

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
<http://dnr.maryland.gov/forests/>

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

DATE OF FIELD AUDIT
6-10/April/2015
DATE OF LAST UPDATE
17/April/2015

SCS Contact:

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

SCSglobal
SERVICES
Setting the standard for sustainability™

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

Foreword

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

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

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

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

Organization of the Report

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

Table of Contents

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY	4
1. GENERAL INFORMATION	4
1.1 Annual Audit Team	4
1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation	5
1.3 Standards Employed	5
2 ANNUAL AUDIT DATES AND ACTIVITIES	5
2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities	5
2.2 Evaluation of Management Systems	8
3. CHANGES IN MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	8
4. RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION.....	9
4.1 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations	9
4.2 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations	39
5. STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS	43
5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted	44
5.2 Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Responses from the Team, Where Applicable.....	44
6. CERTIFICATION DECISION	44
7. CHANGES IN CERTIFICATION SCOPE	44
8. ANNUAL DATA UPDATE	48
8.1 Social Information.....	48
8.2 Annual Summary of Pesticide and Other Chemical Use	48
SECTION B – APPENDICES (CONFIDENTIAL).....	49
Appendix 1 – List of FMUs Selected For Evaluation.....	49
Appendix 2 – List of Stakeholders Consulted.....	49
Appendix 3 – Additional Audit Techniques Employed.....	50
Appendix 4 – Pesticide Derogations	50
Appendix 5 – Detailed Observations	50
Appendix 6 – Chain of Custody Indicators for FMEs.....	91

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY

1. General Information

1.1 Annual Audit Team

Auditor Name:	Kyle Meister	Auditor role:	FSC Lead Auditor
Qualifications:	<p>Kyle Meister is a Certification Forester with Scientific Certification Systems. 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, 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>		
Auditor Name:	Mike Ferrucci	Auditor role:	SFI Lead Auditor
Qualifications:	<p>Mike Ferrucci is the SFI Program Manager for NSF – International Strategic Registrations and is responsible for all aspects of the firm’s SFI Certification programs. He is qualified as a RAB-QSA Lead Auditor (ISO 14001 Environmental Management Systems), as an SFI Lead Auditor for Forest Management, Procurement, and Chain of Custody, as an FSC Lead Auditor Forest Management and Chain of Custody, as a Tree Farm Group Certification Lead Auditor, and as a GHG Lead Auditor. Mike has led Sustainable Forest Initiative (SFI) certification and precertification reviews throughout the United States. He has also led or participated in joint SFI and Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) certification projects in nearly one dozen states and a joint scoping or precertification gap-analysis project on tribal lands throughout the United States. He also co-led the pioneering pilot dual evaluation of the Lakeview Stewardship Unit on the Fremont-Winema National Forest.</p> <p>Mike Ferrucci has 33 years of forest management experience. His expertise is in sustainable forest management planning; in certification of forests as sustainably managed; in the application of easements for large-scale working forests, and in the ecology, silviculture, and management of mixed species forests, with an emphasis on regeneration and management of native hardwood species. Mike has conducted or participated in assessments of forest management operations throughout the United States, with field experience in 4 countries and 33 states. Mike has been a member of the Society of American Foresters for over thirty-five years. He is Past Chair of the SFI Auditor’s Forum. Mike is also a Lecturer at the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, where he has taught graduate courses and workshops in forest management, harvesting operations, professional forest ethics, private forestry, and financial analysis.</p>		

1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation

A. Number of days spent on-site assessing the applicant:	3.5
B. Number of auditors participating in on-site evaluation:	2
C. Additional days spent on preparation, stakeholder consultation, and post-site follow-up:	2
D. Total number of person days used in evaluation:	9

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

1.3.2. SCS Interim FSC Standards

Title	Version	Date of Finalization
SCS FSC Chain of Custody Indicators for Forest Management Enterprises	V5-1	December 3, 2012
This SCS Interim Standard was developed by modifying SCS' Generic Interim Standard to reflect forest management in the region and by incorporating relevant components of the Draft Regional / National Standard and comments from stakeholders. More than one month prior to the start of the field evaluation, the SCS Draft Interim Standard for the country / region was sent out for comment to stakeholders identified by FSC International, SCS, the forest managers under evaluation, and the National Initiative. A copy of the standard is available at www.scsglobalservices.com/certification-standards-and-program-documents or upon request from SCS Global Services (www.SCSglobalServices.com).		

2 Annual Audit Dates and Activities

2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities

April 6, 2015 Chesapeake and Pocomoke State Forests

Opening Meeting: Introductions, client update, review audit scope, audit plan, intro/update to FSC and SCS standards and protocols, review of open CARs/OBS, final site selection

Site 1. P01 Sturges Creek, Tract 2 – Stand 15- first pine thinning started April 2013 but suspended work; started again and completed in September 2014 (70 square feet of basal area). Retention of hard-mast hardwoods. Minimal rutting and residual stem damage, and reasonable utilization were observed. BMPs to protect RTE species in adjacent power line right-of-way implemented to avoid negative impacts, primarily through designating log landings away from the area. Part of future Delmarva Fox Squirrel zone. Natural Heritage staff signed off on sale after conducting preliminary environmental review.

Site 2. WR10 Ruddick Tract, Stand 20 –first thinning; dry portions cut February 2014, and wetter sections done in September 2014. Confirmed that special sites (ESA 1, ESA 3, and an archeological site) were protected by buffering them from harvesting. Interviews with Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC).

Site 3. P02 Nazareth Church, Tract 7- Stand 8 – Pond Pine seed tree harvest was completed during the fall of 2014. Block #3 was inspected. The prescription had been for a clearcut with reserves, but this was changed to seed-tree harvest. During the harvest set up Parker Forestry (consultants) identified Pond Pine throughout the site and marked them for retention. Each retained tree has been entered as a point on the GIS.

Site 4. WR24 Johnson & Johnson, Stand 3- Planned aerial Herbicide Treatment on a site where hardwood control is needed to achieve stocking goals in a stand that had received a seed-tree regeneration treatment. Foresters have thoroughly assessed the site, mapped the presence of desirable oak sapling and sprouts, and designed a treatment plan to avoid these and to spray areas where undesirable maple and gum trees require control. Also reviewed documentation for and discussed the completed Wango Pine herbicide treatment.

Site 5. P04 Dividing Creek Tract 13 – Stand 8 – first thinning (formerly Dividing Creek Compartment #22) completed mid-January 2015. Residual stocking was 90 square feet of basal area per acre, and there were no issues with rutting or residual stand damage. Use of slash on skid trails to avoid rutting and compaction. Discussion of typical rotation ages, pre-commercial and commercial thinnings.

Site 6. WR 40 Dunn Swamp, Stand 94 – pre-commercial thinning of a planted stand on former farm land intended to develop forest cover to support water-quality improvement goals. A ditch running through the stand has had water control structures installed to slow water movement off site. Plantation has volunteer pine, cedar and hardwood and was overstocked, so a pre-commercial thinning was implemented targeting maple, gum, and pine.

Stop 7. Parker Forestry Services office to review and discuss records pertaining to:

- Safety and training
- Chemical Use
- Timbersales and Chain of Custody

April 8, 2015 Chesapeake State Forests

Sites 1, 2, and 3 are three of four main blocks of the Brookview Ponds Restoration project. The entire 873-acre Indiantown complex is former industrial pine plantation being restored with an emphasis on the Delmarva Bays (also known as Carolina Bays). In the 1970s the tract was cleared, tops and slash windrowed, most areas bedded and ditched, and all planted with Loblolly Pine, followed by chemical release. These treatments altered the vegetation and hydrology to the detriment of biodiversity. The project goal is to “contribute to the restoration of Carolina Bay marshes, rare and endangered species populations, and upland oak forest” by the commercial harvest of all pine and most hardwoods within 200 feet of the edges of the bays, thinning pine stands further away, and later herbiciding all trees within the bays, and then by implementing a regular program of prescribed burns.

Site 1. D14 Indiantown, South Quad – restoration harvest recently completed; work started in January 2014 halted after a few days because conditions were too wet, with some areas of rutting nearly reaching the CFP excessive threshold of 12-inches deep for more than 50 feet; the harvest resumed mid-July and was completed August 5, 2014. Objectives were considered met, with some larger undesirable hardwood trees left standing because loggers believed them to be oak trees. Use of prescribed fire likely should kill these trees as they are less tolerant than oaks to fire.

Site 2. D14 Indiantown, West Quad – restoration harvest recently completed; see harvesting details for Site 1 above. Reviewed a major portion of harvest area including the largest bay, which has some of the desired grasses already.

Site 3. D14 Indiantown, North Quad – restoration harvest completed 3 years ago, prescribed burn attempted but halted after small test burn because conditions were not suitable; goal is to burn in the fall of 2015 if conditions are suitable. Vegetative response met expectations, with dense growth of plant communities associated with Delmarva Bays (e.g., grasses, sedges, and other herbaceous plants), which was the goal. Burns are needed to control undesirable tree invasion of Bay and surrounding clearcut uplands, including undesirable hardwood seedling/sapling/stump sprouts (maple and gum) and volunteer Loblolly pine. Burns are also required to sustain Delmarva Bay plant communities, which are less tolerant of shade.

Site 4. Bennett Tract, second thinning completed in 2014 by Timber Harvest Inc. Stand planted in 1986 with significant amount of volunteer Loblolly, then herbicide release in 1989, resulting in a somewhat natural-looking pine stand. First thinning in 2002 was described as having somewhat wide corridors and not enough thinning between, and thus high stocking. The recent thinning lowered stocking to basal area of about 100, where the target was 90. Logging quality appeared excellent with no residual stem damage or rutting. Harvest took place during deer season with efforts to manage the interactions including investment in gravel and chips to provide alternate parking area for hunters.

April 9, 2015: Green Ridge State Forest

Office Discussions:

- Progress made on road work
- Complaints, training, and updates on forest inventory
- Citizens Advisory Committee: meets annually, very close working relationships between CAC and many of the ID Team Members
- Tours: Home Ground, work with colleges
- Outreach: Appalachian Forest Heritage Area, many others (see AWP).

Site 1. Poly Neil Road Silviculture Site – Sold, not started variable retention/ regeneration harvest covering 32 harvest acres, 54 managed acres. Reviewed harvest area access, layout including avoiding sensitive areas, selection of variable retention, assessment and presence of regeneration, and sale contract, including chain of custody requirements. Multiple species, size classes, and forms are retained for future timber value, biodiversity, and snags/ wildlife habitat.

Site 2. Zumbrun Overlook Recreation Site – This recently-completed recreation site includes a parking area, interpretive signs, a short, accessible trail, a viewing platform, and a vista created through a timber sale reviewed on a past audit. The interpretive signs are high quality and informative, including history, ecology, and forest management information. The site is very well constructed and maintained, links to the existing 12-mile mountain bike trail and the new Great Eastern Trail, and provides an opportunity for a new 2-mile circuit trail. Interviews with CAC members and security personnel.

Site 3. Diehl Shade Barren Restoration Site – The long-term restoration project and the more recent 35-acre Diehl Barren Burn Unit were reviewed. The burn objectives on this moderate to steeply-sloping site were met. Discussed challenges involved with the needed expansion of the prescribed burning program.

Site 4. Green Ridge Road Silviculture Site – This completed 15-acre regeneration/variable retention harvest was planned and implanted in ways to protect the adjacent Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) while salvaging infested Ash and regenerating the stand. Interviews with CAC members.

Site 5. Mertens Road Salvage Harvest Site. The harvest activity on this 25-acre salvage/regeneration site is nearly complete, with retention, regeneration, utilization, and site impacts all reviewed and found to be acceptable. This stand and others were severely damaged by a hail storm in 2011. Despite the urgency associated with needed salvage the project went through standard planning and review of the Annual Work Plan process while still being sold quickly by “flipping” the 2013 and 2014 AWP.

Site 6. Gordon Road proposed culvert replacement, graveling and regarding. Inspected two locations where stream-crossing infrastructure is failing and replacement culverts are needed. Culverts are partially plugged, with some parts of roads failing due to overtopping of culverts. This area was identified prior to the 2013 AWP and the needed work described and approved in that plan, but funding has been challenging to obtain. The site is part of a larger project that was identified as high priority for repairs, but a project plan is pending the completion of higher priority work on other forests.

Site 7. Gordon Road, Black Sulfur Crossing- The stream-crossing here includes a culvert with headwalls constructed from railroad ties. The headwalls are crumbling, the culvert is partially-blocked, and water has crossed and begun to erode the road. The site is part of a larger project that was identified as high priority for repairs, but a project plan is pending the completion of higher priority work on other forests. Overflow ditches and culverts demonstrate evidence of frequent failure and replacement, as well as hydrological disconnectivity of streams on either side of the road.

April 10, 2015: Greenbrier State Park

Closing Meeting and Review of Findings (8:00am-9:30am): Convene with all relevant staff to summarize audit findings, potential non-conformities and next steps

2.2 Evaluation of Management Systems

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

3. Changes in Management Practices

There were no significant changes in the FME’s management system that affected conformance to FSC requirements. The FME expressed concerns over FSC’s new chemical use requirements and its effects

on efforts to control invasive insect pests, especially during initial infestations. Staff completed training in forest inventory, wild fire, fire equipment, and trail maintenance among other types. Records of training are maintained in personnel files. Several recreational and ecological restoration projects have been started or completed since the last audit.

4. Results of the Evaluation

4.1 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations

Finding Number: 2014.1	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify): None
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US Indicator 1.3.a.
Non-Conformity (or justification): FME's management plans and supporting documents are based on state laws and regulations, many of which were ratified to comply with federal laws that require compliance to international treaties. For example, the Endangered Species Act is relevant to the Convention on Biological Diversity. However, the FME has not conducted an analysis of international binding agreements to determine applicability.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): FME should conduct an analysis of international binding agreements to determine which are applicable to its management system so that it can ensure that forest management plans and operations comply with relevant provisions of said agreements.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	<p>The DNR-Forest has reviewed the USDA Forest Service International Programs website in reference to international laws that govern or may govern forest management on Maryland State Forests and have found that only the http://www.fs.fed.us/global/aboutus/policy/multi/bind.htm#1</p> <p>Legally Binding Agreements Although there is no single legally binding global convention that governs sustainable forest management, a number of legally binding agreements have an effect on the management of forest resources and trade of forest products. For the United States, becoming party to a convention is a two-step process. First, the President must sign the convention, and second, the Senate must ratify the convention into law.</p> <p>We are abiding by the <i>Convention on Biological Diversity</i> through our collaborative work with the DNR Natural Heritage Program (NHP), including our annual work plan review and ID Teams. Plus, our management plans are a reflection of our collaboration with key members of the NHP regional and headquarter staffs.</p> <p>The <i>Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and</i></p>

	<p><i>Flora (CITES)</i> was established to control the trade of endangered species. Again, our collaborative work with NHP, DNR Natural Resource Police (enforcement) and Maryland Department of Agriculture Ginseng Management Program (licensing and data collection). For example, in 2013, the DNR Secretary signed a policy that effectively eliminated ginseng harvests from all DNR lands as a result of information from NHP and licensing data from MDA.</p> <p>In addition, the FME contacted the MD Office of the Attorney General regarding international or global laws we must adhere to. Their email reply (Feb 10, 2015) is as follows, "I did a quick search of COMAR and the Natural Resources Articles and saw no mention of our abiding by international laws (which as "global laws" we would have to follow so I would have been surprised if there were such state code or reg. requirements).</p>
SCS review	FME has completed its analysis in consultation with multiple sources and has demonstrated that it meets the intent of applicable international agreements through implementing its management system.
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i>

Finding Number: 2014.2	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US Indicator 1.6.a
Non-Conformity (or justification): FME describes the importance of FSC to its management system and is now subject to a law that requires that it maintain conformance to forestry certification requirements. However, FME does not have an explicit publicly available statement of commitment to manage the FMU in conformance with FSC standards and policies.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): FME shall prepare a publicly available statement of commitment to manage the FMU in conformance with FSC standards and policies.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	Language has been added to the DNR Forest Certification webpage to serve as, "an explicit publicly available statement of commitment to manage the FMU in conformance with FSC standards and policies."
SCS review	FME's statement is as follows: "As directed according to EXECUTIVE ORDER 01.01.2004.21 Enhanced Forestry Management on the Department of Natural Resources-Owned Forest Lands and the Natural Resources – Forest Preservation Act of 2013, the Department of Natural Resources shall confer with the Forest Stewardship Council and the Sustainable Forestry Initiative in order to determine the parameters of securing

