benefit the species or communities found in them. ESA management plans set the stage for the implementation of maintenance and recovery objectives for RTE species and/or sensitive ecosystems, as well as detail monitoring strategies that are compatible with these objectives.</p>	
<b>Corrective Action Request (or Observation):</b>	
<p>The FMP should describe historical ecological conditions, 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).</p> <p>The FMP, specifically for ESAs, should include a description of the following resources and outline activities to conserve and/or protect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• rare, threatened, or endangered species and natural communities (see Criterion 6.2);</li> <li>• plant species and community diversity and wildlife habitats (see Criterion 6.3);</li> <li>• Representative Sample Areas (see Criterion 6.4);</li> <li>• High Conservation Value Forests (see Principle 9);</li> <li>• Other special management areas.</li> </ul>	
<b>FME response (including any evidence submitted)</b>	We have met with the Wildlife & Heritage Service (WHS) leadership with the sole purpose of continuing the development of the Ecologically Significant Area data for the Western Maryland state forests. The WHS staff person who has started this work by outlining the ESA areas has not completed this work yet. While this project is important to our forest management planning efforts, it is not within our authority to force this work to be done. We have and will continue to address this issue with DNR staff and look for creative alternatives.
<b>SCS review</b>	The portion of the OBS on conifers in the Western Region (7.1.b and 7.1.c) has been continued and expanded upon in <b>OBS 2017.1</b> . In 2016, the FY2017 Annual Work Plans (AWPs) were still under draft and thus the issue with incomplete AWPs was not a nonconformity. While many of the sensitive resources in question may be maintained under passive management, the AWPs are being

	implemented without sufficient review from Natural Heritage staff. Not only is review of options for conservation and/or maintenance of RTE species and communities an integral part of the FME’s procedures, it also is something that stakeholders expect from FSC-certified entities. Refer to <b>Minor CAR 2017.2</b> .
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

## 4.2 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations

<b>Finding Number: 2017.1</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):	
<b>Deadline</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification/recertification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> 12 months or next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation – response is optional <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
<b>FSC Indicator:</b>	FSC-US 7.1.b, 7.1.c., and 7.1.d
<p><b>Non-Conformity</b> (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): Continuation of OBS 2016.1, 2016.3, and 2016.4. According to interviews with FME staff, the Sustainable Forest Management Plans (SFMPs) for the Western Region are currently being revised for several reasons, including updating the information about the historical presence of conifers in the landscape and desired future conditions for these species. Some options for conifer management are being exercised as described in Annual Work Plans (AWPs), as in the case of the Northern goshawk.</p> <p>The SFMPs describe 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). However, the historical presence of conifers in the management plan could be expanded to include the knowledge presented by local forestry staff in 2016, which could help set the stage for conifer objectives on the landscape.</p> <p>FME is considering expanding the use of native (e.g., Eastern white pine, Eastern hemlock, Virginia pine, Shortleaf pine, etc.) and non-native conifers (e.g., Norway spruce and Red pine) on certain sites as a wildlife management component, to restore native species (both conifer and broadleaf), and possibly to adapt to climate change and invasive pests/ pathogens. At the landscape level, FME has completed a partial assessment of the conifer cover as described in its response to OBS 2016.1, but a way to compare the county-level information from the early 1900s to today is incomplete. Information on current conifer cover on Western State Forests is complete.</p> <p>At the landscape level, the desired future condition of the native and non-native conifer component, including selection of species that will meet social, economic, and ecological objectives depending on site conditions, has not been fully completed. FME staff pointed out that maintenance of current conditions may be desirable in many instances. However, opportunities to explore connectivity between conifer cover types for wildlife movement, hydrology or other objectives could be explored.</p>	

<b>Corrective Action Request (or Observation):</b>	
The FMP should describe historical ecological conditions, 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).	
The FME should describe 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	
<b>FME response</b> <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	
<b>SCS review</b>	
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

<b>Finding Number: 2017.2</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):	
<b>Deadline</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification/recertification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 12 months or next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Observation – response is optional <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
<b>FSC Indicator:</b>	FSC-US 7.1.e.
<p><b>Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):</b> Upgrade of OBS 2016.4. In 2016, the FY2017 Annual Work Plans (AWPs) were still under draft and thus the issue with incomplete AWP was not a nonconformity. While many of the sensitive resources in question may be maintained under passive management, the AWP are being implemented without sufficient review from Natural Heritage staff. Not only is review of options for conservation and/or maintenance of RTE species and communities an integral part of the FME’s procedures, it also is something that stakeholders expect from FSC-certified entities to conform to indicator 7.1.e. The AWP are a component of the management plan.</p> <p>According to interviews with FME staff, of concern is the sensitive nature of some of the natural heritage information. As is the case in most states, confidential information may be excluded from publicly available documents in order to protect the resource.</p>	

<b>Corrective Action Request (or Observation):</b> The FMP shall include a description of the following resources and outline activities to conserve and/or protect:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• rare, threatened, or endangered species and natural communities (see Criterion 6.2);</li> <li>• plant species and community diversity and wildlife habitats (see Criterion 6.3);</li> <li>• water resources (see Criterion 6.5);</li> <li>• soil resources (see Criterion 6.3);</li> <li>• Representative Sample Areas (see Criterion 6.4);</li> <li>• High Conservation Value Forests (see Principle 9);</li> <li>• Other special management areas.</li> </ul>	
<b>FME response</b> <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	
<b>SCS review</b>	
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

<b>Finding Number: 2017.3</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Major CAR</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Minor CAR</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Observation</b>	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):	
<b>Deadline</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification/recertification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> 12 months or next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Observation – response is optional <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
<b>FSC Indicator:</b>	FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 1.15, 1.16, and 6.1.
<b>Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):</b>	
<p>The appropriate trademark symbol (® in superscript font) does not accompany the first use of “FSC” and “Forest Stewardship Council” on the FME’s website.</p> <p>No trademark approval records for the three detected uses were available (brochure, website, and AWP template).</p> <p>The website does not have the promotional panel, or at least the FSC trademark license code, in a prominent place.</p>	
<b>Corrective Action Request (or Observation):</b>	
FME shall implement corrective actions to resolve the nonconformities described above.	
<b>FME response</b> <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FME emailed evidence on 28 April 2017 for the SCS logo use approval (recorded 20 April 2017) of the county guide.</li> </ul>
<b>SCS review</b>	

<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i>
-----------------------	--

## 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

NGOs	Educational institutions
Industry groups	Citizen Advisory Council members

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

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

<input type="checkbox"/> <i>FME has not received any stakeholder comments from interested parties resulting from stakeholder outreach activities during this annual audit.</i>	
<b>Stakeholder comments</b>	<b>SCS Response</b>
<b>Economic concerns</b>	
None received.	
<b>Social concerns</b>	
I would like to see:	1. All Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) meetings and

<p>1. A list of the CAC meetings for the past 2 years, and what representatives attended each one.</p> <p>2. How the annual work plans were advertised for public comment (beyond just posting them on the DNR website). For instance: in the newspaper? What newspapers, when. On the radio? What stations, when.</p> <p>3. 8 likes on Facebook? I get more from posting a picture of my lunch. hardly any Twitter traffic?</p> <p>No newspapers on the Eastern Shore? Announcement came out Christmas week?</p> <p>As has been a problem for years...very little effort to get public comment. Almost seems they don't want any comments. And have they replied to those who commented via the website?</p>	<p>attendance records are included in Annual Work Plans (AWPs) on each State Forest's website. For example, when you refer to <a href="http://dnr.maryland.gov/forests/Pages/chesapeakeforestslands.aspx">http://dnr.maryland.gov/forests/Pages/chesapeakeforestslands.aspx</a>, the AWP's are in PDF format as cited in the left-hand column of the webpage. Within each of those plans you will see the CAC meetings and comments. It is similar for Pocomoke (<a href="http://dnr.maryland.gov/forests/Pages/publiclands/eastern_pocomokeforest.aspx">http://dnr.maryland.gov/forests/Pages/publiclands/eastern_pocomokeforest.aspx</a>) and the other State Forests.</p> <p>2. FME staff worked with the DNR Director of Communications to disseminate the public comment efforts. FME also works through the DNR-IT program to get the <a href="#">webpage</a> setup.</p> <p>For the work plans, FME posted the release on the DNR news page, shared it with press via an email message and with the public via the monthly newsletter. The release was also displayed on social media channels.</p> <p>Communications facilitated comments and questions from the public with assistance from FME staff. Communications also uses a service to monitor and distribute media clips and mentions, which it shares with staff and others in the government each business day.</p> <p>SCS confirmed these actions via email records, files, websites, and interviews with FME staff. For example, the following announcements were verified:</p> <p><b>Twitter</b> &gt;&gt; <a href="https://twitter.com/search?q=%22State%20Forest%20work%20plans%20released%22&amp;src=typd">https://twitter.com/search?q=%22State%20Forest%20work%20plans%20released%22&amp;src=typd</a></p> <p><b>Facebook</b> &gt;&gt; <a href="https://www.facebook.com/search/top/?q=%E2%80%9CState%20Forest%20Work%20Plans%20Released%E2%80%9D">https://www.facebook.com/search/top/?q=%E2%80%9CState%20Forest%20Work%20Plans%20Released%E2%80%9D</a></p> <p><b>DNR online newsletter</b> &gt;&gt; <a href="http://news.maryland.gov/dnr/2016/12/19/state-forest-work-plans-released/">http://news.maryland.gov/dnr/2016/12/19/state-forest-work-plans-released/</a></p> <p><b>Western Maryland newspaper</b> DNR makes the story available, the newspapers decide whether to run it or not. <a href="#">Cumberland Times</a> ran it.</p> <p>3. In regards to media outlets, FME sends the announcement to multiple outlets and the managers/editors of those organizations decide which stories to run, which was confirmed in email records. FME has no control over which stories are selected for publication.</p>
---	--

	<p>As for Twitter and Facebook, FME has no control over who decides to like or retweet them.</p> <p>The announcement came out on December 19. According to interviews with staff, it was FME’s intention to have the news release go out after January 1, which was communicated to the Communications team, but ultimately that decision was in the hands of the DNR Communications Director. There is usually a delay in getting announcements posted, but this one went out very quickly.</p> <p>The FME normally does not reply directly to comments received, but will if their nature requires clarification or needs to be addressed quickly.</p> <p>While comments deserve attention, many comments are not specific, addressing an opinion rather than a specific work plan proposal. For example, comments are frequently received that oppose any timber harvest on state lands. As part of the FME’s public mandate is to manage forests for multiple values, including timber, these types of comments are rarely given a response. This year, there was one forest harvest proposal of concern to a stakeholder group in the Savage River State Forest Annual Work Plan, and FME responded directly and invited the constituents to meet with the forest manager in the office or at the site. The stakeholder group so far has not accepted the invitation. These comments were verified via communication records and interviews with FME staff since the AWP for 2018 is still under development.</p> <p>FME has met with various constituents over the years when issues arise over its forest management practices and continues to do so. Also, FME received two comments from Eastern Shore constituents. All comments from the AWP review process become part of the official annual work plan when completed. Final AWPs are all made publicly available online on the DNR website. These actions were verified through email records, visitor logs, review of AWPs, and interviews with FME staff.</p> <p>SCS concludes that the FME uses multiple outlets to receive stakeholder feedback and responds to substantiated comments in a timely manner. The FME</p>
--	---

	also has a Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC), which includes members of environmental, social, economic, and tribal concerns. Members are rotated periodically to ensure that different citizens and organizations may be represented. A recreational member of the CAC commented during the audit that their constituents now can learn about forest management planning and the rationale behind harvests in discussion with FME staff. No non-conformance is warranted.
<b>Environmental concerns</b>	
None received.	