	<p>forest certification of the State’s efforts for the purpose of managing Maryland’s State Forests in an environmentally responsible and sustainable manner.”</p> <p>The statement of commitment fulfills this requirement.</p>
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2014.3	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify): None
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US Indicator 1.6.c.
Non-Conformity (or justification): FME is in the process of evaluating land acquisitions for incorporation into the FMU. FME does not have a formal process for informing the CB of significant changes in ownership and/or significant changes in management planning within 90 days of such change. Note that FSC-US has not defined what a significant change is.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): FME should consider developing a policy or procedure for when to notify the Certifying Body of significant changes in ownership and/or significant changes in management planning within 90 days of such change.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	<p>After discussing what “significant ownership changes” and in ownership and/or “significant management planning changes” with FME leadership, we have decided that the threshold of 2,000 acres (total acres within the scope) will be our policy for when to contact FSC-US. The DNR Acreage Report is the official document for DNR Owned Lands Acreage. The 2014 report states there are 202,679 acres within the state forest and Chesapeake Forest (includes Seth and Wicomico Demo Forests) designations. While this is not the most up-to-date numbers (state forest managers have more real-time data) it is the official data and one in which we can quickly check and reference for acreage changes.</p> <p>Link :: http://dnr.maryland.gov/land/stewardship/pdfs/currentacreagereport.pdf</p>
SCS review	FME has created a policy that should allow stakeholders sufficient time to be informed of significant changes to the certificate scope. In discussion with FME staff, SCS clarified that the certification body must be contacted for any changes to the scope of certification, significant or otherwise.
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2014.4	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US Indicator 4.2.b.
Non-Conformity (or justification): Large-sale contracts reference safety requirements for both Eastern and Western Regions. However, small-sale contracts, which are contracts for services valued at less than \$5,000, do not include safety requirements.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): Contracts or other written agreements shall include safety requirements.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	<p>The small-scale timber sale contract has been updated to reflect the language of the larger contracts regarding safety requirements.</p> <p>See FS-310 REVISED v1.8 CoC - Timber Sale Agreement (Sales \$5,000 or less – by lum sum bid) (revised 7/28/14).</p>
SCS review	Item 4 of the updated contract fulfills this requirement.
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2014.5	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US Indicator 4.2.b.
Non-Conformity (or justification): According to 4.2.b, FME's employees and contractors must demonstrate a safe work environment. Migrant workers under the H-2B program were conducting tree planting activities. Some workers on-site independently stated that they were nursing students. However, no one on the job site was able to present evidence of certified First AID/CPR training. Working conditions and terms must comply with all applicable Federal, State and local employment laws, including health and safety laws. The audit team contacted the Maryland Department of Labor to inquire about First AID/CPR requirements for job sites, but did not receive a response.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): FME should investigate what the First AID/CPR requirements are for employees of tree planting/TSI contractors and determine what corrective actions, if any, are warranted.	
FME response	From our research, we do not see where either the US Dept of Labor or the MD

<p><i>(including any evidence submitted)</i></p>	<p>DLLR requires that Farm Labor Contractors (FLCs) be first aid or CPR trained. Our reforestation contractor at Chesapeake Forest is a US Dept of Labor certified FLC. They are not aware of any requirement for first aid/CPR training. We did learn that the state of California does require first aid/CPR training for state of California FLCs and another planting contractor reports that some northern states (Idaho, Maine, Vermont and New Hampshire) require First Aid/CPR training for at least one member of the crew working in remote areas.</p> <p>The FCS Indicator 4.2.b asks that a safe work environment be demonstrated. As I mentioned below, the Chesapeake Forest contractor, Parker Forestry Service, contracts require that their TSI/tree planting sub-contractors be certified US Dept of Labor FLCs. It has been their observation that contractors have been in compliance with US Dept of Labor FLC safety and health requirements including: potable drinking water on site, safe transportation, and safety equipment when performing TSI work (hearing & eye protection, chaps, gloves).</p> <p>Also, the FME has been in contact with our forest tree nursery manager regarding this issue. His statement was, “The nursery labor contract specifies that the contractor(s) have to abide by all requirements of the Migrant Worker Protection Act. This includes working conditions, pay, vehicle transport etc. We do not deal with the daily details of this since we have hired a contractor to do so. Tree planting crews if in the country under H2-B would fall under these guidelines. The crew foreman would be the person to ask and not the individual tree planters.” Plus, “If we do begin to exercise daily control over such issues we run the risk of changing our status to employer which then puts the onus of all the above on us.”</p>
<p>SCS review</p>	<p>In addition to FME’s response, its forestry contractor conducted research into its local pre-commercial thinning and herbicide contractors, as well as US Department of Labor’s Farm Labor requirements (for which web search records were supplied). One pre-commercial thinning contractor sent records of First AID/CPR for all of its field workers, which were demonstrated to the audit team. The herbicide contractor sent procedures for handling spills, including those for treating exposed personnel. For example, the names of the nearest hospital and basic procedures on how to stabilize any exposed person were cited. US Department of Labor Farm Labor requirements include several health & safety provisions, but not necessarily First AID/CPR. The forestry contractor also did not find any requirements from the Maryland Department of Labor that discuss First AID/CPR. SCS concludes that based on the research into State law and the practices of individual contractors that risk of nonconformance to this indicator remains low for the time being. As such, closure is warranted.</p>
<p>Status of CAR:</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i></p>

Finding Number: 2014.6	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US Indicator 4.4.a and 4.4.d.
Non-Conformity (or justification):	
<p>4.4.a: A summary of social impacts that covers the elements of indicator 4.4.a was not available.</p> <p>4.4.d: Overall, FME’s Timber Operations Order directs how the public consultation process is to be followed according to indicator 4.4.d. While it states that the AWP is to include the Public Comments, and outlines the review by the interdisciplinary team, it does not specifically state that a 30-day public review is required.</p> <p>Also the Western Maryland state forests’ Sustainable Forest Management Plans all state that a 30-day public review process is required (SRSF pg 14, PGSF pg 16, GRSF pg 12). However, the Chesapeake Forest/Pocomoke plan does not.</p>	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): A summary of social impacts that covers the elements of indicator 4.4.a shall be made available.	
<p>4.4.d: For public forests, consultation shall include the following components:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clearly defined and accessible methods for public participation are provided in both long and short-term planning processes, including harvest plans and operational plans; 2. Public notification is sufficient to allow interested stakeholders the chance to learn of upcoming opportunities for public review and/or comment on the proposed management; 3. An accessible and affordable appeals process to planning decisions is available. <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>	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	<p>To identify how the FME understands the social impacts of management activities and are incorporating these into our management planning and operations, below we address the various components of Indicator 4.4.a and have listed each component with our evidence following.</p> <p>To summarize these elements and how they are incorporated into our management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Archeological sites and sites of cultural, historical and community significance (on and off the FMU); <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The FME GIS system is used to log all known archeological sites on FME lands under certification. ○ The FME collaborates with Maryland Historical Trust on Project Review (internal and external proposals to alter or use DNR managed lands) to document new findings and to allow MHT review of proposals for any historical significance. MHT is also sent other

	<p>management documents such as the annual work plans for their review.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public resources, including air, water and food (hunting, fishing, collecting); <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Citizens Advisory Committee for each state forest is comprised of an 11-member team that formally represents a spectrum of forest interests. Each AWP is reviewed by the CAC and the general public (30-day online comment period) and a summary of those comments (along with DNR ID Team comments) become part of the final annual work plan for each state forest. • Aesthetics; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ See AWPs, SFMP and other internal review documents for evidence of forest buffers along public roads, riparian buffers, and forest retention. • Community goals for forest and natural resource use and protection such as employment, subsistence, recreation and health; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Forest managers serve on a variety of local economic boards and regularly meet with local economic development agencies. • Community economic opportunities; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A review of the Sustainable Forest Management Plans will show the importance of adding timber to the marketplace in support of local forest product companies. Even during economic slow periods when the private sector is not putting timber on the market, the DNR state forests continues to offer timber contracts. ○ The Meadow Mt Trail on Savage River State Forest is a collaborative effort in conjunction with Garrett County and Garrett Trails (business interests) to bring expanded biking opportunities to the region, which in part, include improved access to state forest lands. The forest manager regularly meets with these groups to gain feedback on how this project should develop. • Other people who may be affected by management operations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Recently several ORV trails were deemed unsustainable and were closed. It was decided by DNR leadership to review all DNR lands to determine if other sustainable sites could be used to add trails to the system. Three sites were forwarded from this process and one was on state forest land. A series of public meetings were held near the proposed sites to gather public information and sentiment regarding these proposals. Due to these efforts, two sites were abandoned and one on Savage River State Forest is currently in the planning stage. Also, as previously mentioned, the Citizens Advisory Committee is a group of advisors comprised to offer the forest manager insight on forest management specific to their area of interest and expertise. <p>4.4.d: Overall, FME’s Timber Operations Order directs how the public consultation process is to be followed according to indicator 4.4.d. While it states that the AWP is to include the Public Comments, and outlines the review by the interdisciplinary team, it does not specifically state that a 30-day public review is required. Also the Western Maryland state forests’ Sustainable Forest</p>
--	--

	<p>Management Plans all state that a 30-day public review process is required (SRSF pg 14, PGSF pg 16, GRSF pg 12). However, the Chesapeake Forest/Pocomoke plan does not.</p> <p>FME Response: The Sustainable Forest Management Plans for all five state forests under our certificate scope have been updated to reflect the entire three-step review process, plus, the DNR-Forest Service Timber Operation Order (Presale Work 10, page 11) has been revised to include this step to the process.</p> <p>Each of the specific SFMPs can be found online. The individual references will be under Section 11.2 Annual Work Plan Time Table.</p>
SCS review	<p>4.4.a: FME’s summary addresses the topics of this indicator as specified in its response and was made available to SCS.</p> <p>4.4.d: SCS reviewed each SFMP for the update content and found that the timeline is included as stated in the FME’s response.</p>
Status of CAR:	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)</p>

Finding Number: 2014.7	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):</p>
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US Indicator 6.3.f (b), 6.3.g.1 and Appalachian Regional Indicator 6.3.g.1.a.
Non-Conformity (or justification): GR-02-13 (post-ice storm salvage harvest) and PGSF 34-3 (clearcut with variable retention) utilized even-aged silviculture. Management maintains, enhances, or restores habitat components and associated stand structures, in abundance and distribution that could be expected from naturally occurring processes, particularly in relation to vertical and horizontal complexity. Live trees on these sites were not retained in a manner consistent with the proportion and configuration of the natural disturbance regime. For example, live small diameter white oaks were designated for removal where crown competition was not yet a significant factor in the salvage area; and live oaks were not well-distributed spatially in the clearcut with variable retention (live oaks were retained only in islands).	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): In the Western Region, when even-aged systems are employed, and during salvage harvests, live trees and other native vegetation shall be retained within the harvest unit as described in indicators, 6.3.f (b), 6.3.g.1 and Appalachian Regional 6.3.g.1.a. Operational constraints, future economic value of retained trees, and effects on desired regeneration can be taken into account.	
FME response (including any	The FME has established a retention guidance policy which has been reviewed by the audit teams. It has been our policy to follow this guidance, but it has been

<p><i>evidence submitted)</i></p>	<p>written in such a way as to allow flexibility to the forest manager, as necessary, to apply best silvicultural practices. In the sites specifically mentioned in the 2014 report, abundant retention was maintained in well-defined buffers and islands and is documented in our GIS management systems.</p> <p>The Appalachian Regional Indicator 6.3.g.1.a. Guidance specifically states that this is acceptable and that <i>“in addition, desirable overstory and understory species may be retained outside of buffers or special zones.”</i> The emphasis on <i>“may”</i> in this guidance suggests that for former riparian buffers are preferred and in addition the manager can utilize other retention methods. Plus, <i>“if stands have been degraded”</i>, which was certainly the situation at the Green Ridge State Forest site, less retention is acceptable for merchantability considerations.</p> <p><i>Guidance: 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>As for the Potomac Garrett State site, the forest manager is not afraid to push conventional methods to obtain desirable silvicultural goals. By maintaining retention in islands and riparian buffers and not throughout the main body of the harvest site, he not only avoided blow-down of isolated retention trees, but natural regeneration will benefit due to enhanced protection from deer browse.</p>
<p>SCS review</p>	<p>A more representative sample of harvest sites were visited in 2015, including one salvage harvest site and two regeneration/ variable retention sites on Green Ridge State Forest. Retention was examined based on species, quality of individual trees selected for retention, diameter, and spacing. It was found that a variety of oak, pine, cherry, and maple species are retained in a configuration and density found on harvest sites. Where objectives were to release advanced regeneration, the audit team inspected sites for regeneration and found that oaks, maples, and tulip poplars were present and ready to respond to release. Other retention elements included shrubs (e.g., serviceberry, dogwood), snags, and down woody debris. More importantly, this year forest managers and technicians were able to consistently describe harvest types and objectives for each site (see response to OBS 2014.10).</p>
<p>Status of CAR:</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)</p>

Finding Number: 2014.8	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US Indicator 6.5.e.1 (Appalachian Regional indicators 6.5.e.1.a-g) and 6.5.e.2.
<p>Non-Conformity (or justification): SMZ guidelines are provided in SFMPs for each state forest and actual SMZs are mapped in the GIS. FME prepared the Western Maryland Erosion and Sediment Control Standards and Specifications for Forest Operations in 2011 that contains SMZ widths based on the "50' + (4' * x%)" principle. For smaller slope %, such as those between the APP 1-10% and 11-20% category, minimum widths depart from the minimum widths required by FSC. For larger slope %, FME's SMZ widths exceed APP requirements. These SMZs are based on watershed studies and have been reviewed by the FME's hydrologist.</p> <p>Minor variations from the minimum widths are permitted as long as the provisions of indicator 6.5.e.2 are met. FME has not sought a variance per these requirements, such as the requirement of input from an independent expert in aquatic ecology or closely related field.</p>	
<p>Corrective Action Request (or Observation): FME shall either bring its SMZ widths into conformance with Appalachian Regional indicators 6.5.e.1.a-g or seek a variance per indicator 6.5.e.2. If the 6.5.e.2 option is selected, an independent expert in aquatic ecology or closely related field must be made available for consultation to the CB.</p>	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	<p>August 2014: The Maryland state forests within the Appalachian Region have been following the established rule of a 50-foot minimum buffer plus an additional four feet width for each percentage of slope. For example, a ten percent slope would require a 90-foot SMZ buffer (50+(10*4)). This guideline has been the Maryland standard since the early 1980s and is based on the following research:</p> <p>Trimble, George R., Jr.; Sartz, Richard S. 1957. How far from a stream should a logging road be located? <i>Journal of Forestry</i> 55:339-341</p> <p>This research is given greater examination in the document referenced below and is available online:</p> <p>Filter Strip Widths for Forest Roads in the Southern Appalachians Lloyd W. Swift, Jr., <i>USDA Forest Service, Southeastern Forest Experiment Station, Coweeta Hydrologic Laboratory, Otto, NC 28763</i></p> <p>webdoc >> http://coweeta.uga.edu/publications/397.pdf</p> <p>As the text describes, the Trimble/Sartz research established an acceptable stream buffer width to properly protect municipal watershed streams during forest harvesting. This simple to remember formula established a base width at 50-feet and was increased based on road slope of an additional four feet for each percent of slope. Thus a one</p>

percent slope would establish a buffer of $50+(1*4) = 54'$ or ten percent slope $50 + (10*4) = 90'$.

Maryland has completed BMP effectiveness studies and found these practices effective in preventing sedimentation of streams from forest harvesting practices. Also, the DNR Forest Service will be collecting further BMP effectiveness data over the next few years which will again include state forest harvest sites.

Forestry Best Management Practices In Maryland: Implementation and Effectiveness for Protection of Water Resources (2009)

webdoc >> <http://www.dnr.state.md.us/forests/pdfs/MDForestBMPResults2006.pdf>

One of the highlights from this research was that BMP compliance with water quality BMPs on State lands was 99%, higher than the statewide average (see Figure 11).

Evaluating the Effectiveness of Maryland’s Best Management Practices For Forest Harvest Operations (1995)

webpage >> <http://www.dnr.state.md.us/forests/mbmp/>

A study of implementation of Maryland’s BMPs by Maryland DNR - Forest Service (Koehn and Grizzel 1995) indicated that most loggers across Maryland followed these BMPs. This project took the next logical step, an attempt to determine whether Maryland’s Best Management Practices, when used as specified, are effective in protecting water quality, i.e., that sediment, temperature and biological activity are only minimally impacted by forest harvest activities, and that the in-stream parameters measured in this study return to pre-harvest conditions relatively quickly. While there have been studies in other states which address the concern of adequacy of timber harvest BMPs (Adams et al.1995; Whipkey 1991) this is the first significant study done in Maryland, using Maryland BMPs in local conditions, with local logging contractors, and using relatively comprehensive and sophisticated monitoring and analysis techniques. This report documents the activities conducted during this four-year experiment, discusses the findings, and draws conclusions based on these findings.

webpage: <http://www.dnr.state.md.us/forests/mbmp/mbmpfho1.html>

Below is a table demonstrates the variations between the Maryland DNR SMZ widths and those prescribed in FSC Appalachian Regional indicators 6.5.e.1.a-g. Essentially, the DNR guidelines offer a progressive buffer width that increases relative to the slope while the FSC prescription is a stepped system, widening at certain slope intervals. Based on research DNR has completed specific to our conditions, we have found the 50+4 formula to be effective in preventing sediment from entering streams during a forest harvest. Also, this formula is easy to remember for foresters responsible for planning a forest harvest near the SMZ and for logging operators to implement since it has been in place for many years and part of our logger education program.

A case could be made that while the effectiveness of the DNR SMZ guidelines have

proven to be effective and that the only area of deficiency (compared to the FSC rule) would be on the lower grade slopes (1-7 and 11 percent) of perennial streams (not intermittent streams) where water is far less likely to move sediment into a stream course. As for the higher percent slopes the DNR SMZ width far exceeds that of the FSC recommendation and the DNR SMZ guidelines offer greater stream protection than the FSC formula.

Harvesting Within the SMZ

The FSC guidance for the most restrictive scenario (intermittent/high-quality waters) does not allow any harvesting within the 25-foot inner SMZ, while the DNR guidance has a 50-foot no-cut buffer. While the DNR guidance does not distinguish between an intermittent and perennial stream, FSC would allow single-tree or small group selection within the inner SMZ of non-high-quality intermittent streams where DNR does not.

Revised Best Management Plan guidelines for forest harvest operations have been drafted (currently in review) that would adopt a less restrictive 50+2 rule across the state. However for DNR state forest operations, it has been decided to maintain the more protective 50+4 rule.

FSC 2014.7		perennial			intermittent		
slope%	DNR	FSC	diff	diff%	FSC	diff	diff%
0	50	80	30	60	40	10	(20)
1	54	80	26	48	40	14	(26)
2	58	80	22	38	40	18	(31)
3	62	80	18	29	40	22	(35)
4	66	80	14	21	40	26	(39)
5	70	80	10	14	40	30	(43)
6	74	80	6	8	40	34	(46)
7	78	80	2	3	40	38	(49)
8	82	80	(2)	(2)	40	42	(51)
9	86	80	(6)	(7)	40	46	(53)
10	90	80	(10)	(11)	40	50	(56)
11	94	100	6	6	50	44	(47)
20	130	100	(30)	(23)	50	80	(62)
21	134	130	(4)	(3)	60	74	(55)
30	170	130	(40)	(24)	60	110	(65)
31	174	135	(39)	(22)	70	104	(60)
40	210	135	(75)	(36)	70	140	(67)
41	214	165	(49)	(23)	80	134	(63)

The diff and diff% table figures indicate FSC vs DNR where a figure in black indicates FSC exceeds DNR and red where FSC is less than DNR.

MD DNR contacted Dr. Michael Aust, Professor of Forestry at Virginia Tech, as an

	<p>independent authority. He has read the attached documentation and is willing to support our case for this variance request.</p> <p>MD DNR conducted a DD BMP evaluation from 2003-2005, the results of which can be found here: http://www.dnr.maryland.gov/forests/pdfs/MDForestBMPResults2006.pdf. MD DNR is currently repeating the study and has just started data collection. Another MD study in the Piedmont did more evaluation of in-stream conditions and benthic community, using standard MD BMPs. http://www.dnr.state.md.us/forests/mbmp/</p>
SCS review	<p>September 2014: SCS interviewed Dr. Aust on September 19, 2014. Dr. Aust's research focuses on the effectiveness of stream buffer widths in controlling sediment deposition into streams and BMP effectiveness. In relation to the topic of stream buffer widths, he has found in peer-reviewed research in West Virginia and other Appalachian States that buffers for the slope ranges cited in the CAR, that a 25 ft. buffer is as effective in terms of sediment control. One study compared 25 ft. buffers no-cut to 50 ft. buffers no-cut, and 50 ft. buffers that were thinned, and showed no significant difference on areas of 50-100% slope. Dr. Aust provided the citation for a current paper on this topic, which builds upon past research in this region (Lakel <i>et al.</i> 2010. Sediment Trapping by Streamside Management Zones of Various Widths after Forest Harvest and Site Preparation. Forest Science, Volume 56, Number 6, December 2010, pp. 541-551(11)). Given that all of MD DNR's buffer widths have a minimum of 50 ft., MD DNR is at low risk for failure to provide equivalent or greater protection than the minimum FSC buffer width. In fact, in most cases, MD DNR's minimum buffer widths exceed the minimum FSC minimums. More importantly, as long as road and skid trail BMPs are being adhered to, the current buffer widths should remain effective.</p>
Status of CAR:	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)</p>

Finding Number: 2014.9	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US Indicator 6.6.b and 6.6.d.
Non-Conformity (or justification):	
<p>6.6.b: The SFMPs contain justification for chemical use in certain situations; however, not all situations are provided with explicit justification. Written strategies have not been developed that justify the use of chemical pesticides.</p> <p>6.6.d: Written prescriptions are not prepared per the requirements of indicator 6.6.d. Written prescriptions prepared by the FME do not contain all provisions (both Regions). In the Eastern Region, the audit team observed that when a contractor applies chemicals, a partial prescription is prepared in</p>	

the care of aerial applications.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): 6.6.b: FME shall provide justification for chemical use and develop a written strategy that justifies the use of chemical pesticides per indicator 6.6.b.	
6.6.d: FME shall ensure that its chemical use prescriptions address the provisions of indicator 6.6.d.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	<p>6.6.b: “The Maryland Department of Agriculture is responsible for regulating the sale, use, storage, and disposal of pesticides and for enforcing the Maryland Pesticide Applicators Law. MDA is responsible for establishing guidelines and requirements for the application of pesticides, the certification of pesticide applicators and the licensing of businesses to ensure that pesticides are applied properly by competent individuals.” (Source: MDA website http://mda.maryland.gov/plants-pests/Pages/Pesticide-Applicator-Certification-and-Business-Licensing-Requirements.aspx)</p> <p>As such, the FME is subject to State law and regulations including reporting of pesticide storage and use to Maryland Department of Agriculture. However, to follow the additional requirements of FSC Indicator 6.6.b, the FME will require the FSC Guide: To integrated pest, disease and weed management in FSC certified forests and plantations (FSC Technical Series, No. 2009-001) to be reviewed by each state forest manager and the Core Decision Key (Figure 1, page 16), the Pesticide Decision Key (Figure 2, page 17) and Decision Recording Sheet (Figure 3, page 18) be attached to each pesticide use report with the latter having been completed by the state forest staff or contractor.</p> <p>6.6.d: A <i>Pesticide Use Tracking Form</i> was been modified to include all the requirements of Indicator 6.6.d. See Auditor Dropbox folder.</p>
SCS review	SCS reviewed the updated guidelines for 6.6.b and found that they meet the requirements. The new form fulfills the requirement to prepare a prescription and consider alternatives to chemical use.
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2014.10	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify): None
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US Indicator 7.1.h and 7.1.i.
Non-Conformity (or justification): 7.1.h: FME has a nonconformance to some indicators of C6.6. If chemicals are used, the management	

<p>plan must describe what is being used, applications, and how the management system conforms to Criterion 6.6. FME’s chemical use strategy may change as a result of the nonconformance, which may require an update to sections of the management plan.</p>	
<p>7.1.l: FME has developed its own silvicultural terms in both the Eastern and Western Regions. In certain cases, these depart from commonly used definitions. In the Western Region, staff used the terms “clearcut with variable retention,” “variable retention,” and “second step of a shelterwood” for the same harvest area. In the Eastern Region, the seed-tree system in use for pond pine restoration does not include a seed-tree removal step (i.e., the seed-trees are retained). However, the Annual Work Plan 2014 for the Eastern Region provides a definition for the FME’s seed-tree harvest system. Such definitions are not provided for the Western Region.</p>	
<p>Corrective Action Request (or Observation):</p> <p>7.1.h: FME should update the management plan to include an explanation of how the management system conforms to Criterion 6.6.</p> <p>7.1.l: FME should include a description of commonly used silvicultural systems of the Western Region in the management plan.</p>	
<p>FME response (including any evidence submitted)</p>	<p>7.1.h: The DNR-Forest Service Timber Operation Order (Submittal of Annual Work Plan, page 6) has been revised to require Pesticide Use as part of the AWP sections.</p> <p>Also, Sustainable Forest Management Plans will be updated to include a Chemical Use section, as has the Chesapeake Forest Sustainable Forest Management Plan (page 60). See text below.</p> <p>Chemicals Use</p> <p>No products on the FSC list of Highly Hazardous Pesticides will be used (see FSC-POL-30-001 EN FSC Pesticides policy 2005 or most recent equivalent) unless a derogation has been successfully awarded. The Pesticide Use Tracking Form will be used to document the identification of an area to be treated, the procedures that will be followed and who will be doing the application, including their qualifications.</p> <p>The <i>FSC Guide: To integrated pest, disease and weed management in FSC certified forests and plantations</i> (FSC Technical Series, No. 2009-001) to be reviewed by the state forest manager and the Core Decision Key (Figure 1, page 16), the Pesticide Decision Key (Figure 2, page 17) and Decision Recording Sheet (Figure 3, page 18) attached to each pesticide use report with the Decision Recording Sheet having been completed by the state forest staff or contractor.</p> <p>All pesticides used to control pests and competing vegetation are used only when and where non-chemical management practices are: a) not available; b) prohibitively expensive, taking into account overall environmental and social costs, risks and benefits; c) the only effective means for controlling invasive and exotic species; or d) result in less environmental damage than non-chemical alternatives. If chemicals are used, the forest manager will use the least environmentally damaging formulation and application method practical.</p>

	<p>As opportunities are available, the state forest will employ and encourage the creation and maintenance of habitat that discourages pest outbreak; that encourages natural predators; will work with cooperating agencies to evaluation pest populations and control options; the diversification of species composition and structure; use of low impact mechanical methods; use of prescribed fire; and the use of longer rotations.</p> <p>Chemicals and application methods are selected to minimize risk to non-target species and sites under the guidance of cooperating agencies such as Maryland Department of Agriculture and DNR Natural Heritage Program.</p> <p>Whenever chemicals are used, the Pesticide Use Tracking Form will be used to prepare a written prescription to describe the site-specific hazards and environmental risks, and the precautions that workers will employ to avoid or minimize those hazards and risks, and includes a map of the treatment area.</p> <p>Chemicals are applied only by appropriately trained and licensed workers according to State requirements.</p> <p>When chemicals are used, the effects are monitored and the results are used to determine the measure of success and if treatment modifications can be employed, such as reduced application rates. Records are kept according to State requirements.</p> <p>7.1.I: Terminology can be a subjective practice, including its jargon, for almost any profession. The Society of American Foresters' Dictionary of Forestry is the definitive guide for of forestry terminology. To learn more about its purpose and genealogy, go to the About Page. To assist with the use of consistent and standard terms used in the DNR-Forest Service annual work plans and subsequent management documents, this source will be used as our guide. To effectively offer this guidance to the public when reviewing the state forest management online, we have provided a reference to the Dictionary of Forestry on our Maryland's State Forest webpage with the following statement:</p> <p><i>"A more complete review of terms used in the State Forest annual work plans and Sustainable Forest Management Plans can be found online through use of the Dictionary of Forestry."</i></p> <p>DOF URL :: http://www.dictionaryofforestry.org</p>
SCS review	<p>For 7.1.h, only the Chesapeake SFP has been updated with the new language. Other plans will be updated this year. For 7.1.I, SCS confirmed that the Dictionary of Forestry is on the FME's webpage and is accessible to staff.</p>
Status of CAR:	<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>

Finding Number: 2014.11	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US Indicator 7.1.p and 7.1.q.
Non-Conformity (or justification):	
<p>7.1.p: The management plan does not describe and justify the types and sizes of harvesting machinery and techniques employed on the FMU to minimize or limit impacts to the resource. A partial explanation is provided in the SFMP for the Eastern Region; however, terms such as “conventional logging equipment” are not defined and/or described. An example of “shovel-logging” is provided for low-impact equipment. No descriptions and justifications are provided in the management plans for the Western Region.</p> <p>7.1.q: Annual Work Plans, or other site-specific plans, do not clearly describe the relationship of planned management activities to objectives and desired outcomes defined in the SFMPs. A review of AWP for both the Eastern and Western Regions confirmed that such relationships are not explicitly stated.</p>	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation):	
<p>7.1.p: The management plan shall describe and justify the types and sizes of harvesting machinery and techniques employed on the FMU to minimize or limit impacts to the resource.</p> <p>7.1.q: Annual Work Plans, or other site-specific plans, shall clearly describe the relationship to objectives and desired outcomes defined in the SFMPs.</p>	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	<p>The Sustainable Forest Management Plans for all five state forests under our certificate scope have been updated to include a Forest Harvesting Equipment section. Based on the style of the SFMP document, the following text was placed accordingly:</p> <p>Forest Harvesting Equipment</p> <p>When planning a forest harvest, the forest manager should consider the soils, weather, seasonal restrictions, necessary harvesting equipment and other factors that may influence successfully harvesting the site.</p> <p>In-woods equipment used on forest harvest operations may include: whole tree chippers, processors, feller-bunchers, grapple skidders, cable skidders, cut-off saws and forwarders.</p> <p>Normally, bidding on forest harvest contracts are not restricted or limited by the equipment available to bidders. This is to maintain competitive fairness to all sized operations. However, forest harvest operations are closely monitored by the state forest staff to ensure compliance with the contract and use of Best Management Practices.</p>

	<p>If necessary, the state forest manager can restrict the type of machinery required or allowed on the harvest site. The state forest manager has the authority to temporarily close a forest harvest operation if the conditions become too wet to prevent excessive rutting and damaging of forest soils. Seasonal restrictions may apply during late winter and early spring as the frozen soils begin to thaw. Certain sensitive areas may require specialized equipment such as dual-wheeled skidders, high floatation tires or other specialized equipment.</p> <p>— — Placement — —</p> <p>To attempt to minimize the disturbance of the remainder of the SFMP, the above “Amended Language” has been placed in following document locations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GRSF - 5.7.1 Forest Harvesting Equipment • SRSF - 5.8 Forest Harvesting Equipment • PGSF - 5.7.9 Forest Harvesting Equipment • Pocomoke State Forest - 5.18.1 Forest Harvesting Equipment • Chesapeake Forest - 5.7 Forest Management Activities (created additional heading, Forest Harvesting Equipment) <p>7.1.q: In reference to major forest management and conservation themes governing state forest management as found in each of the Sustainable Forest Management Plans, the following text will be added to the annual work plans under the section Annual Work Plan Summary.</p> <p>All projects and proposals within this Plan have been developed to meet one or more of the Land Management Guidelines and Objectives as seen in the Potomac-Garrett State Forest Sustainable Forest Management Plan including:</p> <p>Forest Economy - management activities with a purpose to maintain an economically sustainable forest and contribute to the local economy through providing forest-related employment and products.</p> <p>Forest Conservation - management activities with a purpose to protect significant or unique natural communities and elements of biological diversity, including Ecologically Significant Areas, High Conservation Value Forests and old growth Forests. Old growth forest management serves to restore and/or enhance old growth forest structure and function.</p> <p>Water Quality - management activities designed to protect or improve ecological functions in protecting or enhancing water quality.</p> <p>Wildlife Habitat - management activities with a purpose to maintain and enhance the ecological needs of the diversity of wildlife species and habitat types.</p> <p>Recreation and Cultural Heritage - management activities with a purpose to maintain and enhance areas that serve as visual, public camping, designated trails, and other high public use areas.</p>
SCS review	7.1.p: SCS verified that the respective sections of each State Forests’ management

	plan were updated in response to this finding. 7.1.q: This text is ready to be inserted into the next year’s AWP’s since the latest AWP’s were worked on prior to this CAR.
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2014.12	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify): None
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US Indicator 7.4.b.
Non-Conformity (or justification): FME makes draft management plans, revisions and supporting documentation easily accessible for public review and comment prior to their implementation via the website. FME addresses public comments and modifies the plans to ensure compliance with FSC requirements. Evidence reviewed includes draft documents and plans that were modified after comments were reviewed. All comments from the interdisciplinary team and the public are included in appendices of the AWP’s; however, a clear explanation as to how the comments were considered is not provided to stakeholders.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): FME should consider providing an explanation as to how public comments were considered in the modification of management plans (e.g., SFMPs, AWP’s).	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	<p>As part of the 30-day public review and comment period, we issue a media release across the state with the details of how the public can affect forest management in their state. Experience has taught that often the comments are vague and too general to decipher clear management plan revisions. We include in that media announcement the following statement:</p> <p><i>“Each proposal is accompanied with a description, field data summary, objective and a map of the vicinity. Comments should reference the specific forest work plan with a page and item number so that the forest experts can understand and properly utilize the participant’s input. Overly general or vague comments may make be difficult to accurately interpret.”</i></p> <p>Also, the annual work plans have a summary of comments and actions taken in response to the three-part review process. The following is an example for the Potomac Garrett State Forest FY 2015 annual work plan, page 53.</p> <p>Wildlife Habitat Improvement Proposals Comp. 16 Stand 21 Wildlife Opening / Thinning Proposal <i>ID Team Comments:</i> Wildlife biologist suggested, where possible, leave the few</p>