## 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"/>
<b>Comments:</b>	

## 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

<b>Organization name</b>	State of Maryland DNR – Forest Service		
<b>Contact person</b>	Jack Perdue		
<b>Address</b>	580 Taylor Ave, E1 Annapolis, MD 21401	<b>Telephone</b>	410-260-8505
		<b>Fax</b>	410-260-8595
		<b>e-mail</b>	jack.perdue@maryland.gov
		<b>Website</b>	dnr.maryland.gov/forests

### FSC Sales Information

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FSC Sales contact information same as above.			
<b>FSC salesperson</b>			
<b>Address</b>		<b>Telephone</b>	
		<b>Fax</b>	
		<b>e-mail</b>	
		<b>Website</b>	

### Scope of Certificate

<b>Certificate Type</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Single FMU	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple FMU
-------------------------	--	---------------------------------------

	<input type="checkbox"/> Group		
<b>SLIMF (if applicable)</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Small SLIMF certificate	<input type="checkbox"/> Low intensity SLIMF certificate	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Group SLIMF certificate		
<b># Group Members (if applicable)</b>	0		
<b>Number of FMUs in scope of certificate</b>	1		
<b>Geographic location of non-SLIMF FMU(s)</b>	<i>Latitude &amp; Longitude:</i> Savage River State Forest- 39.576, -79.129 Green Ridge State Forest- 39.631, -78.475 Potomac State Forest- 39.472, -79.439 Garrett State Forest- 39.341, -79.28 Pocomoke State Forest- 38.15, -75.487 Chesapeake Forest Lands - 38.329, -75.799		
<b>Forest zone</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Boreal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Temperate	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Subtropical	<input type="checkbox"/> Tropical	
<b>Total forest area in scope of certificate which is:</b>		<b>Units:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac	
privately managed			
state managed	211,044 (2016) acreage has expanded, some yet to be classified for management.		
community managed			
<b>Number of FMUs in scope that are:</b>			
less than 100 ha in area		100 - 1000 ha in area	
1000 - 10 000 ha in area		more than 10 000 ha in area	1
<b>Total forest area in scope of certificate which is included in FMUs that:</b>		<b>Units:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac	
are less than 100 ha in area			
are between 100 ha and 1000 ha in area			
meet the eligibility criteria as <i>low intensity</i> SLIMF FMUs			
<b>Division of FMUs into manageable units:</b>			
FME considers two forest regions based on regional forest types: Eastern and Western Regions. FME then divides the state forest system into four geographic districts. Under each geographic district there are state forests, which are then managed according to a state forest-level long-term management plan and annual work plan. A full description of how the FMU is divided into manageable units is available publicly via the FME's website: <a href="http://dnr.maryland.gov/forests/">http://dnr.maryland.gov/forests/</a> .			

**Production Forests**

<b>Timber Forest Products</b>	<b>Units:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac
Total area of production forest (i.e. forest from which timber may be harvested)	135,101
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	
<b>Silvicultural system(s)</b>	<b>Area under type of management</b>
Even-aged management	
Clearcut (clearcut size range )	
Shelterwood	
Other:	
Uneven-aged management	
Individual tree selection	
Group selection	
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)	2.4 mmbf under vol regulation, plus 780 ac under area regulation
<b>Non-timber Forest Products (NTFPs)</b>	
Area of forest protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for the production of NTFPs or services	
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	
<b>Explanation of the assumptions and reference to the data source upon which AAH and NTFP harvest rates estimates are based:</b>	
<p>See SFMP Chapter 5, Appendix H and CFI Summary for each State Forest. MD DNR uses Remsoft's Woodstock program to analyze forest inventory data to project sustainable harvest levels based on allowed silvicultural systems. Harvest rates are based on area control rather than volume control currently. For example, the Green Ridge SFMP includes a description of the maximum number of acres that may be treated with variable retention harvests.</p> <p>Appendix H includes a description of the assumptions behind the growth and yield modeling, including the elements of the indicator. Summaries of projected growth and allowable harvests based on growth rates, mortality, disease, etc. are included in Appendix H.</p>	
<b>Species in scope of joint FM/COC certificate: (Scientific / Latin Name and Common / Trade Name)</b>	
<p>Acer rubrum; Acer spp.; Carya spp.; Celtis occidentalis; Fagus grandifolia; Fraxinus spp.; Juglans nigra L.; Liquidambar styraciflua L.; Liriodendron tulipifera L.; Nyssa sylvatica Marsh; Pinus echinata; Pinus taeda; <b>Pinus serotina</b>; <b>Quercus spp.</b>; Quercus alba; Quercus rubra; Tilia americana L; Tsuga canadensis (L.) Carr.; Ulmus spp.</p>	

**FSC Product Classification**

Timber products		
Product Level 1	Product Level 2	Species
W1 Rough Wood	W1.1 Roundwood (logs)	All
	W1.2 Fuel Wood	

	W1.3 Twigs	
<b>W3 Wood in chips or particles</b>	W3.1 Wood chips	All
<b>Non-Timber Forest Products</b>		
<b>Product Level 1</b>	<b>Product Level 2</b>	<b>Product Level 3 and Species</b>

**Conservation Areas**

<b>Total area of forest and non-forest land protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for conservation objectives:</b>		71,390 ac	
<b>High Conservation Value Forest / Areas</b>			
<b>High Conservation Values present and respective areas:</b>		<b>Units:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac	
<b>Code</b>	<b>HCV Type</b>	<b>Description &amp; Location</b>	<b>Area</b>
HCV1	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g. endemism, endangered species, refugia).	Ecologically Significant/Wildlands - Eastern region; Ecologically Significant/Wildlands - Western region	15,226 16,656
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.		
HCV3	Forests or areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems.	Core FIDs habitat; core DFS habitat – Eastern region; old growth and old growth management – Western region	18,484 24,874
HCV4	Forests or areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g. watershed protection, erosion control).	Riparian Buffer Areas – Eastern region; Riparian Buffer Areas – Western region	38,274 2,145
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).		
<b>Total Area of forest classified as 'High Conservation Value Forest / Area'</b>			71,984

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

<input type="checkbox"/> <i>N/A – All forestland owned or managed by the applicant is included in the scope.</i>		
<input checked="" 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>		
<b>Explanation for exclusion of FMUs and/or excision:</b>	These other state forests see very little silvicultural activity and are relatively small in acreage. We have no interest in pursuing certification currently on these lands.	
<b>Control measures to prevent mixing of certified and non-certified product (C8.3):</b>	These additional properties are not located near the areas included in the current or expanded certification scope. Harvesting is very limited and usually for the purpose of salvage or demonstration. These properties are not allowed to use the FSC certificate or license codes.	
<b>Description of FMUs excluded from, or forested area excised from, the scope of certification:</b>		
<b>Name of FMU or Stand</b>	<b>Location (city, state, country)</b>	<b>Size (<input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac)</b>
Elk Neck State Forest	Northeast, MD, Cecil	3,380
Cedarville State Forest	Brandywine, MD, Prince Georges	3,625
Doncaster Demonstration Forest	Ironsides, MD, Charles	1,953
Stoney Demonstration Forest	Aberdeen, MD, Harford	318
Salem State Forest	Leonardtown, MD, St Mary's	837

**8. Annual Data Update**

**8.1 Social Information**

<b>Number of forest workers (including contractors) working in forest within scope of certificate (differentiated by gender):</b>		
# of male workers: 27	# of female workers: 9	
<b>Number of accidents in forest work since last audit:</b>	<b>Serious: 0</b>	<b>Fatal: 0</b>

**8.2 Annual Summary of Pesticide and Other Chemical Use**

Maryland DNR Forest Service :: 2016	Annual Summary of pesticide and other chemical use	(over approx. last 12 months)
-------------------------------------	--	-------------------------------

Forest	Commercial name of pesticide/herbicide	Active ingredient	Quantity applied annually (kg or lbs)	Size of area treated during previous year (ha or ac)	Reason for use
e.g. Savage River State Forest	Gly 4	Glyphosate	2 gal (2 % solution)	1 acre	Weed Control
Savage River State Forest	Arsenal AC	Imazapyr	76.5 oz. active ingredient	102 acres	Hardwood cut surface (hack and squirt)
Savage River State Forest	Razor Pro	Glyphosate	2 lbs active ingredient/acre	102 acres	Foliar spray for fern, grass and sedge control
Savage River State Forest	Oust XP	Sulfometuron ethyl	1.5 oz active ingredient/acre	102 acres	Foliar spray for fern, grass and sedge control
Savage River State Forest	Gly 4	Glyphosate	36 oz. of active ingredient	2 acres	Invasive species control (Japanese knotweed)
Savage River State Forest	Gly 4 Plus	Glyphosate	48 oz. of active ingredient	8 acres	Foliar spray for fern control
Savage River State Forest	Round-Up Pro Dry	Glyphosate	22.5 oz. of active ingredient	8 acres	Hardwood cut surface (hack and squirt)
Savage River State Forest	Garlon 4 Ultra	Triclopyr	48 oz. of active ingredient	8 acres	Hardwood cut surface (hack and squirt)
Green Ridge State Forest	Vanquish	Dicamba	16 OZ	30 acres 100 stems	Ailanthus control
Green Ridge State Forest	Roundup Pro Concentrate	Glyphosate	84 OZ	54 acres, 600 stems	Ailanthus control
Potomac Garrett State Forest (32-5)	Arsenal AC	Imazapyr	3% solution on 25ac. = 31 oz.	25ac.	TSI Woody veg. control
Potomac Garrett State Forest (32-5)	Razor Pro	Glyphosate	2#/ac. on 25 ac. = 50#	25ac.	fern and grass/foliar spray
Potomac Garrett State Forest (32-5)	Oust	Sulfometuron methyl	1.5 oz./ac on 25ac. = 37.5oz.	25ac.	fern and grass/foliar spray
Potomac Garrett State Forest (32-6)	Arsenal AC	Imazapyr	3% solution on 15ac. = 10.5 oz.	15ac.	TSI Woody veg. control
Potomac Garrett State Forest (32-7)	Razor Pro	Glyphosate	2#/ac. on 18 ac. = 36#	18ac.	fern and grass/foliar spray
Potomac Garrett State Forest (32-7)	Oust	Sulfometuron methyl	1.5 oz./ac on 18ac. = 27oz.	18ac.	fern and grass/foliar spray
Potomac Garrett State Forest (32-33)	Razor Pro	Glyphosate	2#/ac. on 45 ac. = 90#	45ac.	fern and grass/foliar spray
Potomac Garrett State Forest (32-33)	Oust	Sulfometuron methyl	1.5 oz./ac on 45ac. = 67.5oz.	45ac.	fern and grass/foliar spray
Potomac Garrett State Forest (7-5)	Razor Pro	Glyphosate	2#/ac. on 19 ac. = 38#	19ac.	fern and grass/foliar spray
Potomac Garrett State Forest (7-5)	Oust	Sulfometuron methyl	1.5 oz./ac on 19ac. = 28.5oz.	19ac.	fern and grass/foliar spray

Potomac Garrett State Forest (7-5)	Arsenal AC	Imazapyr	3% solution on 19ac. = 13.3 oz.	19ac.	TSI Woody veg. control
Potomac Garrett State Forest (Spruce Planting)	Arsenal AC	Imazapyr	2% solution on 100 sq.ft. =.5oz.	100 sq.ft.	Grass Control in Spruce Planting
Potomac Garrett State Forest (Comp 17,25,41)	Arsenal AC	Imazapyr	2% solution on 1 stem =.01 oz.	1 stem	Non-native Invasive Species Hack and Squirt
Potomac Garrett State Forest (Comp 7)	Gly 4	Glyphosate	3% solution on 200 sq. ft. = 2 oz.	200 sq.ft.	Non-native Invasive Species Foliar
Potomac Garrett State Forest (Comp 19)	Gly 4	Glyphosate	3% solution on <1 ac. = 1/2 oz.	<1 ac.	Non-native Invasive Species Cut Surface
Potomac Garrett State Forest (Comp 35)	Oust xp	Sulfometuron methyl	2 oz. / ac. On 2400 sq.ft. = .36 oz.	2400 sq.ft.	dewberry foliar spray
Pocomoke State Forest	Makaze	Glyphosate	1.5 gal (2% solution)	7,400 sq. ft/0.17 ac.	Invasive grass/weed control
Chesapeake Forest	Makaze	Glyphosate	10.125 gal (2 % solution)	21,400 sq. ft/0.49 ac.	Invasive grass/weed control
Chesapeake Forest	Arsenal+Escort+Herbimax	Imazapyr+Met sulfuron Methyl+Petroleum Surfactant	16oz+2oz+2.5oz	36.7 ac.	Hardwood control
Chesapeake Forest	Arsenal+Herbimax	Imazapyr+Petroleum Surfactant	8oz+2.5oz	26.8	Hardwood 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

### Appendix 2 – List of Stakeholders Consulted

#### List of FME Staff Consulted



#### List of other Stakeholders Consulted

Name	Organization	Contact Information	Consultation method	Requests Cert. Notf.
Joan Maloof	Executive Director, Old-Growth Forest Network; and Professor Emeritus, Salisbury University	<a href="mailto:JEMALOOF@salisbury.edu">JEMALOOF@salisbury.edu</a> ; 410-251-1800	Email	Y
Marty Renshaw	Renshaw Logging	Bus. (410) 543-2757 Cell (410) 726-2166	Field	N

An email was sent to stakeholders in advance of the audit to ask for comments. One comment was received. No stakeholders contacted by phone returned any calls. See daily sign-in sheets (PDF files above) for CAC members.

### Appendix 3 – Additional Audit Techniques Employed

- None.  
 Additional techniques employed (*describe*):

### Appendix 4 – Pesticide Derogations

- There are no active pesticide derogations for this FME.

### Appendix 5 – Detailed Observations

Criteria required by FSC at every surveillance audit ( <i>check all situations that apply</i> )	<input type="checkbox"/> NA – all FMUs are exempt from these requirements. <input type="checkbox"/> Plantations > 10,000 ha (24,710 ac): 2.3, 4.2, 4.4, 6.7, 6.9, 10.6, 10.7, and 10.8 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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
---	---

	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> All applicable documents and records as required in section 7 of audit plan were reviewed; or <input type="checkbox"/> The following documents and records as required in section 7 of the audit plan were NOT reviewed ( <i>provide explanation</i> ):

Evaluation Year	FSC P&C Reviewed
2014	All – (Re)certification Evaluation
2015	1.3, 1.5, 1.6, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.4, 4.2, 4.4, 5.6, 6.2, 6.3, 6.5, 6.6, 6.9, 7.1, 7.2, 7.4, 8.2, 8.3 (COC indicators for FMEs) and 9.4
2016	1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 2.3, 3.2, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 5.5, 5.6, 6.2, 6.3, 6.7, 6.8, 6.9, 6.10, 7.3, 8.2 and 9.4
2017	See also mandatory Criteria; and 2.1, 2.2, 3.3, 6.1, 8.1, 8.4, and 8.5.
2018	See also mandatory Criteria; and 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 6.4, 9.1, 9.2, and 9.3.

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

Abbreviations for Maryland DNR State Forests which may be used in this checklist:

CF/PSF = Chesapeake Forest / Pocomoke State Forest DFS = Delmarva Fox Squirrel ESA = Ecologically Sensitive Area FIDS = Forest Interior Dwelling Species GRSF = Green Ridge State Forest	PGSF = Potomac Garrett State Forest S/FMP = Sustainable/ Forest Management Plan SRSF = Savage River State Forest ROW = Right-of-way RTE = Rare, threatened or endangered
--	--

REQUIREMENT	C/NC	COMMENT/CAR
<b>Principle #1: Compliance with Laws and FSC Principles</b>		
<b>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.</b>		
<b>1.1 Forest management shall respect all national and local laws and administrative requirements.</b>	NE	
<b>1.2. All applicable and legally prescribed fees, royalties, taxes and other charges shall be paid.</b>	NE	
<b>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.</b>	NE	
<b>1.4. Conflicts between laws, regulations and the FSC Principles and Criteria shall be evaluated for the purposes of</b>	NE	

<b>certification, on a case by case basis, by the certifiers and the involved or affected parties.</b>		
<b>1.5. Forest management areas should be protected from illegal harvesting, settlement and other unauthorized activities.</b>	C	
<b>1.5.a.</b> The forest owner or manager supports or implements measures intended to prevent illegal and unauthorized activities on the <b>Forest Management Unit (FMU)</b> .	C	FME has a department of Natural Resources Police (NRP) that regularly patrol state lands to prevent and detect unauthorized activities. In addition, FME gates roads and posts signage that cites applicable laws and regulations.
<b>1.5.b.</b> If illegal or unauthorized activities occur, the forest owner or manager implements actions designed to curtail such activities and correct the situation to the extent possible for meeting all land management objectives with consideration of available resources.	C	FME did not report any significant illegal or unauthorized activities since the last audit. Per interviews with staff, FME’s NRP prosecutes or fines violators. NRP also works with local law enforcement to deal with more complex situations involving illegal activities, such as marijuana operations. FME staff regularly clean up dump sites to avoid attraction. Interviews with staff indicate that outside of this occasional dumping, there have been no major illegal or unauthorized activities.
<b>1.6. Forest managers shall demonstrate a long-term commitment to adhere to the FSC Principles and Criteria.</b>	NE	
<b>Principle #2: Long-term tenure and use rights to the land and forest resources shall be clearly defined, documented and legally established.</b>		
<b>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.</b>	C	
<b>2.1.a</b> The forest owner or manager provides clear evidence of <b>long-term</b> rights to use and manage the FMU for the purposes described in the management plan.	C	See Tax Maps and Deed Descriptions via MDLandRec.net (Digital Image Retrieval System for the lands of MD). Copies of deeds are maintained at each State Forest Office. Jean Lippard, Land Acquisition & Planning (LAP) / Annapolis, has originals. A sample of deeds was shown for the Chesapeake and Pocomoke State Forests; these files are maintained in local offices in binders.
<b>2.1.b</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	FME’s legal department (Office of the Attorney General) maintains records of use and access rights, such as deeded rights-of-way. LAP maintains original documents.
<b>2.1.c</b> 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	Boundaries are painted and sometimes include signs, but ROW and easements are not. FME has internal roads and ROW mapped. All property boundaries observed on the Eastern State

		Forests were clearly signed and/or painted. These are also visible on maps. Harvests observed in 2017 had property boundary tree painted and retention trees near property boundaries were evident.
<b>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.</b>	C	
<b>2.2.a</b> The forest owner or manager allows the exercise of <i>tenure</i> and <i>use rights</i> allowable by law or regulation.	C	See evidence presented in C2.1. There are hunt-leases on the Chesapeake State Forest for which contracts were demonstrated for files maintained in FME offices. All other State Forests allow public hunting and other use rights, such as plant collection, via a permit system. Signage on property boundaries indicates if public hunting is allowed. Powerline ROWs are mapped and easily identifiable in the field since the power company keeps them clear.
<b>2.2.b</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	See evidence presented in C2.1. Per hunt lease requirements on Chesapeake, FME maintains communications over timber sales as timber harvests are used to promote wildlife habitat.
<b>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.</b>	C	
<b>2.3.a</b> If <i>disputes</i> 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.	C	FME staff reported no new disputes over tenure claims or use rights. There are several cases that are open related to encroachment onto state forests from adjacent landowners. Each state forest maintains its own records, but the land planning office may become involved in reviewing records and survey information. FME's lawyers at headquarters review boundary disputes and encroachment, and take the final actions to resolve these issues.
<b>2.3.b</b> The forest owner or manager documents any significant disputes over tenure and use rights.	C	
<b>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.</b>		

<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>NE</p>	
<p><b>3.2. Forest management shall not threaten or diminish, either directly or indirectly, the resources or tenure rights of indigenous peoples.</b></p>	<p>NA</p>	
<p><b>3.2.a</b> 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.</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>There are no tribal forest management or ownership/ use rights on FME lands. There are no sites of special tribal significance on the certified FMU. There are no tribes with legal rights or binding agreements to the FMU, as confirmed through interviews with staff and review of tenure documents under C2.1.</p>
<p><b>3.2.b</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.</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>Routine communication with Chiefs in regards to management activities and public posting of AWP's on the forest web site.</p> <p>FME staff reported that activities in 2016-17 did not affect any tribal issues.</p>
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>C</p>	
<p><b>3.3.a.</b> The forest owner or manager invites consultation with tribal representatives in identifying sites of current or traditional cultural, archeological, ecological, economic or religious significance.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>As part of the management planning process, tribal representatives are invited to comment on the FME's planned activities. No comments have been received during the past three years, per interviews with FME staff and review of the AWPs.</p>
<p><b>3.3.b</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).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>SCS' efforts to reach out to stakeholders prior to the audit, including emails and phone calls, yielded no comments from tribal representatives. However, initial management planning conducted during the first few year of FSC and SFI certification yielded some comments from tribal representatives that have been incorporated into management plans. Also, all state forest proposals are reviewed by the Maryland Historical Trust during the planning phase. FME staff maintains contact with the Maryland Commission on Indian Affairs since</p>

		<p>tribal leadership changes periodically and, at times, there are conflicts between tribes over political issues according to FME staff. According to interviews with FME staff in Chesapeake/Pocomoke, there are recent efforts at re-establishing contact with a recognized tribe since there has been a leadership change. Email records of these communications were demonstrated onsite.</p>
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>NE</p>	
<p><b>Principle #4: Forest management operations shall maintain or enhance the long-term social and economic well-being of forest workers and local communities.</b></p>		
<p><b>4.1. The communities within, or adjacent to, the forest management area should be given opportunities for employment, training, and other services.</b></p>	<p>NE</p>	
<p><b>4.2. Forest management should meet or exceed all applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of employees and their families.</b></p>	<p>C</p>	
<p><b>4.2.a</b> 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).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>FME reported no accidents or safety incidents since the last audit, and that there have been no changes to health &amp; safety regulations or contract templates. OSHA postings were observed in all state forest offices. Per interviews with FME staff, all are aware of health and safety laws and receive regular training on the subject. Training records were provided for FME staff and staff of contractors (e.g., Parker Forestry Staff Training - March 24, 2015 thru April 21, 2017).</p> <p>Auditors examined personnel files maintained at Chesapeake State Forest, which contain training records such as trail maintenance, fire certification, FEMA, state forestry licenses, CFEs for SAF, etc. Auditors confirmed pesticide applicators' licenses for the only two qualified</p>

		staff at the Chesapeake-Pocomoke State Forest (Alex Clark, license 27515-75484; Michael Schofield, 27515-39330).
<b>4.2.b</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	<p>Items 6, 10, and 11 of Parker Forestry Services' contracts address safety requirements. State of Maryland contracts reviewed include safety requirements in items 15 (accident prevention), 16 (insurance), and 19 (law applicable). Chemical application contracts reviewed include requirements for licensing, which addresses safety and qualifications (item 9).</p> <p>Evidence of safe felling techniques were observed in the field on stumps and use of slash on skid trails. Chemical application maps demonstrate that hazard zones and protected areas are avoided, consistent with how they are identified in pre-application maps.</p>
<b>4.2.c</b> The forest owner or manager hires well-qualified service providers to safely implement the management plan.	C	<p>Through use of a competitive bidding system and use of strict contracts that include logger licensing and safety requirements, FME ensures that it uses qualified service providers. Evidence: contracts for all timber sales arranged by Parker Forestry Services visited (item 6, Master Logger requirement); and state contracts (item 5, Conditions). Parker Forestry demonstrated a copy of the 2016 Master Logger list, which includes all loggers used on timber harvests in the Eastern Region.</p> <p>Chemical application contracts reviewed include requirements for licensing, which addresses safety and qualifications (item 9).</p>
<b>4.3</b> 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	
<b>4.4.</b> 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.	C	
<b>4.4.a</b> 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:	C	The Annual Work Plan and ID Team processes are robust examples of planning efforts that allow for consideration of social impacts as described in this indicator. FME most recently updated its