	<p>trees with low hanging branches as they provide good winter cover. <i>Advisory Board Comments:</i> No specific comments or concerns. <i>Public Comments:</i> <i>Public Comments:</i> No comments received.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final Proposal: Edited to note retention of trees with low hanging branches for winter cover, and possibly replanting 2-3 rows of conifers along this new edge to further "soften the edge" and replace winter cover values.
SCS review	Specifically, the "Final Proposal" section may include an explanation of how public comments were incorporated into the plan (or not), as confirmed through interviews with FME staff.
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2014.13	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US Indicator 8.2.d.3
Non-Conformity (or justification): FME conducts many socioeconomic analyses and monitoring activities through partnership with other departments within the DNR and other state or federal agencies. However, a formal monitoring system that addresses the components of indicator 8.2.d.3 has not been determined. For example, FME has not defined which monitoring activities currently conducted are relevant to the achievement of its mission and socioeconomic objectives.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): FME shall monitor relevant socioeconomic 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).	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	<p>The FME monitors relevant socio-economic issues as referenced in Indicators 4.4.a, 4.4.g, 4.4.b and 4.4.e through a series of regular, normal activities and through involvement in other social-economic opportunities with other agencies and interest groups. It has been our philosophy that this is best performed in not only through larger public forums (e.g. Mapping a Sustainable Forestry Strategy for Maryland), but also in the normal, daily engagements, contacts, relationships and organizational structures.</p> <p>Monitoring State Forest Issues Important to Maryland The document Mapping a Sustainable Forestry Strategy for Maryland: Report on the Public Engagement Process is a summary of a process to gain insight to the interests of an interested cross-section of Maryland. "During 2009, a multi-stakeholder partnership led by the Harry R. Hughes Center for Agro-Ecology and the Maryland Department of Natural Resources – Forest</p>

Service developed a plan for obtaining public input in identifying key issues and strategies for sustaining forests and forestry in Maryland. The public engagement plan included a public survey of Maryland’s forestry leaders and other interested parties, five listening sessions held throughout the State in June 2009, and a Statewide Forestry Summit held in October 2009, in Linthicum, Maryland. The public engagement process resulted in the identification of four issue areas and for each issue, strategies and recommended actions. Strategies and recommended actions are both presented in order of priority with the highest priority first.”

Document URL >>

<http://dnr.state.md.us/forests/pdfs/sas/ForestrySummitReport.pdf>

Several of the key issues and recommended actions identified the public’s interest in DNR managed State Forests. For example, Issue 1. Maintaining Viable Forests and a Viable Forest Industry in Maryland, Priority 1: Inventory and manage State-owned forests as sustainable working forests.

Below is a summary of relevant findings.

Strategy 1.1: Inventory forests that have high environmental, economic and social value at the landscape scale and adjust management accordingly.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:

Priority 1:

Inventory and manage State-owned forests as sustainable working forests.

- Inventory all forests.
- Review forest management plans on public lands and ensure that management objectives reflect diverse needs and values; while we argue over what to do about forests, we are losing them.
- Manage State forests with science instead of politics.
- Manage forests under a comprehensive watershed management plan that includes public and private lands.
- Resist pressure on State lands to become locations for commercial enterprises like ski resorts rather than working forests.

Priority 3:

Increase the amount of certified forest land, both public and private.

- Certify State-owned lands to enhance credibility and increase supply of certified products.
- Encourage the use of all major forest certification schemes in State building projects.
- Support umbrella and aggregation programs that allow owners of smaller forest land to share the cost of certification.
- Develop series of indicators for a sustainable forest at the State and large landscape level.

Monitoring Forest Recreation Interests

Maryland Land Preservation and Recreation Plan 2014-2018

Doc URL :: http://www.dnr.state.md.us/land/stewardship/LPRP_2014-2018.asp

As stated in the Executive Summary:

“The Maryland Land Preservation and Recreation Plan is a framework for state, county, and local outdoor recreation planning initiatives. This plan has a strong

	<p>focus on planning and design for access by people of all abilities, and on encouraging enjoyment and stewardship of Maryland’s natural resources, parks, trails, and cultural places. This document presents a clear, concise vision for the next five years. Preserving and enhancing Maryland’s outdoor resources corresponds with broader state and national efforts to balance outdoor recreation land use with natural and cultural resource protection.”</p> <p>The FME staff was involved in the development of this effort by serving on the Technical Advisory Committee. While many the resulting Strategies and Actions were specific to state forests, see below, many others would involve state forest opportunities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with academic partners in Maryland to conduct Forest Economic Impact Study to show the importance of our state forests, concurrently with carrying capacity studies on overused lands as identified by DNR staff. • Create connections between trails within Maryland state parks and forests as well as between state, city, county, and federal trail systems. <p>Components of Monitor Relevant Socioeconomic Issues</p> <p>FSC Indicator 4.4.a The forest owner or manager understands the likely social impacts of management activities, and incorporates this understanding into management planning and operations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Archeological sites and sites of cultural, historical and community significance (on and off the FMU); <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The FME GIS system is used to log all known archeological sites on FME lands under certification. o The FME collaborates with Maryland Historical Trust on Project Review (internal and external proposals to alter or use DNR managed lands) to document new findings and to allow MHT review of proposals for any historical significance. MHT is also sent other management documents such as the annual work plans for their review. • Public resources, including air, water and food (hunting, fishing, collecting); <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The Citizens Advisory Committee for each state forest is comprised of an 11-member team that formally represents a spectrum of forest interests. Each AWP is reviewed by the CAC and the general public (30-day online comment period) and a summary of those comments (along with DNR ID Team comments) become part of the final annual work plan for each state forest. • Aesthetics; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o See AWPs, SFMP and other internal review documents for evidence of forest buffers along public roads, riparian buffers, and forest retention. • Community goals for forest and natural resource use and protection such as employment, subsistence, recreation and health; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Forest managers serve on a variety of local economic boards and regularly meet with local economic development agencies. • Community economic opportunities; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Cheryl DeBerry, is a member of PGSF CAC is works at the Garrett County Office of Economic Development o A review of the Sustainable Forest Management Plans will show the importance of adding timber to the marketplace in support of local forest product companies. Even during economic slow periods when the private sector is not putting timber
--	--

	<p>on the market, the DNR state forests continues to offer timber contracts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The Meadow Mt Trail on Savage River State Forest is a collaborative effort in conjunction with Garrett County and Garrett Trails (business interests) to bring expanded biking opportunities to the region, which in part, include improved access to state forest lands. The forest manager regularly meets with these groups to gain feedback on how this project should develop. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other people who may be affected by management operations. • Recently several ORV trails were deemed unsustainable and were closed. It was decided by DNR leadership to review all DNR lands to determine if other sustainable sites could be used to add trails to the system. Three sites were forwarded from this process and one was on state forest land. A series of public meetings were held near the proposed sites to gather public information and sentiment regarding these proposals. Due to these efforts, two sites were abandoned and one on Savage River State Forest is currently in the planning stage. Also, as previously mentioned, the Citizens Advisory Committee is a group of advisors comprised to offer the forest manager insight on forest management specific to their area of interest and expertise. <p>FSC Indicator 4.1.g The forest owner or manager participates in local economic development and/or civic activities, based on scale of operation and where such opportunities are available.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o State Forest managers have worked with Garrett County Office of Tourism and Economic Development to promote natural resource and recreational values that make the county attractive to businesses o State Forest managers serve on the Appalachian Forest Heritage Area board o State Forest managers have serviced on the Leadership Allegany. This is a 9-month program put on each year organized by the Chamber of Commerce. Its function is to promote networking with business and civic leaders in the county as well as participation in local economic and social services development. o State Forest managers have served as a member of a team assembled for Allegany County to attend a week long course focused on "Asset Based Economic Development For Rural Areas o State Forest managers meet monthly with the Mountain Maryland Gateway to the West Heritage Area. The goal is to integrate our cultural/natural/historical resources with others in the county to improve the cultural heritage tourism in the county <p>Indicator 4.1.b Forest work is offered in ways that create high quality job opportunities for employees.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Actually, working within a state government system that is focused on creating local employment opportunities while at the same time trying to reduce government costs due to budgets and slumping state revenues. This is a difficult task and not largely within the responsibility and ability of the FME to affect change in this regard. The truth is, that it is often difficult to attract and keep talented people in this business environment. <p>Indicator 4.1.e The forest owner or manager provides work opportunities to qualified local applicants and seeks opportunities for purchasing local goods and</p>
--	---

	<p>services of equal price and quality.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The FMEs timber contract bidding procedure includes sending invitations to bid on State Forest timber sale contracts sent to licensed, local Forest Products Operators which supports work opportunities for local businesses and families. o Our procurement policies require competitive bidding on purchases over \$2,500 which removes discriminating business practices, allowing equal opportunities for businesses of all sizes to win local work. This includes not only timber harvesting but also herbicide and fencing work associated with silvicultural plans. These are bid among local, qualified contractors. o Other examples include repairs of automotive fleet and heavy equipment carried out at local garages. o Seasonal positions, though advertised state wide, often allows employment opportunities for revolving seasonal and contractual labor force. <p>Monitoring Through Local Representatives</p> <p>As stated in the FMEs guidance documents, the Sustainable Forest Management Plans and Timber Operation Order, each state forest has a Citizens Advisory Committee assigned to offer advice on relevant socio-economic issues particular to that state forest. Each CAC has a unique membership but with the assigned role across a spectrum of interests.</p> <p>The Timber Operation Order states, “It is then the responsibility of the land unit manager to submit the proposed Annual Work Plan to the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) for review and comments. A meeting will be scheduled at the convenience of the Citizens Advisory Committee and land manager after the field review by the ID Team has been completed. Comments from the CAC will be submitted to the land manager.</p> <p>The Citizens Advisory Committee meet with the state forest manager at least twice a year and provides an opportunity for review by individuals with a working familiarity of the forest, representing various interest areas. Interest areas represented on the committee include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • recreational users, • fishermen, • hunters, • ecologists, • wildlife, • conservationists, • forestry professionals, • recreation professionals, • timber interests, • economic interests, and • youth representation <p>Appointments to the committee are made by the State Forester/Director. All members of the existing committee are asked to make nominations for consideration of new members as vacancies occur. While the Secretary makes all appointments, consideration will emphasize retention of a diverse committee make-up representing the variety of advocacy groups, user groups and professional disciplines interested in management of the forest.</p>
--	---

	<p>Primary objectives of this step include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ensure that the proposals meet the needs of as many interest areas as possible and contain provisions that make the plan sensitive to the concerns of all user groups. 2. Follow-up review of all interdisciplinary reviews to eliminate any oversights, or clarify misunderstandings.
SCS review	<p>FME has prepared a summary of its social impacts monitoring activities and results in response to this finding, which is consistent with achieving its objectives. Through use of the Citizen Advisory Committees and other informal (e.g., Forest Summits) and formal (e.g., recreational trail user counts) monitoring as described in the response, FME obtains information on the social impacts of its management activities.</p>
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i>

Finding Number: 2014.14	
Select one: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US Indicator 8.5.a.
Non-Conformity (or justification): Partial monitoring results are made available for the Chesapeake State Forest via the website. However, for other State Forests (Eastern and Western), a summary of results or the full results of the most recent monitoring information is not being maintained. The content must address the indicators listed in Criterion 8.2, and be made available to the public, free or at a nominal price, upon request.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): While protecting confidentiality, either full monitoring results or an up-to-date summary of the most recent monitoring information shall be maintained, covering the Indicators listed in Criterion 8.2, and be made available to the public, free or at a nominal price, upon request.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	<p>Forest Stewardship Council Audit 2014 – Response to Major CAR</p> <p>Indicator 8.2.a.1 For all commercially harvested products, an inventory system is maintained. The inventory system includes at a minimum: a) species, b) volumes, c) stocking, d) regeneration, and e) stand and forest composition and structure; and f) timber quality.</p> <p>FMU Response: <i>A complete forest re-inventory is in progress, entering year four of five, for the Western State Forests and will begin in 2014 for the Eastern state forests (Pocomoke State Forest and Chesapeake Forest). Some preliminary analysis has been completed and is available under the Monitoring sections for the</i></p>

relevant state forest webpage. The most recent forest inventories were completed in 2002 for the western state forests, in 2009 for Pocomoke State Forest and in 2004 for Chesapeake Forest. Results are found in the Sustainable Forest Management Plan's available online on the relevant state forest webpages.

Indicator 8.2.a.2 Significant, unanticipated removal or loss or increased vulnerability of forest resources is monitored and recorded. Recorded information includes date and location of occurrence, description of disturbance, extent and severity of loss, and may be both quantitative and qualitative.

FMU Response: *This information, unanticipated removal or loss or increased vulnerability of forest resources, would be expressed in each of the state forest annual work plans which is made publically available on the relevant state forest webpage. These events require a response in silvicultural activities that will often be highlighted in the annual work plan. For example, in the fiscal year 2014 work plan for Green Ridge State Forest, the annual work plan summary states:*

This work plan includes three silviculture proposals for a total of 281 managed acres within the 24,414 acre general management zone in which area based sustainable forest management is practiced. Within these managed acres, end of rotation harvests are proposed to regenerate the stands while salvaging ice damaged forest resources. These harvests are proposed due to near total mortality of the overstory trees that resulted from a catastrophic hail storm event. There will be some variation between managed acres and actual harvest acres to provide for various buffers and/or retention areas.

On 27 May 2011 a major storm event producing very large hail impacted stands in the Mertens Avenue/Oldtown Road intersection area of the forest causing significant canopy loss. One year later the damage was evaluated and we learned that significant mortality occurred in approximately 400 acres of mature oak stands. The silviculture proposals in this work plan are the result of responding to this mortality. These proposals will focus on regenerating these stands while salvaging the timber loss. Once these salvage proposals are approved, they will be moved ahead to be accomplished during the FY-2013 operation cycle to salvage the timber while it is still merchantable. In return, an equivalent number of proposals approved in the FY-2013 AWP will be held for the FY-2014 operation cycle.

The silviculture proposals within this plan include 281 acres of variable retention harvests for an estimated 1,090 mbf of hardwood timber.

Indicator 8.2.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.

FMU Response: *Each state forest maintains a Silvicultural Activity Summary By Annual Work Plan that is available on the relevant state forest webpages. Also, each Sustainable Forest Management Plan has included an explanation of the*

	<p><i>annual growth calculations.</i></p> <p>Indicator 8.2.c The forest owner or manager periodically obtains data needed to monitor presence on the FMU of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Rare, threatened and endangered species and/or their habitats; 2) Common and rare plant communities and/or habitat; 3) Location, presence and abundance of invasive species; 4) Condition of protected areas, set-asides and buffer zones; 5) High Conservation Value Forests (see Criterion 9.4). <p>FMU Response: <i>As possible, respecting the security issues of protected species and habitats as guided by the Maryland Natural Heritage Program, the results of this data are covered in each of the Sustainable Forest Management Plans. More recent and specific research and inventories can be found under the Monitoring section on each of the state forest webpages. The HCVF is documented and outlined in the Sustainable Forest Management Plan for each of the state forests (available online).</i></p> <p>Indicator 8.2.d.1 Monitoring is conducted to ensure that site specific plans and operations are properly implemented, environmental impacts of site disturbing operations are minimized, and that harvest prescriptions and guidelines are effective.</p> <p>FMU Response: <i>Operations monitoring is performed by our internal audit. This team includes the Regional Supervisor and Environmental Specialist which receives a list of all silvicultural activities that have been completed within the last year or are currently on going, and either visits each of these sites or a randomly selected subset. The sites are walked, discussed and examined based on established criteria such as how the annual work plan proposal was implemented and how well the operations was conducted considering sensitive areas, unique cultural or geologic resources, forest retention, aesthetic and recreation considerations, water quality, forest health and regeneration, forest roads, and community relations.</i></p> <p><i>The internal audits sheets are made available to the certification audit body and are available to the public for free or at a nominal price upon request.</i></p> <p>Indicator 8.2.d.2 A monitoring program is in place to assess the condition and environmental impacts of the forest-road system.</p> <p>FMU Response: <i>A forest roads inventory has been completed and is maintained in a GIS database for each of the state forests. The Forest Roads Management for Forest Operations on Maryland State Forests established the protocol in how this data would be collected and maintained. This system not only identifies the road structures such as culverts and bridges but also road segments, dimensions and condition. This system was used to create a priority list of culverts and roads to receive maintenance funding.</i></p>
--	---

	<p><i>The inventory protocol or an analysis of the results is available to the public for free or at a nominal price upon request.</i></p> <p>Indicator 8.2.d.3 The landowner or manager monitors relevant socio-economic issues (see Indicator 4.4.a), including the social impacts of harvesting, participation in local economic opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.g), the creation and/or maintenance of quality job opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.b), and local purchasing opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.e).</p> <p>FMU Response: <i>The DNR Forest Service three-step review process involves an Inter-Disciplinary Team of natural resource professions including: forestry, wildlife, natural heritage, fisheries, parks, and water resources. This team reviews each of the annual work plans and performs local site visits for proposals that may have a proximity to sensitive habitats or species. The second level of review involves a Citizens Advisory Committee comprised of an eleven-person team representing a wide arrangement of natural resource interests. These team members are local and knowledgeable in the resource interests they represent, such as recreation, hunting, fishing, forest industry, and special habitats. Their purpose is to communicate the pulse of the resource issues and concerns they represent. The third level of review is a 30-day public review of each of the state forest annual work plans.</i></p> <p><i>The comments from each of these three groups then become part of the work plan document itself which is available online.</i></p> <p>Indicator 8.2.d.4 Stakeholder responses to management activities are monitored and recorded as necessary.</p> <p>FMU Response: <i>See Indicator 8.2.d.3 FMU Response above.</i></p> <p>Indicator 8.2.d.5 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>FMU Response: <i>There are no federally recognized tribes in Maryland.</i></p> <p>Indicator 8.2.e The forest owner or manager monitors the costs and revenues of management in order to assess productivity and efficiency.</p> <p>FMU Response: <i>Each of the state forest annual work plans includes a budget section that outlines expected incomes and expenditures for the forest.</i></p> <p>MD DNR have created a new “Monitoring” info block on the right sidebar for each of the state forests. We wanted to get this info collected and up ASAP, but soon will begin work with our webmaster to consolidate the monitoring references to a single webpage for ease of maintenance and access, with references to the appropriate state forests.</p>
--	---

	<p>Webpages updated:</p> <p>Potomac Garrett State Forest :: http://dnr.maryland.gov/publiclands/western/garrettforest.asp / http://dnr.maryland.gov/publiclands/western/potomacforest.asp</p> <p>Savage River State Forest :: http://dnr.maryland.gov/publiclands/western/savageriverforest.asp</p> <p>Green Ridge State Forest :: http://dnr.maryland.gov/publiclands/western/greenridgeforest.asp</p> <p>Pocomoke State Forest :: http://dnr.maryland.gov/publiclands/eastern/pocomokeforest.asp</p> <p>Chesapeake Forest :: http://dnr.maryland.gov/forests/chesapeakeforestlands.asp</p>
<p>SCS review</p>	<p>MD DNR’s response provides a summary of how monitoring results are currently available in AWP’s or SFMP’s on the website or how monitoring results are made available upon request. Those that can be made available upon request were shown to the SCS audit team as evidence for Principle 6 and Criterion 8.2. The websites now present the most up-to-date monitoring results as confirmed on April 29, 2014. MD DNR’s current actions are sufficient to warrant closure of this Major CAR.</p> <p>While there are no federally recognized tribes in Maryland, MD DNR has reached out to representatives of indigenous people of the state. No comments from tribal representatives have been received by MD DNR or SCS related to sites of cultural significance on the certified FMU.</p> <p>In addition for 8.2.e, MD DNR is also subject to internal audits and external legislative audits to ensure that funds are received and appropriated according to applicable laws and regulations. This information is public.</p> <p>Tracking the summary of monitoring results and updates to the same will be done via MD DNR’s master checklist of certification requirements. Future audits will focus on updates and completeness of the information presented.</p>
<p>Status of CAR:</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i></p>

Finding Number: 2014.15	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, indicator 6.1 (see also COC for FMEs, part 3)
Non-Conformity (or justification): Website does not include the full promotional panel. Management documents that are linked to the website and observed in hard copy include FSC trademarks that are not in conformance with the most recent version of the trademark standard. The FME requested permission to used trademarks in 2009 and 2011 and the website and management documents were in conformance to the previous trademark standard.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): Catalogues, brochures, and websites shall include the promotional panel or its elements in a prominent place. A link or text such as “Look for FSC certified products” is included next to the panel, where the products are not all on the same page. FSC certified products are indicated by using the logo or with “FSC certified” in the product description.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	
SCS review	FME demonstrated records of approval for use of the FSC promotional panel in the forest management plans for the Chesapeake and Pocomoke State Forests (approval granted from SCS on July 2, 2014).
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

4.2 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations

Finding Number: 2015.1	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US indicator 5.6.c.
<p>Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): Rates and methods of timber harvest are not leading to achieving desired conditions, or improving or maintaining 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 not being returned to desired stocking levels and composition at the earliest practicable time as justified in management objectives.</p> <p>On Savage River, harvest levels have been at below planned acres to be treated in annual work plans for over 5 years. SILVAH information shows that sufficient regeneration is not being achieved. These oak forest types are older, overstocked, and at risk of becoming distressed, which could make establishing regeneration difficult. This is a significant deviation from planned activities described in Annual Work Plans that are to be implemented to achieve desired stocking and species compositions.</p>	
<p>Corrective Action Request (or Observation): Rates and methods of timber harvest shall 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, shall be returned to desired stocking levels and composition at the earliest practicable time as justified in management objectives.</p>	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2015.2	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify): No deadline
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US Indicator 6.2.b.
<p>Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):</p> <p>When RTE species are present or assumed to be present, modifications in management are made in order to maintain, restore or enhance the extent, quality and viability of the species and their habitats. Conservation zones and/or protected areas are established for RTE species, including those S3 species that are considered rare, where they are necessary to maintain or improve the short and long-term viability of the species. Conservation measures are based on relevant science, guidelines and/or consultation with relevant, independent experts as necessary to achieve the conservation goal of the Indicator.</p> <p>On the Eastern Shore, there are several Delmarva Bay restoration projects that will require consistent prescribed fire applications for the first three years after initial restoration activities followed by periodic natural or prescribed fire at certain intervals. FME currently has been hindered by weather and lack of human resources to keep up with these activities. Specialists involved in this project have determined that restoration objectives for this community of RTE plants cannot be met without fire. There is a similar situation with prescribed fire at Shale Barrens in the Western Region.</p>	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): FME should ensure that it implements prescribed fire activities in a timely manner to better ensure the success of its ecological restoration projects.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2015.3	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify): No deadline
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US Indicator 6.5.d.
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): The transportation system, including design and placement of permanent and temporary haul roads, skid trails, recreational trails, water crossings and landings, is designed, constructed, maintained, and/or 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • access to all roads and trails (temporary and permanent), including recreational trails, and off-road travel, is controlled, as possible, to minimize ecological impacts; • road density is minimized; • erosion is minimized; • sediment discharge to streams is minimized; • there is free upstream and downstream passage for aquatic organisms; • impacts of transportation systems on wildlife habitat and migration corridors are minimized; • area converted to roads, landings and skid trails is minimized; • habitat fragmentation is minimized; and • unneeded roads are closed and rehabilitated. <p>FME has fallen behind in its road construction and maintenance upgrades or closures due to several factors outside of its control in the Western Region. There are several crossings and other drainage features in need of upgrades (or closures) in order to prevent negative impacts to soil and water.</p>	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): FME should consider accelerating the rate of implementation of its road construction and maintenance program to ensure continued conformance to the requirements of 6.5.d.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2015.4	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify): No deadline
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US Indicator 6.6.c.
<p>Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):</p> <p>Chemicals and application methods are selected to minimize risk to non-target species and sites. When considering the choice between aerial and ground application, the forest owner or manager evaluates the comparative risk to non-target species and sites, the comparative risk of worker exposure, and the overall amount and type of chemicals required.</p> <p>Aerial spraying is done with a helicopter equipped with sensitive GPS equipment, which coupled with the machine’s high maneuverability, helps to reduce the risk to non-target species and sites and virtually eliminates the risk of the pilot’s exposure to chemicals.</p> <p>On Wango Pines, during an aerial herbicide treatment the helicopter operator sprayed non-target species of concern (horse sugar and sheep laurel) that were clearly designated on maps and in GIS with buffers. The buffer was discussed with the forester in charge prior to the application, but apparently the pilot forgot about this sensitive site (note that others sensitive areas were avoided).</p> <p>FME’s contractor, Parker Forestry, has suggested some corrective actions to implement during the next application to eliminate this risk in the future (i.e., an onsite briefing just prior to spraying). Initial communication with the applicator on these corrective actions took place well prior to the FSC audit.</p>	
<p>Corrective Action Request (or Observation):</p> <p>FME should ensure that corrective actions are implemented to avoid risk to non-target species during aerial applications.</p>	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2015.5	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify): No deadline
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US Indicator 7.2.a.
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): The management plan is kept up to date. It is reviewed on an ongoing basis and is updated whenever necessary to incorporate the results of monitoring or new scientific and technical information, as well as to respond to changing environmental, social and economic circumstances. FME has made some changes to its management plans in response to OBS 2014.10 that have been incorporated into some SFMPs, but not all.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): FME should ensure that its response to OBS 2014.10 is fully incorporated into management planning documents by the next audit.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

5. 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

Citizen Advisory Committee 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"/> FME has not received any stakeholder comments from interested parties as a result of stakeholder outreach activities during this annual audit.	
Stakeholder comments	SCS Response
Economic concerns	
None.	
Social concerns	
Maryland DNR does a good job of balancing social, economic, and environmental considerations.	Noted as evidence of conformance.
Environmental concerns	
Maryland DNR’s Natural Heritage Program is a very important partner for us. We have a very good relationship with the DNR on our reserve area management initiative.	Noted as evidence of conformance; Maryland DNR implements several restoration projects on natural heritage areas to establish or maintain communities of rare plants on Eastern Shore and in the Western Region. For example, the audit team visited Delmarva Bay restoration harvest and burn sites on the Eastern Shore and Shale Barren Communities in the Western Region.

6. Certification Decision

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

7. Changes in Certification Scope

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

Name and Contact Information

Organization name			
Contact person			
Address		Telephone	
		Fax	
		e-mail	
		Website	

FSC Sales Information

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

Scope of Certificate

Certificate Type	<input type="checkbox"/> Single FMU	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple FMU
	<input type="checkbox"/> Group	
SLIMF (if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/> Small SLIMF certificate	<input type="checkbox"/> Low intensity SLIMF certificate
	<input type="checkbox"/> Group SLIMF certificate	
# Group Members (if applicable)		
Number of FMUs in scope of certificate		
Geographic location of non-SLIMF FMU(s)	<i>Latitude & Longitude:</i>	
Forest zone	<input type="checkbox"/> Boreal	<input type="checkbox"/> Temperate
	<input type="checkbox"/> Subtropical	<input type="checkbox"/> Tropical
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is:		Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac
privately managed		
state managed		
community managed		
Number of FMUs in scope that are:		
less than 100 ha in area	100 - 1000 ha in area	
1000 - 10 000 ha in area	more than 10 000 ha in area	
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is included in FMUs that:		Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input 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		
Division of FMUs into manageable units:		

Production Forests

Timber Forest Products	Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac
Total area of production forest (i.e. forest from which timber may be harvested)	
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	
Silvicultural system(s)	Area under type of management
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)	
Non-timber Forest Products (NTFPs)	
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	
Explanation of the assumptions and reference to the data source upon which AAH and NTFP harvest rates estimates are based:	
Species in scope of joint FM/COC certificate: (<i>Scientific / Latin Name</i> and Common / Trade Name)	

FSC Product Classification

Timber products		
Product Level 1	Product Level 2	Species
Non-Timber Forest Products		
Product Level 1	Product Level 2	Product Level 3 and Species

--	--	--

Conservation Areas

Total area of forest and non-forest land protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for conservation objectives:		ha or ac		
High Conservation Value Forest / Areas				
High Conservation Values present and respective areas:		Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Code	HCV Type	Description & Location	Area
<input type="checkbox"/>	HCV1	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g. endemism, endangered species, refugia).		
<input type="checkbox"/>	HCV2	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant large landscape level forests, contained within, or containing the management unit, where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance.		
<input type="checkbox"/>	HCV3	Forests or areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems.		
<input type="checkbox"/>	HCV4	Forests or areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g. watershed protection, erosion control).		
<input type="checkbox"/>	HCV5	Forests or areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g. subsistence, health).		
<input type="checkbox"/>	HCV6	Forests or areas critical to local communities' traditional cultural identity (areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in cooperation with such local communities).		
Total Area of forest classified as 'High Conservation Value Forest / Area'				

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 type="checkbox"/>	<i>Applicant owns and/or manages other FMUs not under evaluation.</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Applicant wishes to excise portions of the FMU(s) under evaluation from the scope of certification.</i>
Explanation for exclusion of FMUs and/or excision:	
Control measures to prevent mixing of certified and non-	

certified product (C8.3):		
Description of FMUs excluded from, or forested area excised from, the scope of certification:		
Name of FMU or Stand	Location (city, state, country)	Size (<input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac)

8. Annual Data Update

8.1 Social Information

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

8.2 Annual Summary of Pesticide and Other Chemical Use

<input type="checkbox"/> <i>FME does not use pesticides.</i>				
Commercial name of pesticide / herbicide	Active ingredient	Quantity applied annually (kg or lbs)	Size of area treated during previous year	Reason for use

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

Name	Title	Contact Information	Consultation method
Jack Perdue	DNR-Forest Service	Certificate holder	Field and meeting
Anne Hairston-Strang	DNR-Forest Service		
Mike Schofield	DNR-MFS		
Don VanHassent	DNR-Forest Service		
Stephen Payne	DNR-NRP		
Brett Coakley	DNR-Fisheries		
Gary Adelhardt	DNR-Forest Service		
Wesley Knapp	DNR-Wildlife & Heritage		
George Elberling	DNR-Forest Service		
Kip Powers	DNR-Forest Service		
Alexander Clark	DNR-Forest Service		
John F. Wilson	DNR-LAP		
Pete Dolan	DNR-CCS		
Mark Beals	DNR-Forest Service		
Jesse Morgan	DNR-Forest Service		
Eric Null	DNR-Forest Service		
Steve Carr	DNR LAP Trails planner		
Wade Dorsey	DNR-Forest Service		
John Denning	DNR-Forest Service		
Jason Savage	DNR-Forest Service		
Mike Johnson	DNR-Forest Service		
Noah Rowe	DNR-Forest Service		
Scott Campbell	DNR-Forest Service		
Jeff Sweitzer	DNR-NRP		
Kenneth Jolly	DNR-Forest Service		
Ed Thompson	DNR-Heritage		
Pete Kelley	DNR-Forest Service		

List of other Stakeholders Consulted

Name	Organization	Contact Information	Consultation method	Requests Cert. Notf.
Skip Jones	Parker Forestry		Field and meeting	No
John Connor				
Stacy Esham				
Bill Giese	Citizen Advisory Committee			No
Tony DiPaolo				No
Deborah Barber				No
Donnell Keech				No
Francis Zumbrun				No

Appendix 3 – Additional Audit Techniques Employed

No additional audit techniques were employed.