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Archeological sites and sites of cultural, historical and community significance (on and off the FMU;</li> <li>• Public resources, including air, water and food (hunting, fishing, collecting);</li> <li>• Aesthetics;</li> <li>• Community goals for forest and natural resource use and protection such as employment, subsistence, recreation and health;</li> <li>• Community economic opportunities;</li> <li>• Other people who may be affected by management operations.</li> </ul> <p>A summary is available to the CB.</p>		<p>social impacts summary in response a Minor CAR in 2014.</p> <p>According to interviews with FME staff, Western State Forests have engaged in cooperative project with Frostburg State University to carry out a Recreation/Tourism Economic Impact Study, with survey work slated to begin in April 2017.</p>
<p><b>4.4.b</b> The forest owner or manager seeks and considers input in management planning from people who would likely be affected by management activities.</p>	C	<p>SRSF — Comments regarding the FY-18 Annual Work Plan were received via e-mail, phone calls and letters. Several stakeholders have aired concerns over an FY-18 silvicultural proposal in Compartment 38 that involves a regeneration harvest on a 55-acre management unit. The unit abuts the properties of two stakeholders. Both stakeholders/ landowners are apprehensive of the harvest and its potential impact on their water supply, property values, and view shed. A response to the stakeholders is being formulated and the invitation for a site-visit has been extended to the interested parties to review the harvest proposal and address pertinent issues.</p> <p>FME reported that few comments have been received from stakeholders since the last audit on other State Forests. Most comments are received during the Annual Work Plan (AWP) review process from the Citizens Advisory Committees. SCS reviewed complaints log at Chesapeake Forest, which as complaints dating back to 2011. The most recent complaints date to 2015, all of which have been resolved.</p>
<p><b>4.4.c</b> 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.</p>	C	Refer to 4.4.b.
<p><b>4.4.d</b> For <i>public forests</i>, consultation shall include the following components:</p>	C	Refer to 4.4.b.

<p>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;</p> <p>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;</p> <p>3. An accessible and affordable appeals process to planning decisions is available.</p> <p>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.</p>		<p>See response to Minor CAR 2014.6 in the 2015 annual audit report. There has been no change since the last audit.</p>
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>NE</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>		
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>NE</p>	
<p><b>5.2. Forest management and marketing operations should encourage the optimal use and local processing of the forest’s diversity of products.</b></p>	<p>NE</p>	
<p><b>5.3. Forest management should minimize waste associated with harvesting and on-site processing operations and avoid damage to other forest resources.</b></p>	<p>NE</p>	
<p><b>5.4. Forest management should strive to strengthen and diversify the local economy, avoiding dependence on a single forest product.</b></p>	<p>NE</p>	
<p><b>5.5. Forest management operations shall recognize, maintain, and, where appropriate, enhance the value of forest services and resources such as watersheds and fisheries.</b></p>	<p>NE</p>	
<p><b>5.6. The rate of harvest of forest products shall not exceed levels which can be permanently sustained.</b></p>	<p>C</p>	
<p><b>5.6.a</b> In FMUs where products are being harvested, the landowner or manager calculates the sustained yield harvest</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>FME calculates the AAH for each State Forest in the scope.</p>

<p>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.</p> <p>The sustained yield harvest level calculation for each planning unit is based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• documented growth rates for particular sites, and/or acreage of forest types, age-classes and species distributions;</li> <li>• mortality and decay and other factors that affect net growth;</li> <li>• areas reserved from harvest or subject to harvest restrictions to meet other management goals;</li> <li>• silvicultural practices that will be employed on the FMU;</li> <li>• management objectives and desired future conditions.</li> </ul> <p>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.</p>		<p>Of each State Forest, only one has reported changes in its calculated AAH: SRSF has been conducting an extensive forest inventory project for past 5 years. Initial inventory work has been completed on the harvestable areas of SRSF and the analysis of this data will be the basis for any changes that may be necessary in adjusting the annual allowable harvest rate.</p> <p>See SFMP Chapter 5, Appendix H and CFI Summary for each State Forest. FME uses Remsoft’s Woodstock program to analyze forest inventory data to project sustainable harvest levels based on allowed silvicultural systems. Harvest rates are based on area control rather than volume control currently.</p> <p>Appendix H includes a description of the assumptions behind the growth and yield modeling, including the elements of the indicator. Summaries of projected growth and allowable harvests based on growth rates, mortality, disease, etc. are included in Appendix H.</p> <p>In 2017, FEM recently completed updated modelling for the Eastern Region using forest inventory data and site indexes modeled using REMSOFT’s software. The model considers growth rates, site quality, current age/ size class, species composition, management zone, operability, management constraints such as FIDS, ESAs and DFS, silvicultural practices, and objectives.</p>
<p><b>5.6.b</b> Average annual harvest levels, over rolling periods of no more than 10 years, do not exceed the calculated sustained yield harvest level.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>GRSF — The allowable harvest within the GRSF General Forest Area is to manage 200 acres for end of rotation regeneration harvests. FME managed 190 acres since the last audit.</p> <p>SRSF — See Appendix 3 in the Savage River State Forest FY 2017 Annual Work Plan. 1.0 MMBF</p>

		<p>planned, 941,285 actual.                  PGSF — 634 MBF planned, 542 MBF actual                  CF/PSF — Thinning acreage was slightly below AAH, final and uneven-aged harvest acreage (clear cuts, variable retention, seed tree, shelterwood) was well below our AAH, as confirmed in records (see Timber Sale Summary for all State Forests).</p> <p>Each State Forest maintains an annual work plan summary to compare actual acres harvested versus projected (e.g., <a href="http://www.dnr.state.md.us/forests/download/wp_summary.pdf">http://www.dnr.state.md.us/forests/download/wp_summary.pdf</a>). Harvest levels on an area control basis remain well below what is allowed per the Woodstock model. Each State Forest also prepares quarterly harvest reports, which were reviewed during the audit.</p> <div style="text-align: center;">                       Timber Sale                      Summary FY2016.pdf                 </div> <p>Refer also to</p> <p>Harvest records for lump-sum, stumpage, and gatewood sales were reviewed at Parker Forestry Services.</p>
<p><b>5.6.c</b> 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.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>AWP scouting done by the Forest Manager and Forester. Notes on future management activities, such as silvicultural treatments or TSI, are incorporated into the forest GIS.</p>
<p><b>5.6.d</b> 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</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>There is no significant harvest of NTFPs on the FMU, as confirmed in field visits and interviews with FME staff.</p> <p>Hunt leases are used only on the Chesapeake State Forest. The meat acquired is not commercially sold and is not commercially significant.</p>

adverse effects to the forest ecosystem.		
<p><b>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.</b></p>		
<p><b>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.</b></p>	C	
<p><b>6.1.a</b> Using the results of <i>credible scientific analysis, best available information</i> (including relevant databases), and local knowledge and experience, an assessment of conditions on the FMU is completed and includes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Forest community types and development, size class and/or successional stages, and associated <i>natural disturbance regimes</i>;</li> <li>2) <i>Rare, Threatened and Endangered (RTE) species</i> and <i>rare ecological communities</i> (including plant communities);</li> <li>3) Other habitats and species of management concern;</li> <li>4) Water resources and associated riparian habitats and hydrologic functions;</li> <li>5) <i>Soil resources</i>; and</li> <li>6) <i>Historic conditions</i> on the FMU related to forest community types and development, size class and/or successional stages, and a broad comparison of historic and current conditions.</li> </ol>	C	<p>These subject areas are addressed in the SFMPs and AWP's for each state forest or region. Specifically, each SFMP discusses current stand conditions and disturbance regimes that have led to current conditions. RTE species and communities are also addressed; however, FME also uses recovery plans. Special habitats discussed in SFMPs include riparian corridors. Water and soil resources are discussed in detail in SFMPs. An overview of land use history that has shaped the landscapes of the Eastern and Western Regions is included in each SFMP.</p>
<p><b>6.1.b</b> Prior to commencing site-disturbing activities, the forest owner or manager assesses and documents the potential short and long-term impacts of planned management activities on elements 1-5 listed in Criterion 6.1.a.</p> <p>The assessment must incorporate the <i>best available information</i>, drawing from scientific literature and experts. The impact assessment will at minimum include identifying resources that may be impacted by management (e.g., streams, habitats of management concern, soil nutrients). Additional detail (i.e., detailed description or quantification of impacts) will vary depending on the uniqueness of the resource, potential risks, and steps that will be taken to avoid and minimize risks.</p>	C	<p>The Annual Work Plans (AWPs) and the associated Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) reviews serve as a document assessment of resources identified in 6.1.a and how these could be affected. In addition, the AWP's are subject to public review during which any citizen can make comments on how planned activities may affect resources of 6.1.a.</p> <p>FME's assessments draw from experts on the CACs, scientific literature, and assessment methods carried out by qualified/trained FME staff.</p> <p>In the Eastern Region, Parker Forestry Services uses the AWP's to complete pre-harvest</p>

		assessments to ensure that impacts to sensitive resources identified in the AWP are prevented or mitigated.
<b>6.1.c</b> Using the findings of the impact assessment (Indicator 6.1.b), management approaches and field prescriptions are developed and implemented that: 1) avoid or minimize negative short-term and long-term impacts; and, 2) maintain and/or enhance the long-term ecological viability of the forest.	C	The AWP includes descriptions of prescriptions and measures to avoid or minimize negative impacts. Certain prescriptions, such as road and trail maintenance, are intended to ensure that damaged BMPs are repaired so that impacts to soil and water resources are mitigated. Harvest prescriptions are based on the reproductive ecology of the tree species on site and natural disturbance regimes.
<b>6.1.d</b> On public lands, assessments developed in Indicator 6.1.a and management approaches developed in Indicator 6.1.c are made available to the public in draft form for review and comment prior to finalization. Final assessments are also made available.	C	SFMPs and AWP are subject to public review in draft form prior to finalization as described in 4.4.d. Pre-harvest inspection forms from Parker Forestry Services may be provided upon request with sensitive and confidential information removed.
<b>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.</b>	C	
<b>6.2.a</b> 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.	C	The following was reported by DNR Natural Heritage Program: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GRSF — 9 days surveying for rare plants; Searched for State listed plants and high quality or rare natural communities (per our SWAP plan), 26 days surveying for rare animals; Searched for wood turtles, rattlesnakes, Appalachian cottontails, and eastern spotted skunks.</li> <li>PGSF — 2 days surveying for rare plants; Searched for high quality or rare natural communities as identified in our State Wildlife Action Plan (SWAP), and purple-fringed and purple-fringeless orchids, 13 days surveying for rare animals; Searched for rattlesnakes, green salamanders, and goshawks. CF/PSF — No new areas have been established.</li> <li>SRSF — 31 days surveying for rare animals;</li> </ul>