Appendix 4 – Pesticide Derogations

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

Appendix 5 – Detailed Observations

Evaluation Year	FSC P&C Reviewed
2014	All – (Re)certification Evaluation
2015	1.3, 1.5, 1.6, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.4, 4.2, 4.4, 6.2, 6.3, 6.5, 6.6, 6.9, 7.1, 7.2, 7.4, 8.2, and 8.3 (COC indicators for FMEs)
2016	
2017	
2018	

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

REQUIREMENT	C/NC	COMMENT/CAR
Principle #1: Compliance with Laws and FSC Principles Forest management shall respect all applicable laws of the country in which they occur, and international treaties and agreements to which the country is a signatory, and comply with all FSC Principles and Criteria.		
1.1 Forest management shall respect all national	NE	

and local laws and administrative requirements.		
1.2. All applicable and legally prescribed fees, royalties, taxes and other charges shall be paid.	NE	
1.3. In signatory countries, the provisions of all binding international agreements such as CITES, ILO Conventions, ITTA, and Convention on Biological Diversity, shall be respected.	C	
1.3.a. Forest management plans and operations comply with relevant provisions of all applicable binding international agreements.	C	Ginseng, which is not allowed to be harvested on MD DNR lands, is regulated by the Maryland Department of Agriculture to comply with CITES. See also response to OBS 2014.1.
1.4. Conflicts between laws, regulations and the FSC Principles and Criteria shall be evaluated for the purposes of certification, on a case by case basis, by the certifiers and the involved or affected parties.	NE	
1.5. Forest management areas should be protected from illegal harvesting, settlement and other unauthorized activities.	C	
1.5.a. The forest owner or manager supports or implements measures intended to prevent illegal and unauthorized activities on the Forest Management Unit (FMU).	C	<p>Potomac Garrett State Forest One unauthorized use/occupancy of state forestland. While conducting routine boundary line maintenance, DNR-staff found a neighboring landowner was fencing a piece of state forestland. Further investigation indicated that the man had made an adverse possession claim on the property. A meeting was held to discuss this claim, and the issue was resolved. Fence will be removed, and a subsequent claim will be recorded in tax office so neighbor will not be charged taxes on the state forestland he had mistakenly claimed.</p> <p>Chesapeake Forest / Pocomoke State Forest There was one instance of illegal ATV use, with significant impact on RTE species and natural communities. Natural Resource Police were notified of this violation and are patrolling the area. This issue involved significant ATV damage at a few Delmarva Bays and a Wetlands of Special State Concern at Brookview Ponds ESA. Buffering and/or special harvesting prescriptions are employed to protect these resources.</p>
1.5.b. If illegal or unauthorized activities occur, the forest owner or manager implements actions	C	See 1.5.a.

designed to curtail such activities and correct the situation to the extent possible for meeting all land management objectives with consideration of available resources.		
1.6. Forest managers shall demonstrate a long-term commitment to adhere to the FSC Principles and Criteria.	C	
1.6.a. The forest owner or manager demonstrates a long-term commitment to adhere to the FSC Principles and Criteria and FSC and FSC-US policies, including the FSC-US Land Sales Policy, and has a publicly available statement of commitment to manage the FMU in conformance with FSC standards and policies.	C	See response to Minor CAR 2014.2.
1.6.b. If the certificate holder does not certify their entire holdings, then they document, in brief, the reasons for seeking partial certification referencing FSC-POL-20-002 (or subsequent policy revisions), the location of other managed forest units, the natural resources found on the holdings being excluded from certification, and the management activities planned for the holdings being excluded from certification.	C	See Section A of 2014 recertification report (or section 7/8 of annual audit reports) for a list of all lands outside of the scope of the certificate.
1.6.c. The forest owner or manager notifies the Certifying Body of significant changes in ownership and/or significant changes in management planning within 90 days of such change.	C	See response to OBS 2014.3.
Principle #2: Long-term tenure and use rights to the land and forest resources shall be clearly defined, documented and legally established.		
2.1. Clear evidence of long-term forest use rights to the land (e.g., land title, customary rights, or lease agreements) shall be demonstrated.	NE	
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.	NE	
2.3. Appropriate mechanisms shall be employed to resolve disputes over tenure claims and use rights. The circumstances and status of any	C	

<p>outstanding disputes will be explicitly considered in the certification evaluation. Disputes of substantial magnitude involving a significant number of interests will normally disqualify an operation from being certified.</p>		
<p>2.3.a 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.</p>	C	<p>Potomac Garrett State Forest See C1.5. Pertinent contacts: Nathan Beeman, DNR-LAP Property Specialist.</p>
<p>2.3.b The forest owner or manager documents any significant disputes over tenure and use rights.</p>	C	<p>Potomac Garrett State Forest See C1.5. Pertinent contacts: Nathan Beeman, DNR-LAP Property Specialist.</p>
<p>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.</p>		
<p>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.</p>	NA	<p>There are no Federally recognized native American tribes in Maryland. There is no tribal forest management or ownership/ use rights on MD DNR lands. However, with assistance from the Maryland Commission on Indian Affairs, has placed several native American members on the Citizens Advisory Committee in the past.</p>
<p>3.1.a Tribal forest management planning and implementation are carried out by authorized tribal representatives in accordance with tribal laws and customs and relevant federal laws.</p>	NA	
<p>3.1.b The manager of a tribal forest secures, in writing, informed consent regarding forest management activities from the tribe or individual forest owner prior to commencement of those activities.</p>	NA	
<p>3.2. Forest management shall not threaten or diminish, either directly or indirectly, the resources or tenure rights of indigenous peoples.</p>	NA	
<p>3.2.a During management planning, the forest owner or manager consults with American Indian groups that have legal rights or other binding agreements to the FMU to avoid harming their resources or rights.</p>	NA	<p>FME reported that no activities have taken place that affect any tribal resources in 2015.</p>
<p>3.2.b Demonstrable actions are taken so that forest management does not adversely affect tribal</p>	NA	<p>There are no tribal forest management or ownership/ use rights on MD DNR lands. There are no sites of special tribal</p>

resources. When applicable, evidence of, and measures for, protecting tribal resources are incorporated in the management plan.		significance on the certified FMU. There are no tribes with legal rights or binding agreements to the FMU.
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.	NE	
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.	NA	No protected traditional knowledge is used for commercial or forest management purposes.
3.4.a The forest owner or manager identifies whether <i>traditional knowledge</i> in forest management is being used.	NA	
3.4.b When traditional knowledge is used, written protocols are jointly developed prior to such use and signed by local tribes or tribal members to protect and fairly compensate them for such use.	NA	
3.4.c The forest owner or manager respects the confidentiality of tribal traditional knowledge and assists in the protection of such knowledge.	NA	
Principle #4: Forest management operations shall maintain or enhance the long-term social and economic well-being of forest workers and local communities.		
4.1. The communities within, or adjacent to, the forest management area should be given opportunities for employment, training, and other services.	NE	
4.2. Forest management should meet or exceed all applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of employees and their families.	C	
4.2.a The forest owner or manager meets or exceeds all applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of employees and their families (also see Criterion 1.1).	C	There have been no changes to health & safety regulations or FME's internal policies regarding the same since the last audit. In interviews with forestry contractors and state employees, these workers demonstrated knowledge of safety requirements and had required licenses or

		<p>certificates to demonstrate that they can safely implement planned management activities. For example, heritage program staff interviewed in 2015 maintain pesticide applicator’s licenses, as confirmed through interviews.</p> <p>Safety laws are referenced in training for licensing/ certification and in FME’s relevant management planning policies and procedures. Timber operation plan reviews occur prior to all timber sales, in which contractor qualifications are reviewed.</p>
<p>4.2.b The forest owner or manager and their employees and contractors demonstrate a safe work environment. Contracts or other written agreements include safety requirements.</p>	C	<p>On the Eastern Shore, an employee of logging contractor was cut when skidder door closed on hand, which was the only lost-time accident that the FME reported in 2015.</p> <p>Chesapeake Forest / Pocomoke State Forest Additional sections have been added to herbicide applicators contract.</p> <p>See also response to Minor CAR 2014.4 and OBS 2014.5.</p>
<p>4.2.c The forest owner or manager hires well-qualified service providers to safely implement the management plan.</p>	C	<p>While there were no active jobs during the 2015 annual audit, Parker Forestry has continued to demonstrate exemplary performance in planning and overseeing timber harvests on the Eastern shore. Where mistakes have been detected, it has implemented corrective actions. For example, an herbicide contractor sprayed in an area that was marked off-limits and Parker Forestry will now conduct pre-work consultations to ensure that all off-limits areas.</p>
<p>4.3 The rights of workers to organize and voluntarily negotiate with their employers shall be guaranteed as outlined in Conventions 87 and 98 of the International Labor Organization (ILO).</p>	NE	
<p>4.4. Management planning and operations shall incorporate the results of evaluations of social impact. Consultations shall be maintained with people and groups (both men and women) directly affected by management operations.</p>	C	
<p>4.4.a The forest owner or manager understands the likely social impacts of management activities, and incorporates this understanding into management planning and operations. Social impacts include effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Archeological sites and sites of cultural, 	C	<p>MD DNR provided a summary of social impacts; see response to Minor CAR 2014.6.</p>

<p>historical and community significance (on and off the FMU);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public resources, including air, water and food (hunting, fishing, collecting); • Aesthetics; • Community goals for forest and natural resource use and protection such as employment, subsistence, recreation and health; • Community economic opportunities; • Other people who may be affected by management operations. <p>A summary is available to the CB.</p>		
<p>4.4.b The forest owner or manager seeks and considers input in management planning from people who would likely be affected by management activities.</p>	C	<p>The following procedure is similar for both annual work plan and management plan; however, the most frequently used means of seeking and considering input on an annual basis is the Public consultation process for AWP. The first draft is made by management staff, this is reviewed along with necessary field visits by DNR’s internal interdisciplinary team, the revision is reviewed by the Citizen’s Advisory Committee, and then it is put on the web for 30 day review period. A public announcement is distributed to every major news outlet in the State, plus Patch.com and several relevant blog sites.</p>
<p>4.4.c People who are subject to direct adverse effects of management operations are apprised of relevant activities in advance of the action so that they may express concern.</p>	C	<p>Chesapeake Forest / Pocomoke State Forest The DNR-Natural Resource Police asked about whether a piece of state land was being illegally logged, after an investigation it was determined that there was no timber trespass taking place.</p> <p>Examples in 2015 of FME’s informing adjacent landowners of management activities include warnings of pending herbicide applications, most of which have yet to occur.</p> <p>See also 4.4.b and 4.4.d.</p>
<p>4.4.d For <i>public forests</i>, consultation shall include the following components:</p> <p>4. 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>	C	<p>See response to Minor CAR 2014.6.</p>

<p>5. 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>6. 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>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.</p>	NE	
<p>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.</p>		
<p>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.</p>	NE	
<p>5.2. Forest management and marketing operations should encourage the optimal use and local processing of the forest’s diversity of products.</p>	NE	
<p>5.3. Forest management should minimize waste associated with harvesting and on-site processing operations and avoid damage to other forest resources.</p>	NE	
<p>5.4. Forest management should strive to strengthen and diversify the local economy, avoiding dependence on a single forest product.</p>	NE	
<p>5.5. Forest management operations shall recognize, maintain, and, where appropriate, enhance the value of forest services and resources such as watersheds and fisheries.</p>	NE	
<p>5.6. The rate of harvest of forest products shall not</p>	C	

<p>exceed levels which can be permanently sustained.</p>		
<p>5.6.a In FMUs where products are being harvested, the landowner or manager calculates the sustained yield harvest level for each sustained yield planning unit, and provides clear rationale for determining the size and layout of the planning unit. The sustained yield harvest level calculation is documented in the Management Plan.</p> <p>The sustained yield harvest level calculation for each planning unit is based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • documented growth rates for particular sites, and/or acreage of forest types, age-classes and species distributions; • mortality and decay and other factors that affect net growth; • areas reserved from harvest or subject to harvest restrictions to meet other management goals; • silvicultural practices that will be employed on the FMU; • management objectives and desired future conditions. <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>C</p>	<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 at this point in time. 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>
<p>5.6.b Average annual harvest levels, over rolling periods of no more than 10 years, do not exceed the calculated sustained yield harvest level.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Each State Forest maintains an annual work plan summary to compare actual acres harvested versus projected (e.g., http://www.dnr.state.md.us/forests/download/awp_summary.pdf). Harvest levels on an area control basis remain well below what is allowed per the Woodstock model. See Annual Work Plans for more information.</p> <p>Chesapeake Forest / Pocomoke State Forest Pine pulpwood 39,651 tons harvested, Pine sawtimber 10,096 tons harvested</p> <p>Green Ridge State Forest The allowable harvest at GRSF is</p>

		<p>to manage 200 acres for end of rotation regeneration harvests. FME managed 137 acres since the last audit.</p> <p>Savage River State Forest Four harvests sold since last audit: SR-07-14, 172,766 Bd. Ft., SR-01-15, 41,875 Bd.Ft., SR-02-15, 90,380 Bd.Ft., SR-03-15, 48,406 Bd.Ft.</p> <p>Potomac Garrett State Forest ****</p>
<p>5.6.c Rates and methods of timber harvest lead to achieving desired conditions, and improve or maintain health and quality across the FMU. Overstocked stands and stands that have been depleted or rendered to be below productive potential due to natural events, past management, or lack of management, are returned to desired stocking levels and composition at the earliest practicable time as justified in management objectives.</p>	<p>NC</p>	<p>FME has been harvesting on overstocked stands of the Eastern Region using pre-commercial thinning and a two-entry thinning regime prior to final harvest. First-entry seed tree harvests are used in pond pine restoration in which the seed trees are not removed and are recruited for legacy trees. See audit itinerary for further details.</p> <p>In the Western Region, shelterwood, thinning, clearcut, and variable retention are used for treating overstocked stands and controlling species composition to deal with gypsy moth outbreaks.</p> <p>Notes on future management activities, such as silvicultural treatments or TSI, are incorporated into the forest GIS.</p> <p>See Minor CAR 2015.1.</p>
<p>5.6.d For NTFPs, calculation of quantitative sustained yield harvest levels is required only in cases where products are harvested in significant commercial operations or where traditional or customary use rights may be impacted by such harvests. In other situations, the forest owner or manager utilizes available information, and new information that can be reasonably gathered, to set harvesting levels that will not result in a depletion of the non-timber growing stocks or other adverse effects to the forest ecosystem.</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>No NTFPs are harvested in significant commercial operations.</p>
<p>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.</p>		
<p>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</p>	<p>NE</p>	

<p>the impacts of on-site processing facilities. Environmental impacts shall be assessed prior to commencement of site-disturbing operations.</p>		
<p>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.</p>	C	
<p>6.2.a If there is a likely presence of RTE species as identified in Indicator 6.1.a then either a field survey to verify the species' presence or absence is conducted prior to site-disturbing management activities, or management occurs with the assumption that potential RTE species are present.</p> <p>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.</p>	C	<p>Chesapeake Forest / Pocomoke State Forest Numerous surveys for Rare, Threatened and Endangered species have been conducted on CF/PSF lands during 2014. The vast majority of these have been updates or monitoring in existing Ecologically Significant Areas (ESAs). Some areas have been surveyed that appeared to contain high quality habitats outside of already existing ESAs but these yielded no new RTE species and thus no new ESAs designations. Implementation of harvests resulted in discovery of vernal pools and establishment of buffers on the Chandler Tract and on the Ruddick Tract.</p>
<p>6.2.b When RTE species are present or assumed to be present, modifications in management are made in order to maintain, restore or enhance the extent, quality and viability of the species and their habitats. Conservation zones and/or protected areas are established for RTE species, including those S3 species that are considered rare, where they are necessary to maintain or improve the short and long-term viability of the species. Conservation measures are based on relevant science, guidelines and/or consultation with relevant, independent experts as necessary to achieve the conservation goal of the Indicator.</p>	C	<p>Chesapeake Forest / Pocomoke State Forest Habitat management is an increasing portion of the role of the Heritage Ecologist. Areas that have been managed in recent years need to be surveyed to assess success, and numerous additional areas have been /are being managed for RTE species or habitat. The most significant of these are the Brookview Ponds ESA, Wango Pines ESA, and Powell Road Seeps ESA. Final harvests and thinning occur adjacent to and sometimes within these habitats.</p> <p>Green Ridge State Forest One ecological restoration project occurred within an ESA Shale Barren. Sole purpose of the management activity was to restore/enhance rare habitat/plant community.</p> <p>Potomac Garrett State Forest All management activities that would potentially impact RTE species were field verified by the Heritage ecologists as not have an impact.</p>

		See OBS 2015.2.
6.2.c For medium and large public forests (e.g. state forests), forest management plans and operations are designed to meet species’ recovery goals, as well as landscape level biodiversity conservation goals.	C	The requirements of this section of the standard are primarily accomplished through the ID team process described in detail elsewhere in this report. 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. Evidence of conformance: For example, the Delmarva Bay Restoration and Shale Barren restoration projects (see Audit Itinerary).
6.2.d Within the capacity of the forest owner or manager, hunting, fishing, trapping, collecting and other activities are controlled to avoid the risk of impacts to vulnerable species and communities (See Criterion 1.5).	C	Chesapeake Forest / Pocomoke State Forest There was one instance of illegal ATV use with significant impact on RTE species and natural communities. Natural Resource Police were notified of this violation and are patrolling the area. This issue involved significant ATV damage at a few Delmarva Bays and a Wetlands of Special State Concern at Brookview Ponds ESA. Buffering and/or special harvesting prescriptions are employed to protect these resources.
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.	C	
6.3.a.1 The forest owner or manager maintains, enhances, and/or restores under-represented successional stages in the FMU that would naturally occur on the types of sites found on the FMU. Where old growth of different community types that would naturally occur on the forest are under-represented in the landscape relative to natural conditions, a portion of the forest is managed to enhance and/or restore old growth characteristics.	C	Chesapeake Forest / Pocomoke State Forest RSA’s have been identified and recorded in the GIS. Early successional & ESA’s are being managed by WHS guidelines. Potomac Garrett State Forest The seedling/sapling succession stage of hardwood forests could be considered under represented. As such, mngt. work, planned within the AWP’s is generally focused on regeneration of hardwood forests and enhancing this stage of forest growth. Distribution if approx.:(Forest wide/general mngt) Seed/sap=6/10% ; poles=15/9%; sawtimber=80/75% Green Ridge State Forest Shale barren restoration
6.3.a.2 When a rare ecological community is present, modifications are made in both the management plan and its implementation in order to maintain, restore or enhance the viability of the community. Based on the vulnerability of the	C	See 6.2.b and 6.2.c.

<p>existing community, conservation zones and/or protected areas are established where warranted.</p>		
<p>6.3.a.3 When they are present, management maintains the area, structure, composition, and processes of all Type 1 and Type 2 old growth. Type 1 and 2 old growth are also protected and buffered as necessary with conservation zones, unless an alternative plan is developed that provides greater overall protection of old growth values.</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>	<p>C</p>	<p>No management activity has occurred in or near any old growth stands 2014-15 according to interviews with MD DNR staff.</p> <p>Type 1 and Type 2 old growth forests have been identified and protected as mapped in the State Forest management plans for each of the five state forests. Confirmed that old growth layers appear in the GIS layer for PSF, CSF, GRSF, PGSF and SRSF. The Policy and Procedures Handbook, Appendix F <i>Management Guidelines for the Conservation and Protection of Old Growth Forests</i> and details contained in each State Forest management plan (Chapter 3) covers any old growth.</p> <p>Note that MD DNR’s classification of old growth may include second growth areas that have been identified as important to the development of late-seral stands. Many of these areas may not meet the FSC definitions for Type 1 and Type 2, but support MD DNR’s conformance to 6.3.a.1.</p>

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Old growth forests comprise a significant portion of the tribal ownership. 2. A history of forest stewardship by the tribe exists. 3. High Conservation Value Forest attributes are maintained. 4. Old-growth structures are maintained. 5. Conservation zones representative of old growth stands are established. 6. Landscape level considerations are addressed. 7. Rare species are protected. 		
<p>6.3.b To the extent feasible within the size of the ownership, particularly on larger ownerships (generally tens of thousands or more acres), management maintains, enhances, or restores habitat conditions suitable for well-distributed populations of animal species that are characteristic of forest ecosystems within the landscape.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Chesapeake Forest / Pocomoke State Forest D14 Indiantown-Brookview Ponds ESA Project, WR12 Purnell-ESA Project.</p> <p>Green Ridge State Forest Removal of overgrown white pine plantations in the Kirk Orchard Early Succession Wildlife Habitat Management Area. Overgrown white pine plantations were removed, windrow brush piles were generated with debris and series of hard needle conifer seedlings, fruit trees, and openings were established to enhance American woodcock habitat and other early succession wildlife habitat.</p> <p>Potomac Garrett State Forest A)-RGS Grant funded: Habitat improvements, to permanent grassy openings via planting a grass legume mix , lime and fertilizer to make these small openings as productive as possible for a variety of birds and animals that utilize these openings. B) – “Feathered Edge Cut” around perimeter of wildlife food plot/ grassy opening in handicapped hunter area of Kindness Demo Forest Area. This work marked and in contract negotiations to carry out this marginally commercial habitat improvement work by end of FY. C) – all planned and completed timber harvests include wildlife habitat improvement elements, often leaning toward providing additional early succession habitat critical to a variety of species in need of conservation: including Gold winged Warblers, American Woodcock, etc.</p> <p>Savage River State Forest Thinning operations created a flux of understory vegetation which will benefit a variety of wildlife species.</p>
<p>6.3.c Management maintains, enhances and/or</p>		<p>Chesapeake Forest / Pocomoke State Forest One-third of</p>

<p>restores the plant and wildlife habitat of Riparian Management Zones (RMZs) to provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) habitat for aquatic species that breed in surrounding uplands; b) habitat for predominantly terrestrial species that breed in adjacent aquatic habitats; c) habitat for species that use riparian areas for feeding, cover, and travel; d) habitat for plant species associated with riparian areas; and, e) stream shading and inputs of wood and leaf litter into the adjacent aquatic ecosystem. 		<p>final harvests and thinning occur adjacent to or within the 300 foot SMZ buffer.</p> <p>Potomac Garrett State Forest See AWP maps re. HCVF blue line stream/wetlands protection.</p> <p>Savage River State Forest an occasional bridged stream crossing (permitted by MD Depart. of Environment)</p>
<p>Stand-scale Indicators 6.3.d 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>Within the eastern region, an abundance of loblolly pine exists and management practices (e.g., retain and release oaks) are designed to decrease the relative abundance of loblolly over time and increase the presence of other native species as confirmed through field observations (see Audit Itinerary).</p> <p>Within the western region, the audit team observed instances of promoting early successional habitat in oak regeneration and shale barren restoration areas.</p>
<p>6.3.e When planting is required, a local source of known provenance is used when available and when the local source is equivalent in terms of quality, price and productivity. The use of non-local sources shall be justified, such as in situations where other management objectives (e.g. disease resistance or adapting to climate change) are best served by non-local sources. Native species suited to the site are normally selected for regeneration.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Chesapeake Forest / Pocomoke State Forest The seed source for loblolly pine seedlings is Maryland. The seed source for shortleaf pine seedlings is Missouri. Shortleaf has a bimodal distribution within Maryland (coastal and mountain).</p> <p>Potomac Garrett State Forest Couple hundred red oak seedlings planted as supplemental planting in Deer Enclosure. Seedlings from MD State Nursery, with seed collected in MD.</p>
<p>6.3.f Management maintains, enhances, or restores habitat components and associated stand structures, in abundance and distribution that could be expected from naturally occurring processes. These components include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) large live trees, live trees with decay or declining health, snags, and well-distributed coarse down and dead woody material. Legacy trees where present are not harvested; and b) vertical and horizontal complexity. 	<p>C</p>	<p>On the Eastern shore (see Audit Itinerary), snags, hardwood retention, and woody debris were observed on all pine harvest sites. Operators are provided with guidelines on what elements to retain throughout the stands.</p> <p>See response to Minor CAR 2014.7 for the Western Region.</p>

<p>Trees selected for retention are generally representative of the dominant species found on the site.</p>		
<p>6.3.g.1 In the Southeast, Appalachia, Ozark-Ouachita, Mississippi Alluvial Valley, and Pacific Coast Regions, when even-aged systems are employed, and during salvage harvests, live trees and other native vegetation are retained within the harvest unit as described in Appendix C for the applicable region.</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>	<p>C</p>	<p>Chesapeake Forest / Pocomoke State Forest Four even-aged harvests totaling 138 acres were completed or were started this year. Some difficulty in retaining understory oaks in one five acre area was encountered. This was primarily due to the high volume of timber being harvested on that particular 5 acres.</p> <p>Green Ridge State Forest Two of the even-aged regeneration harvests that were complete since the past audit were also salvage harvests where barely any oaks remained alive making it difficult to retain living oaks.</p> <p>Potomac Garrett State Forest 26 ac. regen harvest in Comp. 16-2 only regen. harvest completed since last audit, though others under contract. No issues with retention.</p> <p>Savage River State Forest Conifer Regeneration harvest off Bowman Hill Road. No problem retaining standing live conifers and downed woody debris.</p> <p>See response to Minor CAR 2014.7 for the Western Region.</p>
<p>6.3.g.2 Under very limited situations, the landowner or manager has the option to develop a qualified plan to allow minor departure from the opening size limits described in Indicator 6.3.g.1. A qualified plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is developed by qualified experts in ecological and/or related fields (wildlife biology, hydrology, landscape ecology, forestry/silviculture). 2. Is based on the totality of the best available information including peer-reviewed science regarding natural disturbance regimes for the FMU. 3. Is spatially and temporally explicit and includes maps of proposed openings or areas. 4. Demonstrates that the variations will result in equal or greater benefit to wildlife, water quality, and other values compared to the normal opening size limits, including for 	<p>C</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 MD DNR has had openings that range from 120-160 acres in the case of restoration of wetland ecosystems where pine was planted or invaded after disturbance.</p> <p>For the Western Region, there have been no departures; all harvests contain retention elements required in 6.3.g.1 and Appalachian regional indicators.</p>

<p>sensitive and rare species.</p> <p>5. Is reviewed by independent experts in wildlife biology, hydrology, and landscape ecology, to confirm the preceding findings.</p>		
<p>6.3.h The forest owner or manager assesses the risk of, prioritizes, and, as warranted, develops and implements a strategy to prevent or control invasive species, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. a method to determine the extent of invasive species and the degree of threat to native species and ecosystems; 2. implementation of management practices that minimize the risk of invasive establishment, growth, and spread; 3. eradication or control of established invasive populations when feasible: and, 4. monitoring of control measures and management practices to assess their effectiveness in preventing or controlling invasive species. 	<p>C</p>	<p>Chesapeake Forest / Pocomoke State Forest Power washing equipment prior to harvest. Backpack sprayed a total of 54.6 acres of invasive species. Locations are stored within GIS.</p> <p>Green Ridge State Forest Herbicide treatment of ailanthus in and around shale barren restoration sites to remove ailanthus from barrens and eliminate nearby seed sources.</p> <p>Potomac Garrett State Forest Monitored and treated 16 NNIS occurrences, addressed via. FME’s policy of Early Detection–Rapid Response, accounting for 55 ac. of treated area.</p> <p>Savage River State Forest Japanese knotweed control measures taken along road way.</p>
<p>6.3.i In applicable situations, the forest owner or manager identifies and applies site-specific fuels management practices, based on: (1) natural fire regimes, (2) risk of wildfire, (3) potential economic losses, (4) public safety, and (5) applicable laws and regulations.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Chesapeake Forest / Pocomoke State Forest Two Rx burns occurred this past year for ESA restoration purposes.</p> <p>Green Ridge State Forest 35-acre prescribed woodland/shale barren restoration fire, approximately 10 acres warm season grass establishment/maintenance prescribed fires.</p> <p>Potomac Garrett State Forest No fires on PGSF this yr.</p> <p>Savage River State Forest Warm season grass burns conducted by the Wildlife service. No wildfires.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>NE</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>6.5.a The forest owner or manager has written</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>BMP checklists are filled out prior to each planned</p>

<p>guidelines outlining conformance with the Indicators of this Criterion.</p>		<p>management activity. SFMP and state storm water design manual serve as general guidelines. Certain state forests, such as those in the Western Region, have their own BMP manual adapted to regional conditions.</p>
<p>6.5.b Forest operations meet or exceed Best Management Practices (BMPs) that address components of the Criterion where the operation takes place.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>FORESTRY BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES IN MARYLAND: Implementation and Effectiveness for Protection of Water Resources http://www.na.fs.fed.us/watershed/pubs/bmp/09_md_bmp_report.pdf</p> <p>During an interview with the MD DNR’s forest hydrologist, it was confirmed that another statewide BMP study is to occur soon.</p>
<p>6.5.c Management activities including site preparation, harvest prescriptions, techniques, timing, and equipment are selected and used to protect soil and water resources and to avoid erosion, landslides, and significant soil disturbance. Logging and other activities that significantly increase the risk of landslides are excluded in areas where risk of landslides is high. The following actions are addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slash is concentrated only as much as necessary to achieve the goals of site preparation and the reduction of fuels to moderate or low levels of fire hazard. • Disturbance of topsoil is limited to the minimum necessary to achieve successful regeneration of species native to the site. • Rutting and compaction is minimized. • Soil erosion is not accelerated. • Burning is only done when consistent with natural disturbance regimes. • Natural ground cover disturbance is minimized to the extent necessary to achieve regeneration objectives. • Whole tree harvesting on any site over multiple rotations is only done when research indicates soil productivity will not be harmed. • Low impact equipment and technologies is used where appropriate. 	<p>C</p>	<p>MD DNR’s BMP guidelines are implemented to protect soil and water resources during management activities. During site visits in 2015, for both the Western and Eastern Regions, slash was dispersed relatively evenly over harvest sites due to removal of tops immediately after felling. Options for slash control include use of slash to meet BMPs, crushing, natural decay, and prescribed fire.</p> <p>No excessive topsoil disturbance was observed on harvest sites visited. Areas of disturbed topsoil observed were not draining into water courses and are for the purposes of regeneration.</p> <p>Rutting in the Eastern Region was within established limits set by BMP standards and was limited to principal skid trails. No excessive rutting was observed in the Western Region.</p> <p>BMPs were installed at harvest sites in both regions to control erosion.</p> <p>Whole tree harvesting is not currently in use. Lowest impact equipment is used when available and appropriate for site conditions. Loggers sometimes use slash during harvesting on skid trails or for temporary crossings it can significantly reduce negative impacts without sacrificing safety and efficiency.</p>
<p>6.5.d The transportation system, including design</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>See OBS 2015.3.</p>

<p>and placement of permanent and temporary haul roads, skid trails, recreational trails, water crossings and landings, is designed, constructed, 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"> • access to all roads and trails (temporary and permanent), including recreational trails, and off-road travel, is controlled, as possible, to minimize ecological impacts; • road density is minimized; • erosion is minimized; • sediment discharge to streams is minimized; • there is free upstream and downstream passage for aquatic organisms; • impacts of transportation systems on wildlife habitat and migration corridors are minimized; • area converted to roads, landings and skid trails is minimized; • habitat fragmentation is minimized; • unneeded roads are closed and rehabilitated. 		
<p>6.5.e.1 In consultation with appropriate expertise, the forest owner or manager implements written <i>Streamside Management Zone (SMZ) buffer</i> management guidelines that are adequate for preventing environmental impact, and include protecting and restoring water quality, hydrologic conditions in rivers and stream corridors, wetlands, vernal pools, seeps and springs, lake and pond shorelines, and other hydrologically sensitive areas. The guidelines include vegetative buffer widths and protection measures that are acceptable within those buffers.</p> <p>In the Appalachia, Ozark-Ouachita, Southeast, Mississippi Alluvial Valley, Southwest, Rocky Mountain, and Pacific Coast regions, there are requirements for minimum SMZ widths and explicit limitations on the activities that can occur within</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>See response to Minor CAR 2014.8.</p>