		<p>Searched for Wehrle's salamander, Appalachian cottontails, eastern spotted skunk, West Virginia Whites (butterfly), and goshawks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CF/PSF — CF: 14 days surveying for rare plants; Searched for State listed species and high quality or rare natural communities (per our SWAP plan).</li> <li>• PSF: 5 days surveying for rare plants; Searched for State listed species and high quality or rare natural communities (per our SWAP plan), 4 days surveying for rare animals; Searched for frosted elfins.</li> </ul>
<p><b>6.2.b</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. <b>Conservation zones</b> and/or <b>protected areas</b> 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.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>FME reported the following activities near RTE species habitat zones:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GRSF — NONE</li> <li>• SRSF — See copies of Savage River State Forest Annual Work Plan and all management recommendations; all Ecologically Sensitive Areas as well as High Conservation Value Forest acres are highlighted within each proposal map.</li> <li>• PGSF — See PGSF FY-17 AWP for IX. Wildlife Mngt. Proposals for 2 projects done specifically for RT&amp;E conservation. Compartment 25, Stand 14 – ESA Mngt./ thinning to retain habitat. Compartment 40, Stand 1 – (HCVF Thinning to Retain Habitat.)</li> <li>• CF/PSF — Commercial harvesting and prescribed burning. Activities are guided by both a restoration plan and policies.</li> </ul> <p>Refer to individual Annual Work Plans (AWPs) and the management recommendations for each state forest; all conservation zones and/or protected areas are shown on each project map.</p> <p>Forest harvests have occurred in areas that are potential habitats for RTE species. All harvests must go through the annual work plan process. Heritage assists the FME during planning and</p>

		<p>implementation to ensure that the goals that they have for target species are met. Each year FME includes a location reporting form and information fact sheet along with its standard hunting harvest report forms to each of the local hunt clubs regarding Delmarva Fox Squirrel on the Maryland short. Any forms that FME receives back are sent to US Fish &amp; Wildlife, DNR Wildlife &amp; Heritage, and kept on file at FME offices.</p>
<p><b>6.2.c</b> 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.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The requirements of this section of the standard are primarily accomplished through the ID team process, which includes reviews of all plans by heritage, wildlife, fisheries, and forestry staff. Harvest operations and restoration projects are reviewed by Heritage members of the ID team. Restoration projects for specific sites are listed within each Annual Work Plan.</p>
<p><b>6.2.d</b> 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).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>FME staff reported that there have been no cases of harvest or take of RTE species or significant damage to vulnerable species and communities on the FMU.</p> <p>Refer to AWP’s and the management recommendations as all ESAs are shown per project maps. See also information presented in 6.2.b on hunting of game species (e.g., deer) within Delmarva Fox Squirrel habitat.</p>
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>C</p>	
<p><b>6.3.a.1</b> The forest owner or manager maintains, enhances, and/or restores under-represented <i>successional</i> 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.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>FME reported the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GRSF — Early succession stages are most under-represented on this state forest, so regeneration harvests do the most to maintain young forests.</li> <li>• SRSF — The seedling/sapling succession stage of our hardwood forests could be considered underrepresented. As such, management work planned within the</li> </ul>

		<p>Annual Work Plans is generally focused on regeneration of hardwood forests and enhancing this stage of forest growth. Early successional habitat including grass and shrub dominated acreage is also underrepresented across the forest landscape. Cooperative efforts with the Wildlife Division of DNR will maintain over 150 acres of recent land acquisitions in this habitat. Further acquisitions composed of this habitat type are in review and may potentially broaden the occurrence of this habitat niche on the forest.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PGSF — See PGSF FY-17 AWP for VII. Watershed Protection Comp 19 Lostland Run HWA Mitigation /Red Spruce Planting small (1acre. annual) Native Red Spruce planting. Long standing Hemlock Protection Program with MDA; involving IPA approach to hemlock protection/preservation in important stands.</li> <li>• CF/PSF - Prescribed fire has been used to maintain open and early successional areas on the FMU (i.e. Brookview ponds, Powell Rd ESA, Furnace lupine site, etc.)</li> </ul>
<p><b>6.3.a.2</b> When a <i>rare ecological community</i> 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, <i>conservation zones</i> and/or <i>protected areas</i> are established where warranted.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>FME demonstrates exceptional efforts to identify rare ecological communities for protection, management and/or restoration. During harvests visited in 2017, ESAs and other protected areas were noted on maps when adjacent or within timber sale boundaries.</p> <p>Critical habitats have been mapped for state listed or uncommon species, shale barrens communities, old growth and potential old growth, vernal pools and unique open habitats in state forest management plans. In most cases, these areas are not entered with equipment.</p> <p>Per interviews with staff, for early successional habitat that is not well-represented on the</p>

		<p>landscape, FME is attempting to coordinate more opportunities to combine timber sale and prescribed fire layout to reduce costs.</p>
<p><b>6.3.a.3</b> When they are present, management maintains the area, structure, composition, and processes of all <b>Type 1</b> and <b>Type 2 old growth</b>. 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.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>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).</p> <p>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).</p> <p>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:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Old growth forests comprise a significant portion of the tribal ownership.</li> <li>2. A history of forest stewardship by the tribe exists.</li> <li>3. High Conservation Value Forest attributes are maintained.</li> <li>4. Old-growth structures are maintained.</li> <li>5. Conservation zones representative of old growth stands are established.</li> </ol>	<p>C</p>	<p>FME staff reported that there have been no harvests or other activities that have significantly affected old growth stands.</p>

<p>6. Landscape level considerations are addressed. 7. Rare species are protected.</p>		
<p><b>6.3.b</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.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>FME staff reported the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GRSF — Management activities were completed in the Kasecamp Bottoms, Anthony’s Ridge, Town Creek and Kirk Orchard SWHA including seasonal mowing, field border cutbacks, riparian shrub plantings, brush pile construction, and invasive species suppression to enhance early succession wildlife habitat structure.</li> <li>• SRSF — All planned and completed timber harvests include wildlife habitat improvement elements by creating an increase in early succession habitat critical to a variety of species in need of conservation including golden-winged warblers, American woodcock, etc.</li> <li>• PGSF — See PGSF FY17-AWP IX. Wildlife Mngt. Proposals:</li> <li>• Comp 25-14 is management in an ESA for a State Endangered Species (bird).</li> <li>• Comp 40-1 also management in an ESA involving habitat improvement for state Threatened &amp; Endangered Species (reptiles).</li> <li>• Routine permanent grassy opening mngt. of various small clearings / foodplots to benefit a wide variety of both game and non-game species.</li> <li>• CF/PSF — none reported</li> </ul>
<p><b>6.3.c</b> Management maintains, enhances and/or restores the plant and wildlife habitat of <b>Riparian Management Zones (RMZs)</b> to provide:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) habitat for aquatic species that breed in surrounding uplands;</li> <li>b) habitat for predominantly terrestrial species that breed in adjacent <b>aquatic habitats</b>;</li> <li>c) habitat for species that use riparian areas for feeding, cover, and travel;</li> <li>d) habitat for plant species associated with riparian areas; and,</li> </ol>	<p>C</p>	<p>FME reported the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GRSF — 29 acres of riparian area were converted from abandoned agriculture field and planted 30,000 trees and shrubs to establish riparian buffers and habitat along Town Creek.</li> <li>• SRSF — Annual Work Plan maps reference no cut buffers on blue line streams and wetlands as well as Maryland’s Best Management Practices that are implemented on all silvicultural activities to ensure the</li> </ul>

<p>e) stream shading and inputs of wood and leaf litter into the adjacent aquatic ecosystem.</p>		<p>preservation of water quality in adjacent waterways.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PGSF — 1) Numerous jurisdictional stream culverts associated with the Lost Land Run Road Restoration Project (as reviewed in last year’s audit).</li> <li>• 2) Various jurisdictional stream culverts replaced “in-house”: 2 On CCC Camp Road, 1 in Kindness Demonstration Forest/Hutton Area, and 1 above Laurel Run Area / Jenny Dove access.</li> <li>• 3) Temp. bridge associated with harvest in PG-2016-S-01 North Hill-Comp 14-12.</li> <li>• CF/PSF — Multiple thinnings entered our 300’ stream buffer to reduce pine stocking, and a final harvest was adjacent to a stream buffer.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Stand-scale Indicators</b>  <b>6.3.d</b> Management practices maintain or enhance plant species composition, distribution and frequency of occurrence similar to those that would naturally occur on the site.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>As confirmed in field site visits, all harvests in the Eastern Region include retention of oak and larger diameter legacy pine trees. Some harvests include pine seed trees of species that occur natural on the site, especially in the case of pond, pitch, and short-leaf pines. Other hardwoods, such as maples, poplars, and gums, are mostly retained in no-harvest zones and SMZs, as well as within production areas during thinnings. Bald cypress was observed in SMZs, which are typical sites for this species.</p>
<p><b>6.3.e</b> 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. <b>Native species</b> suited to the site are normally selected for regeneration.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Seed mixes are determined by MD Department of Wildlife and addressed in timber harvest contracts (Attachment E; medium red clover, ladino clover, orchard grass, perennial rye grass, and timothy grass).</p> <p>FME reported the following:  The only artificial regeneration work done on PGSF was the small &lt;1ac. Red Spruce restoration planting done in Lost Land Run; seedling stock from local Appalachian/Alleghany Plateau seed sources. Seedlings used on planted sites were sourced from the Maryland state tree nursery,</p>

		which tracks the origins of genetic material.
<p><b>6.3.f</b> 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:</p> <p>a) large live trees, live trees with decay or declining health, <b>snags</b>, and well-distributed coarse down and dead woody material. <b>Legacy trees</b> where present are not harvested; and</p> <p>b) vertical and horizontal complexity.</p> <p>Trees selected for <b>retention</b> are generally representative of the dominant species found on the site.</p>	C	<p>As confirmed in field site visits, all harvests in the Eastern Region include retention of oak and larger diameter legacy pine trees. Some harvests include pine seed trees of species that occur natural on the site, especially in the case of pond, pitch, and short-leaf pines. Other hardwoods, such as maples and gums, are mostly retained in no-harvest zones and SMZs. Snags were observed on several harvests with harvest areas and in no-harvest zones. Woody material is retained for use on skid trails to control erosion and compaction and distributed over harvest sites. All tree species selected for retention are of dominant species of the site.</p>
<p><b>6.3.g.1</b> In the Southeast, Appalachia, Ozark-Ouachita, Mississippi Alluvial Valley, and Pacific Coast Regions, when <b>even-aged systems</b> 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.</p> <p>In the Lake States Northeast, Rocky Mountain and Southwest Regions, when even-aged silvicultural systems are employed, and during salvage harvests, live trees and 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.</p>	C	<p>FME reported the following even-aged harvests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GRSF - All even-aged regeneration harvests carried out this year were completed under principles of variable retention.</li> <li>• SRSF — Approximately 105.2 acres of even aged harvests were completed on 130.2 management unit acres. 97.2 acres of mature hardwood were regenerated on four stands of 35, 17, 32.4 and 12.8 acres. The remaining even aged management occurred on 8 acres of the 1st first cut of a two-age shelterwood system. Retention objectives were met for each harvest with more than 5% of the original stand being retained. Buffers implemented along Streamside management zones, utilities, and HCVF ensured that retention targets would be met in each silvicultural operation. Refer to the FY-17 Annual Work Plan as well as the final timber harvest contracts for buffer/exclusion delineations.</li> <li>• PGSF — 1) See PGSF FY17-AWP PG-2017-S-09 Hutton Comp 43-7 = small 6 ac. clear cut with variable retention, harvest was under our required ac. for retention, but 5% retention was made per our standard.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2) See PGSF FY17-AWP PG-2017-S-10 Hutton Comp 43-7 = small (4 ac.) failing pine, salvage clear-cut, no retention required, nor any retained.</li> <li>• CF/PSF — Two sites were started within the past year. Neither has not been completed to date, due to weather issues.</li> </ul>
<p><b>6.3.g.2</b> 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:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is developed by qualified experts in ecological and/or related fields (wildlife biology, hydrology, landscape ecology, forestry/silviculture).</li> <li>2. Is based on the totality of the <b>best available information</b> including peer-reviewed science regarding natural disturbance regimes for the FMU.</li> <li>3. Is spatially and temporally explicit and includes maps of proposed openings or areas.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>5. Is reviewed by independent experts in wildlife biology, hydrology, and landscape ecology, to confirm the preceding findings.</li> </ol>	<p>NA</p>	<p>No exemptions to even-aged management restrictions associated with indicator 6.3.g.1 and its applicable regional sub-indicators were detected during field visits or review of management planning documentation.</p>
<p><b>6.3.h</b> The forest owner or manager assesses the risk of, prioritizes, and, as warranted, develops and implements a strategy to prevent or control <b>invasive species</b>, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. a method to determine the extent of invasive species and the degree of threat to native species and ecosystems;</li> <li>2. implementation of management practices that minimize the risk of invasive establishment, growth, and spread;</li> <li>3. eradication or control of established invasive populations when feasible: and,</li> <li>4. monitoring of control measures and management practices to assess their effectiveness in preventing or controlling invasive species.</li> </ol>	<p>C</p>	<p>FME reported the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GRSF — Ailanthus was treated in stands prior to harvest treatments in stands that it was known to exist and ailanthus was treated in special wildlife habitat areas. Furthermore, mowing occurred in old field areas where invasive shrubs exist to prevent establishment of these shrubs such as bush honeysuckle, autumn olive and multi-flora rose.</li> <li>• SRSF — treated and is monitoring several plant colonies or sites including: 9 Japanese Knotweed sites, 3 Tree of Heaven sites, 2 Mile-A-Minute sites and 1 Yellow Archangel site.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PGSF — See PGSF FY17-AWP VIII Ecosystem Restoration /Protection Projects; note control necessary on 3 NNIS spot treatments, (ref. herbicide application record.)</li> <li>CF/PSF — Mapping updates of known and new invasive locations, herbicide applications on high recreation use areas to slow the spread of invasive vegetation.</li> </ul>
<p><b>6.3.i</b> 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.</p>	C	<p>FME reported the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GRSF — No prescribed fire in past year. One wildfire burned approximately 2 acres in the Kirk Orchard area. No natural fires occurred.</li> <li>SRSF — One wildfire (arson) totaling 8.5 acres in Compartment 58.</li> <li>PGSF — None</li> <li>CF/PSF — Multiple prescribed burns have been completed on various sites. The majorities were in or near ESA Zone 1 areas.</li> </ul>
<p><b>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.</b></p>	NE	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	NE	
<p><b>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 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.</b></p>	NE	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	NE	
<p><b>6.8. Use of biological control agents shall be documented,</b></p>	NE	

<p><b>minimized, monitored, and strictly controlled in accordance with national laws and internationally accepted scientific protocols. Use of genetically modified organisms shall be prohibited.</b></p>		
<p><b>6.9. The use of exotic species shall be carefully controlled and actively monitored to avoid adverse ecological impacts.</b></p>	NA	
<p><b>6.9.a</b> The use of <i>exotic species</i> is contingent on the availability of credible scientific data indicating that any such species is non-invasive and its application does not pose a risk to native biodiversity.</p>	NA	<p>FME reported that no exotic species have been used for commercial or management purposes since the last audit, which the auditor confirmed in field observation. None are used in the Eastern Region.</p> <p>Refer to OBS 2016.1 and 2016.3 for use of Norway spruce (<i>Picea abies</i>) in the Western Region.</p>
<p><b>6.9.b</b> If exotic species are used, their provenance and the location of their use are documented, and their ecological effects are actively monitored.</p>	NA	See 6.9.a.
<p><b>6.9.c</b> The forest owner or manager shall take timely action to curtail or significantly reduce any adverse impacts resulting from their use of exotic species</p>	NA	See 6.9.a.
<p><b>6.10. Forest conversion to plantations or non-forest land uses shall not occur, except in circumstances where conversion:</b>  <b>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.</b></p>	NE	
<p><b>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.</b></p>		
<p><b>7.1. The management plan and supporting documents shall provide:</b>  <b>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>  <b>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.</b></p>	NE	

<p><b>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></p> <p><b>b) h) Maps describing the forest resource base including protected areas, planned management activities and land ownership.</b></p> <p><b>i) Description and justification of harvesting techniques and equipment to be used.</b></p>		
<p><b>7.1.a</b> 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.</p>	NE	
<p><b>7.1.b</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).</p>	C	Refer to <b>OBS 2017.1</b> .
<p><b>7.1.c</b> 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.</p>	C	Refer to <b>OBS 2017.1</b> .
<p><b>7.1.d</b> The management plan includes a description of the landscape within which the FMU is located and describes how landscape-scale habitat elements described in Criterion 6.3 will be addressed.</p>	C	Refer to <b>OBS 2017.1</b> .
<p><b>7.1.e</b> The management plan includes a description of the following resources and outlines activities to conserve and/or protect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• rare, threatened, or endangered species and natural communities (see Criterion 6.2);</li> <li>• plant species and community diversity and wildlife habitats (see Criterion 6.3);</li> <li>• water resources (see Criterion 6.5);</li> <li>• soil resources (see Criterion 6.3);</li> <li>• Representative Sample Areas (see Criterion 6.4);</li> <li>• High Conservation Value Forests (see Principle 9);</li> <li>• Other special management areas.</li> </ul>	NC	Refer to <b>CAR 2017.2</b> .
<p><b>7.1.f</b> If invasive species are present, the management plan describes invasive species conditions, applicable management</p>	NE	

objectives, and how they will be controlled (see Indicator 6.3.j).		
<b>7.1.g</b> 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).	NE	
<b>7.1.h</b> If chemicals are used, the plan describes what is being used, applications, and how the management system conforms with Criterion 6.6.	NE	
<b>7.1.i</b> If biological controls are used, the management plan describes what is being used, applications, and how the management system conforms with Criterion 6.8.	NE	
<b>7.1.j</b> The management plan incorporates the results of the evaluation of social impacts, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• traditional cultural resources and rights of use (see Criterion 2.1);</li> <li>• potential conflicts with customary uses and use rights (see Criteria 2.2, 2.3, 3.2);</li> <li>• management of ceremonial, archeological, and historic sites (see Criteria 3.3 and 4.5);</li> <li>• management of aesthetic values (see Indicator 4.4.a);</li> <li>• public access to and use of the forest, and other recreation issues;</li> <li>• 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).</li> </ul>	NE	
<b>7.1.k</b> The management plan describes the general purpose, condition and maintenance needs of the transportation network (see Indicator 6.5.e).	NE	
<b>7.1.l</b> 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.	NE	
<b>7.1.m</b> The management plan describes how species selection and harvest rate calculations were developed to meet the requirements of Criterion 5.6.	NE	
<b>7.1.n</b> The management plan includes a description of monitoring procedures necessary to address the requirements of Criterion 8.2.	NE	
<b>7.1.o</b> The management plan includes maps describing the	NE	

resource base, the characteristics of general management zones, special management areas, and protected areas at a level of detail to achieve management objectives and protect sensitive sites.		
<b>7.1.p</b> 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.	NE	
<b>7.1.q</b> 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.	NE	
<b>7.1.r</b> The management plan describes the stakeholder consultation process.	NE	
<b>7.2</b> 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.	NE	
<b>7.3</b> Forest workers shall receive adequate training and supervision to ensure proper implementation of the management plans.	NE	
<b>7.4</b> 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.	NE	
<b>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.</b>		
<b>8.1</b> 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.	C	
<b>8.1.a</b> Consistent with the scale and intensity of management, the forest owner or manager develops and consistently implements a regular, comprehensive, and replicable written monitoring protocol.	C	All monitoring occurs per established in SFMPs and AWP, and as per FME's procedures and policies. Certain monitoring is required be legislation, such as for accounting purposes. FME also demonstrated BMP manuals, some of which include recommended monitoring practices.

		<p>Certain systems, including software and silvicultural systems, have associated manuals and guidelines that include monitoring protocols. For example, in the Western Region the SILVAH system is used to monitor oak regeneration and growth.</p>
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>C</p>	
<p><b>8.2.a.1</b> 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.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>FME reported the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GRSF — All areas that received a final harvest in the last 2-5 years were inventoried in the last year to monitor and evaluate regeneration. Furthermore, all stands proposed for regeneration harvests were inventoried to evaluate potential for regeneration and guide prescription for regeneration harvest methods.</li> <li>• SRSF — Inventory has been completed within the harvestable areas of the state forest. Regeneration data was gathered for all FY-18 proposals.</li> <li>• PGSF — Forest-wide inventory completed 2 years ago. Regeneration monitoring plans call for 5 yr. (growing seasons) resurvey after harvest completion. 1st harvests since completed since inventoried, are coming due this summer.</li> <li>• CF/PSF — Our CFI and forest inventory procedure was completed in 2016. Yield tables were created from the inventory data, and our forest model was updated. Regeneration surveys have been conducted on recent harvest sites.</li> </ul>
<p><b>8.2.a.2</b> Significant, unanticipated removal or loss or increased vulnerability of forest resources is monitored and recorded.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>FME reported no recent timber theft during interviews with forest managers. No new major</p>

<p>Recorded information shall include date and location of occurrence, description of disturbance, extent and severity of loss, and may be both quantitative and qualitative.</p>		<p>storm or disease events were reported in 2017.</p>
<p><b>8.2.b</b> The forest owner or manager maintains records of harvested timber and NTFPs (volume and product and/or grade). Records must adequately ensure that the requirements under Criterion 5.6 are met.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>FME reported the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GRSF — 411,591BF sawtimber, 914 cords pulpwood</li> <li>• SRSF — 941,285 board feet and 1,105 cords of pulpwood</li> <li>• PGSF — By end of FY-17 (June 30) , will have 520,937 Bd. Ft. under contract</li> <li>• CF/PSF — 42,293 tons; 646 MBF</li> </ul> <p>Refer to Timber Sale Summary FY2016 in 5.6.b. Harvest records for lump-sum, stumpage, and gatewood sales were reviewed at Parker Forestry Services.</p>
<p><b>8.2.c</b> The forest owner or manager periodically obtains data needed to monitor presence on the FMU of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Rare, threatened and endangered species and/or their <b>habitats</b>;</li> <li>2) Common and rare plant communities and/or habitat;</li> <li>3) Location, presence and abundance of invasive species;</li> <li>4) Condition of protected areas, set-asides and buffer zones;</li> <li>5) High Conservation Value Forests (see Criterion 9.4).</li> </ol>	<p>C</p>	<p>FME reported the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GRSF — Woodcock singing ground survey, wood turtle and herpalology surveys, wild turkey poult production, bear den reproduction surveys, bear bait surveys, nightjar survey, golden-winged warbler survey, camera trapping surveys for spotted skunk.</li> <li>• SRSF — Various research projects have been ongoing throughout the forest focusing on a plethora of plant and animal communities including northern long-eared bats, American chestnut, eastern red-backed salamanders, millipedes, golden-winged warblers, Allegheny wood rats and Monarda didyma. Projects to control the non-native invasive species garlic mustard and Japanese spirea were conducted in the Bear Pen Wildlands. Wildlife and Heritage Division of DNR have ongoing monitoring for black bears, golden eagles, striped skunks and Appalachian cottontails.</li> <li>• PGSF — DNR Wildlife and Heritage Program’s surveys for both New England Cottontail and Spotted Skunks, as well as annual Goshawk</li> </ul>

		<p>Nesting monitoring.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CF/PSF — Delmarva Fox Squirrel monitoring by the USFWS, bat monitoring by Salisbury University &amp; plant community monitoring by our Wildlife &amp; Heritage Unit.</li> </ul> <p>During the audit, FME presented published papers on monitoring results of the Frosted Elfin butterfly, as well as monitoring included as a part of updated AWP.</p>
<p><b>8.2.d.1</b> 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.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Timber Sale Inspection forms are maintained for harvest monitoring visits and finalized at the end of harvest. Parker Forestry Services demonstrated inspection forms for the sites visited in 2017. Parker Forestry Services also demonstrated chemical application maps that show application trails and that protected areas were avoided.</p>
<p><b>8.2.d.2</b> A monitoring program is in place to assess the condition and environmental impacts of the forest-road system.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p><i>A Forest Roads Management For Forest Operations on Maryland State Forests</i> has been implemented. This policy creates a systematic inventory of the State Forest roads including ORV trails. This plan documents each road segment and drainage feature in a GIS-based identification system and allows the development of a priority plan for road maintenance and feature replacement that is incorporated into annual work plans for each state forest.</p>
<p><b>8.2.d.3</b> 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).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>FME reported the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GRSF — NONE</li> <li>SRSF — Five (5) trail counters have been installed throughout the forest to monitor visitor numbers and the data is downloaded at regular intervals.</li> <li>PGSF — Western State Forests have engaged in cooperative project with Frostburg State University to carry out a Recreation/Tourism Economic Impact Study, with survey work slated to begin now in April 2017.</li> <li>CF/PSF — Monitoring of social media sites related to recreational trail use.</li> </ul>

<p><b>8.2.d.4</b> Stakeholder responses to management activities are monitored and recorded as necessary.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>At each state forest a complaints log is maintained. This was examined and resolution to each comment is documented when the issue has been investigated and closed.</p>
<p><b>8.2.d.5</b> Where sites of cultural significance exist, the opportunity to jointly monitor sites of cultural significance is offered to tribal representatives (see Principle 3).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>There are no such sites on the FMU. However, FME offered this opportunity to Tribes participating in the CAC in the past. In addition, FME is cooperating with the MD Commission of Indian Affairs</p> <p>The most significant change since the last audit is that managers in the Eastern Region have initiated contact with a new recognized tribal representative and are trying to attain tribal participation on the CAC.</p>
<p><b>8.2.e</b> The forest owner or manager monitors the costs and revenues of management in order to assess productivity and efficiency.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>FME reported that CF/PSF holds quarterly &amp; biweekly meetings with the Contract Manager. All state forests have weekly BMP inspections of harvesting operations.</p> <p>Cost and revenue is monitored as part of the AWP process. AMPs contain a summary of cost and revenue information. Each SF has its own operational budget. Each SF maintains a spreadsheet and reports these to state offices in Annapolis. Accounting reviews all expenditures.</p>
<p><b>8.3</b> 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."</p>	<p>NE</p>	
<p><b>8.4</b> The results of monitoring shall be incorporated into the implementation and revision of the management plan.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p><b>8.4.a</b> The forest owner or manager monitors and documents the degree to which the objectives stated in the management plan are being fulfilled, as well as significant deviations from the plan.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Monitoring results of ongoing projects are frequently reported on in AWPs, including on whether project objectives are being met. Monitoring reports are also published on the FME's website. BMP monitoring and forest inventory updates occur on schedule every few years so that achievement of forest management objectives can be assessed.</p>
<p><b>8.4.b</b> Where monitoring indicates that management objectives</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Regular management planning update processes</p>

<p>and guidelines, including those necessary for conformance with this Standard, are not being met or if changing conditions indicate that a change in management strategy is necessary, the management plan, operational plans, and/or other plan implementation measures are revised to ensure the objectives and guidelines will be met. If monitoring shows that the management objectives and guidelines themselves are not sufficient to ensure conformance with this Standard, then the objectives and guidelines are modified.</p>		<p>under C7.2 are being used to ensure that monitoring information is being incorporated into the plans. Since AWP's are prepared 18 months prior to the beginning of the fiscal year, results of monitoring are regularly used to modify and update management approaches.</p> <p>The SFMP's in the Eastern Region was updated to incorporate the results of DFS recovery efforts, especially in adjusting approaches to classifying suitable habitat and translocation. In the Western Region, use of the SILVAH system has changed some of the approaches to monitoring regeneration and making decisions on stand treatments, as included in AWP's.</p>
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>C</p>	
<p><b>8.5.a</b> While protecting landowner confidentiality, either full monitoring results or an up-to-date summary of the most recent monitoring information is maintained, covering the Indicators listed in Criterion 8.2, and is available to the public, free or at a nominal price, upon request.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>There is a monitoring tab included in each State Forest's webpage. Also, each AWP includes a section on updates to monitoring projects. All elements of Criterion 8.2 are addressed. See also response to Major CAR 2014.14 for a more complete listing of publicly available monitoring results.</p>
<p><b>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.</b></p>		
<p><b>High Conservation Value Forests are those that possess one or more of the following attributes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) <b>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></li> <li>b) <b>Forest areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems</b></li> <li>c) <b>Forest areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g., watershed protection, erosion control)</b></li> <li>d) <b>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).</b></li> </ul>		
<p><b>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</b></p>	<p>NE</p>	

<b>management.</b>		
<b>9.2 The consultative portion of the certification process must place emphasis on the identified conservation attributes, and options for the maintenance thereof.</b>	NE	
<b>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.</b>	NE	
<b>9.4 Annual monitoring shall be conducted to assess the effectiveness of the measures employed to maintain or enhance the applicable conservation attributes.</b>	C	
<b>9.4.a</b> The forest owner or manager monitors, or participates in a program to annually monitor, the status of the specific HCV attributes, including the effectiveness of the measures employed for their maintenance or enhancement. The monitoring program is designed and implemented consistent with the requirements of Principle 8.	C	<p>FME reported that its Wildlife &amp; Heritage Unit continues to monitor ESAs post restoration treatment on high priority sites. DNR Fisheries do regular Brook trout monitoring in SF streams, Maryland Biological Stream Survey has data collection points on several streams (all in HCVF stream buffers), MD Maryland Department of Agriculture Hemlock Woolly Adelgid protection efforts are monitored by MDA for effectiveness, most of these stands are within HCVF areas, including the 50ft. stream buffers.</p> <p>FME has only reported on activities related to the management of significant concentrations of RTE species, such as the Delmarva Fox Squirrel. While many HCVs rely on passive management approaches, Natural Heritage staff conduct annual reviews of these areas based on a sampling protocol.</p> <p>Publications on Frosted Elfin butterfly habitat were provided as evidence of monitoring of this significant concentration of RTE species population.</p>
<b>9.4.b</b> When monitoring results indicate increasing risk to a specific HCV attribute, the forest owner/manager re-evaluates the measures taken to maintain or enhance that attribute, and adjusts the management measures in an effort to reverse the trend.	C	FME has not reported any increasing risks to specific HCV attributes under their control.

**APPENDICES**

**APPENDIX C: REGIONAL LIMITS AND OTHER GUIDELINES ON OPENING SIZES, Indicator 6.3.g.1**

This Appendix contains regional Indicators and guidance pertinent to maximum opening sizes and other guidelines for determining size openings and retention. These Indicators are requirements based on FSC-US regional delineations

**APPALACHIA REGION**

<p><b>6.3.g.1.a</b> When even-aged silviculture (e.g., seed tree, regular or irregular shelterwood), or deferment cutting is employed, live trees and native vegetation are retained and opening sizes are created within the harvest unit in a proportion and configuration that is consistent with the characteristic natural disturbance regime in each community type, unless retention at a lower level is necessary for restoration or rehabilitation purposes. Harvest openings with no retention are limited to 10 acres.</p> <p><i><b>Guidance:</b> Even-age silviculture is used only where naturally occurring species are maintained or enhanced. Retention within harvest units can include riparian and streamside buffers and other special zones. In addition, desirable overstory and understory species may be retained outside of buffers or special zones while allowing for regeneration of shade-intolerant and intermediate species consistent with overall management principals. Where stands have been degraded, less retention can be used to improve both merchantable and non-merchantable attributes.</i></p>	<p>NE</p>	<p>The Western Region of the FMU was not visited in 2017.</p>
---	-----------	---

<p><b>6.3.g.1.b</b> When uneven age silvicultural techniques are used (e.g., individual tree selection or group selection), canopy openings are less than 2.5 acres.</p> <p><i><b>Applicability note:</b> Uneven age silvicultural techniques are used when they maintain or enhance the overall species richness and biologic diversity, regenerate-shade tolerant or intermediate-tolerant species, and/or provide small canopy openings to regenerate shade-intolerant and intermediate species. Uneven-age techniques are generally used to develop forests with at least three age classes. Uneven age silviculture is employed to prevent high-grading and/or diameter limit cutting.</i></p>	<p>NE</p>	<p>The Western Region of the FMU was not visited in 2017.</p>
---	-----------	---

**SOUTHEAST REGION**

<p><b>6.3.g.1.a</b> Primary and natural forests: clear-cutting is not allowed. Harvesting is not allowed at all in <b>primary forests</b>.</p> <p>Semi-natural forests: stands with trees greater than 100 years old: clear-cutting is not allowed; even-aged stands of hardwood and cypress: clear-cutting is allowed; the size of openings</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Within the Eastern State Forests (Southeast Region) even-aged silviculture including final stage of shelterwood (overstory removal) and clearcuts are restricted to previously established pine stands that are being managed as semi-natural/natural stands and openings that are less than 40 acres in size. A notable exception to</p>
--	----------	--

<p>should be conservative.</p> <p>Even-aged stands of pine and pine/hardwood: clear-cutting is allowed; the size of openings should not be higher than the limit for plantations and should be justified by natural regeneration requirements.</p> <p>Clear-cuts up to 80 acres are allowed in cases where a 40-acre stand would not provide enough timber volume to secure an economically operable timber sale, meaning that the sale would not attract a buyer and/or the landowner would not make a profit from the sale. Examples of such cases include stands that have been high graded and the most valuable species of trees have already been removed, or where a site has been planted with inappropriate, poorly growing species and the landowner/manager wants to clear and restore the site. This exception cannot be used when a 40-acre clearcut would be economically operable and a landowner wants to cut 80 acres simply to make a greater profit.</p> <p>Clearcuts up to 80 acres are allowed in cases where harvesting a stand in 40 acre blocks would cause unnecessary environmental disturbance to the area surrounding the stand.</p> <p>An exception to all of the limits on the use and size of clearcuts can be made in cases of ecologic necessity. Clearcutting may be used in natural forest stands--where appropriate and necessary--as a tool for maintaining ecosystems that are dependent on large, contiguous openings. An example is the sand pine scrub ecosystem, which supports the ecologically significant Florida scrub jay and is currently being managed with large, contiguous clear-cuts. Ecologists urge the use of large clearcuts in the sand pine scrub ecosystem to mimic the stand-replacing, catastrophic fires that historically maintained the ecosystem. This exception may only be used when supported by scientific literature.</p>	<p>clearcut opening sizes is in the case of restoration plans developed in cooperation with the FME Natural Heritage to re-establish Delmarva Bays, which are based on best available science.</p> <p>See also section 2.1 (field tour).</p> <p>There are no limitations on opening size limits in the Southeastern regional indicators; however, there are suggested opening size limits (80 acres). The average clearcut size is 40 acres, but FME has had openings that of 120-160 acres in the case of restoration of wetland ecosystems where pine was planted or invaded after disturbance (e.g., Nassawango Pines Restoration Project). In these cases, wetland hydrology is often restored and pines are removed with the intent of restoring natural plant communities. No such sites were visited in the 2017 audit.</p>
--	--

## Appendix 6 – Chain of Custody Indicators for FMEs

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

## SCS Trademark Annex for FMEs: FSC Trademarks, FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2

- N/A, does not use/intend to use FSC trademarks for any purposes (finished with this section); or  
 N/A, is fully integrated and all trademark uses are treated under the COC Annex to this report that includes a full review of FSC-STD-40-004 and FSC-STD-50-001.

NOTE: This section is **applicable for all organizations that use or intend to use any FSC trademarks for promotional and/or on-product purposes**. For evaluation audits, it is acceptable to mark C if the client demonstrates an adequate awareness of the requirements through interviews and other applicable evidence. A requirement should be marked NC and a corresponding CAR should be issued for any nonconformance identified, such as use of FSC trademarks prior to granting of certification.

**Description** of how the organization currently uses, or intends to use, FSC trademarks and/or labels, including but not limited to printed materials, Internet applications, on-product labeling, and other public-facing media:

FME makes promotional use of the FSC Trademarks on its website, Annual Work Plans, and some brochures. FSC Trademarks on the website are incorrect and not approved. FME could not demonstrate its trademark approval records during the audit.

FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 1.9  
 Products intended to be labeled or promoted as FSC certified are included in the organization’s certified **product group list**.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	C
<input type="checkbox"/>	NC
<input type="checkbox"/>	C w/Obs

**Evidence:** Confirmed via review of product group list, website, annual work plans, and brochure.

FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 1.4, 1.6 – 1.8, 1.13 – 1.14  
 The organization does not use the FSC trademarks in the following ways:

- in connection with the sale or promotion of **FSC Controlled Wood** (§1.4)
- in any way that could cause **confusion**, misinterpretation or loss of credibility to the FSC certification scheme (§1.6)
- to imply any **FSC endorsement** or responsibility of the organization’s activities outside of the certificate scope (§1.7)
- to imply any **FSC responsibility** for the production of products, documents or promotional materials (§1.8)
- in product brand names, company names or website domain **names** (§1.13)
- **translated** to another language with no English included (§1.14)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	C
<input type="checkbox"/>	NC
<input type="checkbox"/>	C w/Obs

FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 7.2  
 The FSC trademarks are not used together with the marks of **other forest certification** schemes in a way **which implies equivalence** or in a way which is disadvantageous to the FSC trademarks in terms of size or placement.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	C
<input type="checkbox"/>	NC
<input type="checkbox"/>	C w/Obs

**Sections 1.4, 1.6 – 1.8, 1.13, 1.14, and 7.2 Evidence:** Confirmed via review of annual work plans, brochure, and website.

<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 1.11 Any <b>information about FSC</b> that is in addition to FSC trademarks and labels included in any material has been given prior <b>approval</b> by SCS.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A, no additional FSC information
<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 1.15 The use of the FSC “checkmark-and-tree” logo is directly accompanied by the <b>appropriate trademark symbols</b> ® or ™ (in superscript font). The appropriate symbol also accompanies the <b>first use</b> of “FSC” and “Forest Stewardship Council” in any text.</p> <p><b>NOTES:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The use of trademark registration symbol is not required for FSC claims in sales and delivery documents, or for the disclaimer/ statement specified in requirement 7.5 of FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2. The registration symbol is required for any other use of initials “FSC” on documents; however, the omission of the use of trademark registration symbol in promotional texts related to FSC on invoice templates, delivery notes and similar documents is possible if the software used to produce these documents does not support trademark registration symbols. This exception only applies to the use of the trademark registration symbol for the initials “FSC” and the name “Forest Stewardship Council”.</li> <li>In January 2014, in Hong Kong, FSC changed the trademark symbol from ® back to ™. Companies affected by this change which have approved artwork with the ® registered trademark symbol for distribution in Hong Kong may continue to produce, distribute and sell into the market product using the registered trademark symbol on the FSC trademarks until 1 September 2015, with an additional liquidation period of six months, which expires 1 March 2016. All <b>new</b> artwork must use the ™ trademark symbol.</li> <li>Where the FSC initials are used vertically in the traditional way of writing for Asian nations, the registration status symbol may be used in superscript font in either the top right corner (alongside F), or the bottom right corner (alongside C) as preferred. In this instance, mark “C”.</li> </ol>	<input type="checkbox"/> C <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs <input type="checkbox"/> N/A, one or more of the noted exceptions apply
<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 1.16 All FSC <b>trademark uses</b> have been submitted to SCS for <b>approval</b>.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> C <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs
<p><b>Sections 1.11, 1.15 and 1.16 Evidence:</b> Confirmed via review of website, annual work plans, and brochure. First mention of Forest Stewardship Council and FSC are not followed by the ‘R’ symbol and website has not been submitted for approval to SCS. No approval records were available. See <b>CAR 2017.3</b>.</p>	
<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 1.10 All (previously approved) FSC labels <b>only use the FSC label artwork</b> provided on the label generator or otherwise issued or approved by SCS or FSC.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs <input type="checkbox"/> N/A, no approved FSC labels
<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, Sections 10, 11 and 12 All (previously approved) FSC labels and logos conform to the standard requirements for <b>color and font</b> (§10.1-10.3, 11.5, 11.7, 11.9), <b>format and size</b> (§10.4 - 10.7, 11.2, 11.3, 11.8), <b>trademark symbol</b> (§10.8, 11.4), <b>FSC trademark license code</b> (§10.9), <b>label text</b> (§10.10 - 10.15) and/or <b>mini label</b> requirements (§10.16 - 10.18). The label or logo is not being <b>misused</b> in any manner described in section 12.2.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs <input type="checkbox"/> N/A, no approved FSC labels

<p><b>Sections 1.10, 10, 11 and 12.2 Evidence:</b> Confirmed via review of website, annual work plans, and brochure. No logos are used on the FSC website.</p>	
<p><b>Promotional use of the FSC trademarks</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> N/A, does not use/intend to use FSC trademarks for promotional purposes (Skip Promotional section)</p>	
<p>NOTE: This section is applicable for all organizations that use or <i>intend</i> to use FSC trademarks for <b>promotional purposes</b>. For evaluation audits, it is acceptable to mark C if the client demonstrates an adequate awareness of the requirements through interviews and other applicable evidence. A requirement should be marked NC and a corresponding CAR should be issued for any nonconformance identified, such as use of FSC trademarks prior to granting of certification.</p>	
<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 1.12, 4.4</p> <p>The FSC trademarks are not used to promote <b>product quality</b> aspects not covered by FSC certification (§ 1.12). Any claims regarding <b>qualities outside the control of FSC</b>, such as other environmental attributes of the product, are separated from text about FSC (§ 4.4).</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> C</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> NC</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A, no additional quality claims</p>
<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 6.1</p> <p><b>Catalogues, brochures, and websites</b> meet the following requirements:</p> <p>a) The promotional panel, or at least the FSC trademark license code, is in a prominent place.</p> <p>b) When the products are not all on the same page, a link or text such as “Look for FSC certified products” is included next to the panel / code.</p> <p>c) FSC certified products are indicated by using the logo or with “FSC certified” in the product description.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> C</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NC</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> N/A, do not use trademarks in these items</p>
<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 4.1</p> <p>For labeled <b>stationery and brochures printed on FSC-certified paper, the label is not in such a prominent position</b> as to make it appear that any organization (or its products) represented in the publication is endorsed by FSC. (E.g. the FSC label is not placed on the front cover of the brochure or next to images of forest-based products which are not FSC certified.)</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> C</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> NC</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A, no such labeled items</p>
<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 6.2</p> <p>FSC certified products are not promoted using only the <b>SCS Kingfisher</b> and/or <b>SCS Global Services logo</b>.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> NC</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs</p>
<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 7.3</p> <p>FSC trademarks are <b>not used</b> at the top of <b>document templates</b> such as letterheads, sales documents and emails.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> NC</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs</p>
<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 7.4</p> <p>The FSC trademarks are not used on <b>business cards to promote</b> the organization’s certification.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> NC</p>

<p>NOTE: If authorization was duly received under the previous trademark standard, the organization may use the existing supply until it is depleted. In this case, the approval must be available and must have been granted prior to July 1, 2011.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs <input type="checkbox"/> N/A, approval granted prior to July 1, 2011
<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 4.2                  If a <b>business card is printed on FSC-certified paper</b>, the mini label with product type is used at minimum size. The use of the mini label does not imply that the organization is affiliated with FSC.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A, no labeled business cards
<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 8.1, 8.2                  All <b>promotional items</b> (e.g., mugs, pens, T-shirts, caps, banners, vehicles, etc.) display, at minimum, the FSC logo and FSC trademark license code (§8.1). Any promotional items made wholly or partly of wood (e.g., pencils, memory sticks, etc.) meet the applicable labeling requirements specified by FSC-STD-40-004 (§8.2).</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A, no FSC labels on promotional items
<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 8.3                  For FSC trademarks used for promotion at <b>trade fairs</b> the organization has clearly marked which products are FSC certified and the products carry an FSC label; or if no products are displayed, a visible disclaimer stating, “Ask for our FSC certified products,” or, “We can provide FSC certified products upon request,” is present.                  NOTE: Use of text to describe the FSC certification of the organization does not require a disclaimer.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A, no FSC trademarks used for promotion at trade fairs
<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 9.1, 9.2                  The organization takes full responsibility for the use of FSC trademarks by <b>investment companies</b> and others making <b>financial claims</b> based on their FSC certified operations (§9.1). Any such claims are accompanied by the disclaimer, “FSC is not responsible for and does not endorse any financial claims on returns on investments” (§9.2).</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A, no investment claims about FSC operations
<p><b>Promotional Trademarks Section Evidence:</b> Confirmed via review of website, annual work plans, and brochure. The website does not meet the following requirements:                  a) The promotional panel, or at least the FSC trademark license code, is not in a prominent place.                  See <b>CAR 2017.3</b>.</p>	
<p><b>Number and variety of promotional trademarks and associated approval records reviewed:</b> See website, annual work plans, and brochure. Business cards do not have any trademarks.</p>	
<p><b>Rationale that sample choice is sufficient to confirm system is functioning effectively and as described:</b> Only these uses were detected or reported.</p>	

## Using the FSC labels on products

N/A, does not use/intend to use FSC on-product/packaging labels (Skip section 11)

NOTE: This section is applicable for all organizations that use or *intend* to use FSC trademarks for **on-product purposes**. For evaluation audits, it is acceptable to mark C if the client demonstrates an adequate awareness of the requirements through interviews and other applicable evidence. A requirement should be marked NC and a corresponding CAR should be issued for any nonconformance identified, such as use of FSC trademarks prior to granting of certification.

FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 2.1

For each on-product claim, the organization has selected the **correct FSC label** based upon the FSC claim that the product has been supplied with or is qualified for.

NOTE: For FM/COC certificates, the FSC label and claim is FSC 100%.

C  
 NC  
 C w/Obs

### Sections FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 2.1 Evidence:

FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 2.3

The FSC label is **clearly visible** on the product, its packaging or both.

C  
 NC  
 C w/Obs

FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 2.6

Marks of **other forestry certification schemes** are not used on the **same product** (except for product promotion or educational purposes in an FSC labeled publication, as long as there are no claims about the paper of the publication being certified against the other certification scheme (§2.6.1)).

C  
 NC  
 C w/Obs

FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 2.7

When products are being made for sale to retailers who may wish to use the FSC trademarks to promote them, the products carry the FSC label either on the product or on packaging which will be **visible to the consumer**.

C  
 NC  
 C w/Obs  
 N/A, products not being made for sale to retailers

FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 4.3

Where the FSC logo with the license code is applied as a **heat brand or stencil** directly to the product without all required label elements, a **standard label is also used** either on the packaging or attached as a sticker or hang-tag.

C  
 NC  
 C w/Obs  
 N/A, no brand/stencil  
 N/A, brand/stencil includes all elements

### Sections 2.2 – 2.7, 4.3 Evidence:

**Number and variety of on-product logos and associated approval records reviewed:**

**Rationale that sample choice is sufficient to confirm system is functioning effectively and as described:**