<p>those SMZs. These are outlined as requirements in Appendix E.</p>		
<p>6.5.e.2 Minor variations from the stated minimum SMZ widths and layout for specific stream segments, wetlands and other water bodies are permitted in limited circumstances, provided the forest owner or manager demonstrates that the alternative configuration maintains the overall extent of the buffers and provides equivalent or greater environmental protection than FSC-US regional requirements for those stream segments, water quality, and aquatic species, based on site-specific conditions and the best available information. The forest owner or manager develops a written set of supporting information including a description of the riparian habitats and species addressed in the alternative configuration. The CB must verify that the variations meet these requirements, based on the input of an independent expert in aquatic ecology or closely related field.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>See response to Minor CAR 2014.8.</p>
<p>6.5.f Stream and wetland crossings are avoided when possible. Unavoidable crossings are located and constructed to minimize impacts on water quality, hydrology, and fragmentation of aquatic habitat. Crossings do not impede the movement of aquatic species. Temporary crossings are restored to original hydrological conditions when operations are finished.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>All crossings observed were installed according to specification and only when necessary to access areas for management and monitoring activities. Bridges or culverts are used for crossings. Appropriate sized culverts were observed, which did not impede aquatic organisms.</p>
<p>6.5.g Recreation use on the FMU is managed to avoid negative impacts to soils, water, plants, wildlife and wildlife habitats.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Most ORV trails have been closed. Trail maintenance for other user groups such as mountain bikers and equestrian is accomplished through grants and volunteers of those groups interested in maintaining access. New ORV trails are in the works in the Western Region in cooperation with user groups and environmental stakeholders to ensure that impacts are controlled and reduced (see itinerary for more information).</p>
<p>6.5.h Grazing by domesticated animals is controlled to protect in-stream habitats and water quality, the species composition and viability of the riparian vegetation, and the banks of the stream channel from erosion.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>No grazing is permitted on State Forests. No grazing by domesticated animals was detected during site visits or reported during stakeholder interviews.</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>6.6.a No products on the FSC list of Highly Hazardous Pesticides are used (see FSC-POL-30-001 EN FSC Pesticides policy 2005 and associated documents).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Only arsenal (imazypyr) and oust (sulfometuron methyl) have been applied this year, which are both allowed.</p>
<p>6.6.b All toxicants used to control pests and competing vegetation, including rodenticides, insecticides, herbicides, and fungicides are used only when and where non-chemical management practices are: a) not available; b) prohibitively expensive, taking into account overall environmental and social costs, risks and benefits; c) the only effective means for controlling invasive and exotic species; or d) result in less environmental damage than non-chemical alternatives (e.g., top soil disturbance, loss of soil litter and down wood debris). If chemicals are used, the forest owner or manager uses the least environmentally damaging formulation and application method practical.</p> <p>Written strategies are developed and implemented that justify the use of chemical pesticides. Whenever feasible, an eventual phase-out of chemical use is included in the strategy. The written strategy shall include an analysis of options for, and the effects of, various chemical and non-chemical pest control strategies, with the goal of reducing or</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>See response to Minor CAR 2014.9.</p>

eliminating chemical use.		
<p>6.6.c Chemicals and application methods are selected to minimize risk to non-target species and sites. When considering the choice between aerial and ground application, the forest owner or manager evaluates the comparative risk to non-target species and sites, the comparative risk of worker exposure, and the overall amount and type of chemicals required.</p>	C	<p>On the Maryland shore, most planned chemical treatments are by helicopter. This officers a higher level of control than other aerial crafts. For example, on a planned treatment site visited (WR24 Johnson & Johnson), strips of high oak-density are planned to be excluded from the treatment.</p> <p>See SFMPs, which describe situation in which aerial application occurs and what precautions will be applied during application to protect sensitive sites and non-target species. Aerial applicators are highly trained, licensed, and enclosed in helicopters during applications.</p> <p>Staff apply glyphosate or imazypyr using the hack ‘n’ squirt method, which is among the most direct methods and lowest risk for worker exposure.</p> <p>See OBS 2015.4.</p>
<p>6.6.d Whenever chemicals are used, a written prescription is prepared that describes the site-specific hazards and environmental risks, and the precautions that workers will employ to avoid or minimize those hazards and risks, and includes a map of the treatment area.</p> <p>Chemicals are applied only by workers who have received proper training in application methods and safety. They are made aware of the risks, wear proper safety equipment, and are trained to minimize environmental impacts on non-target species and sites.</p>	C	<p>FME’s forestry contractor on the Maryland Shore, Parker Forestry, demonstrated written prescriptions for 2014-15 that meet this requirement, including maps of treatment areas that show site-specific hazards. The summary document (Chesapeake & Pocomoke Forests Herbicide Release 2014) includes some descriptions of management type (e.g. Delmarva fox squirrel area).</p> <p>See response to Minor CAR 2014.9.</p>
<p>6.6.e If chemicals are used, the effects are monitored and the results are used for adaptive management. Records are kept of pest occurrences, control measures, and incidences of worker exposure to chemicals.</p>	C	<p>Parker Forestry demonstrated records of planned and completed chemical treatments in its offices. One plan was completed since the last audit, an aerial spray completed in October 2014. It includes amount and type of chemical. No follow-up monitoring has been completed yet since a full-growing season has not occurred (i.e., sufficient time for arsenal to fully work).</p> <p>GPS data is taken by helicopter-applicators and provided to Parker Forestry, which shows spray lines (i.e., where), what</p>

		chemical was applied, and how much. Records of chemical use are maintained and are reported in the Section A of the FSC report. FME workers that suffer a chemical exposure incident must fill out incident reports.
6.7. Chemicals, containers, liquid and solid non-organic wastes including fuel and oil shall be disposed of in an environmentally appropriate manner at off-site locations.	NE	
6.8. Use of biological control agents shall be documented, minimized, monitored, and strictly controlled in accordance with national laws and internationally accepted scientific protocols. Use of genetically modified organisms shall be prohibited.	NE	
6.9. The use of exotic species shall be carefully controlled and actively monitored to avoid adverse ecological impacts.	C	
6.9.a 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.	C	No exotic species are used for commercial or management purposes in the Eastern region. In the Western Region, Norway Spruce and Red Pine exist in legacy plantations that are being managed on a trajectory for restoration of mixed native conifer and hardwood stands.
6.9.b If exotic species are used, their provenance and the location of their use are documented, and their ecological effects are actively monitored.	C	The Norway Spruce and Red Pine plantations were established several decades ago. No offsite regeneration is occurring and plans have been developed to restore these areas to semi-natural management.
6.9.c The forest owner or manager shall take timely action to curtail or significantly reduce any adverse impacts resulting from their use of exotic species	C	No adverse impacts have been detected from the exotic species mentioned in 6.9.a-b.
6.10. Forest conversion to plantations or non-forest land uses shall not occur, except in circumstances where conversion: a) Entails a very limited portion of the forest management unit; and b) Does not occur on High Conservation Value Forest areas; and c) Will enable clear, substantial, additional, secure, long-term conservation benefits across the forest management unit.	NE	
Principle #7: A management plan -- appropriate to the scale and intensity of the operations -- shall be written, implemented, and kept up to date. The long-term objectives of management, and the means of achieving them, shall be clearly stated.		
7.1. The management plan and supporting	C	The general structure of the FMP is based on each state

<p>documents shall provide:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>b. Description of silvicultural and/or other management system, based on the ecology of the forest in question and information gathered through resource inventories. d) Rationale for rate of annual harvest and species selection. e) Provisions for monitoring of forest growth and dynamics. f) Environmental safeguards based on environmental assessments. g) Plans for the identification and protection of rare, threatened and endangered species.</p> <p>b) h) Maps describing the forest resource base including protected areas, planned management activities and land ownership. i) Description and justification of harvesting techniques and equipment to be used.</p>		<p>forest with the structure and content of the documents being based on the same templates. Each state forest within the scope of the FSC certificate has an overarching Sustainable Forest Management Plan (SFMP) and Annual Work Plans (AWP) prepared for management activities to occur in the upcoming fiscal year. Summaries of the AWP's are also prepared.</p> <p>Chesapeake and Pocomoke State Forests additionally have individual summaries for their SFMPs and other supporting documentation available online as they have been certified for longer periods of time.</p> <p>MD DNR also maintains a Policy Handbook and procedures for implementing certain components of the FMP.</p>
<p>7.1.a The management plan identifies the ownership and legal status of the FMU and its resources, including rights held by the owner and rights held by others.</p>	C	<p>Each SFMP includes a section on the history of the state forest, along with an ownership history. Allowable public uses are described in the Chapter 9 of each SFMP. Each FMP contains tables and figures on land use within and surrounding state forests.</p>
<p>7.1.b The management plan describes the history of land use and past management, current forest types and associated development, size class and/or successional stages, and natural disturbance regimes that affect the FMU (see Indicator 6.1.a).</p>	C	<p>Each SFMP includes a section on the history of the state forestlands. Chapters 2, 3 and 4 of each SFMP include a description of the current forest resource and guidelines on management based on natural disturbance regimes. Certain appendices may also cover special disturbance regimes, such as fire.</p> <p>The AWP includes a brief description of past land uses and management as an introduction for the basis of the planned management activities for the fiscal year.</p>
<p>7.1.c The management plan describes:</p> <p>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	<p>Chapters 2-8 of each SFMP (Resource Assessment, Resource Characterization, Land Management Area Guidelines, Forest Management, Water Quality, Ecologically Significant Areas, and Wildlife Habitat). Objectives are stated in various chapters; however, Chapter 5 includes management objectives of forest management/ silviculture.</p>

		The AWP includes a description of the current conditions of resources and what will be done in the fiscal year to accomplish desired future conditions based on a given state forest’s ecology or past management.
7.1.d The management plan includes a description of the landscape within which the FMU is located and describes how landscape-scale habitat elements described in Criterion 6.3 will be addressed.	C	See Chapters 2-8 of each SFMP (Resource Assessment, Resource Characterization, Land Management Area Guidelines, Forest Management, Water Quality, Ecologically Significant Areas, and Wildlife Habitat). The AWP provides a description in the summary. While a non-conformance is found in section 6.3.g.1 that is associated with management activities, it should be noted that the required information is found in each SFMP and AWP including in this case a description of retention.
7.1.e The management plan includes a description of the following resources and outlines activities to conserve and/or protect: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • rare, threatened, or endangered species and natural communities (see Criterion 6.2); • plant species and community diversity and wildlife habitats (see Criterion 6.3); • water resources (see Criterion 6.5); • soil resources (see Criterion 6.3); • Representative Sample Areas (see Criterion 6.4); • High Conservation Value Forests (see Principle 9); • Other special management areas. 	C	Chapters 2-8 of each SFMP (Resource Assessment, Resource Characterization, Land Management Area Guidelines, Forest Management, Water Quality, Ecologically Significant Areas, and Wildlife Habitat). The AWP includes descriptions of activities planned to protect or enhance RTE species, plant communities (e.g., Atlantic white-cedar swamps), wildlife, water and soil resources (e.g., soil series appendix), RSAs, and HCVs. Other management areas are described depending on each state forest’s resources (e.g., ORV trails).
7.1.f If invasive species are present, the management plan describes invasive species conditions, applicable management objectives, and how they will be controlled (see Indicator 6.3.j).	C	Chapters 3 and 5 of each SFMP include a section on invasive species based on FSC-US guidelines.
7.1.g The management plan describes insects and diseases, current or anticipated outbreaks on forest conditions and management goals, and how insects and diseases will be managed (see Criteria 6.6 and 6.8).	C	Each SFMP treats insects and diseases in its Resource Assessment and Characterizations (Chapters 2 and 3), but mostly throughout the SFMPs and especially when dealing with fire.
7.1.h If chemicals are used, the plan describes what is being used, applications, and how the management system conforms with Criterion 6.6.	C	Herbicide use is described in Chapters 5, 6, 7 and 10 of the SFMP. Each of these Chapters describes basic use and restrictions near sensitive sites. Some SFMPs and AWPs describe some of the chemicals to

		<p>be used (GRSF MP page 202 ‘...Ailanthus trees will be treated using basal bark applications of Garlon 4 20% or cut treatment of Vanquish (50%)...’ and GRSF AWP page 39 ‘...Japanese barberry will be foliar sprayed with Garlon 3-A...’). The former prescription is specific to Kirk Orchard and the latter is specific to stands located within Shale Barren Communities; however, other chemical prescriptions are not specific as required by this section of the standard.</p> <p>CF-PSF AWP (page 60) includes a prescription for chemical use and does not include all details required by this section of the standard. This FME has a nonconformance to some indicators of C6.6 its chemical use strategy may change as a result of the nonconformance, which may require an update to sections of the management plan.</p> <p>See response to OBS 2014.10.</p>
<p>7.1.i If biological controls are used, the management plan describes what is being used, applications, and how the management system conforms with Criterion 6.8.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Biological control is maintained as an option in Chapter 10 of each SFMP. Other State and Federal agencies are in charge of biological control on MD DNR-managed lands. See C6.8 for more details.</p>
<p>7.1.j The management plan incorporates the results of the evaluation of social impacts, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • traditional cultural resources and rights of use (see Criterion 2.1); • potential conflicts with customary uses and use rights (see Criteria 2.2, 2.3, 3.2); • management of ceremonial, archeological, and historic sites (see Criteria 3.3 and 4.5); • management of aesthetic values (see Indicator 4.4.a); • public access to and use of the forest, and other recreation issues; • local and regional socioeconomic conditions and economic opportunities, including creation and/or maintenance of quality jobs (see Indicators 4.1.b and 4.4.a), local purchasing opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.e), and participation in local development opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.g). 	<p>C</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sections of Chapter 2 of western MD SFMPs and Chapter 9 of CFL SFMP include descriptions of traditional cultural resources and rights of use. • Sections of Chapter 11 of each western MD SFMP and Chapters 1, 9 and 10 of CFL SFMP describe potential conflicts. • Each of the 5 management plans include text from state code that requires protection of these special sites. Chapter 2 of each SFMP describes sites and GIS data points have been established. Sections of Chapter 11 include a description of the process and time table for consultation and review by representatives of tribal groups. Individual AWP also include details associated with aesthetics (Kirk Orchard). During the 2014 audit, the protection of special sites (Old homesteads and fenced Walker Cemetery and the North Craft Cemetery) were observed. The fencing had been replaced about 5 years ago. Maps of cemeteries and other special sites were presented and reviewed for 1 State Forest on the eastern shore and 1 State Forest located in western MD.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aesthetic values are introduced in Chapter 1 and described in Chapter 5 within some of descriptions of forest management activities (e.g. forest buffer thinning, regeneration harvest) and in the some of the AWP's (Kirk Orchard). • Chapter 9 and sections of Chapter 10 of each SFMP includes public access, use and education <p>Local and regional economic condition and opportunity are introduced in Chapter 1 and described in sections of chapters 2, 3, 4, 5, 8 and 9 of each SFMP. Chapter 1 of each SFMP includes the following text: <i>"The primary goal of the Green Ridge State Forest Sustainable Management Plan is to demonstrate that an environmentally sound, sustainably managed forest can contribute to local and regional economies..."</i> A recent study cited in each SFMP also addresses some of this indicator: see Comprehensive Strategy for Reducing Maryland's Vulnerability to Climate Change, Phase II: Building societal, economic, and ecological resilience (Jan 2011) http://www.dnr.state.md.us/climatechange/climatechange_phase2_adaptation_strategy.pdf</p> <p>The AWP's summary includes a description of maintenance and protections needs for archeological and historic sites.</p> <p>The AWP includes descriptions of special projects, their costs, and intended benefits. Many special projects are for ecological restoration, public education, road/ trail upgrades for management and recreation.</p>
<p>7.1.k The management plan describes the general purpose, condition and maintenance needs of the transportation network (see Indicator 6.5.e).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Chapters 5, 6 and 9 of the SFMP cover this topic. The AWP's summary includes a description of road conditions and planned maintenance activities based on said conditions.</p>
<p>7.1.l The management plan describes the silvicultural and other management systems used and how they will sustain, over the long term, forest ecosystems present on the FMU.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Chapter 5 of the SFMP discusses silvicultural systems based on the resource assessment. Other management systems, such as those used to control access or maintain protected areas, are dealt with in other chapters.</p> <p>See response to OBS 2014.10.</p>
<p>7.1.m The management plan describes how species selection and harvest rate calculations were developed to meet the requirements of Criterion 5.6.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Chapter 5 of the SFMP discusses forest inventory and how harvest rates are determined. Tables and figures of inventory and projected harvests are included SFMP.</p>
<p>7.1.n The management plan includes a description</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Certain monitoring is covered throughout the SFMP, but</p>

of monitoring procedures necessary to address the requirements of Criterion 8.2.		Chapters 5 and 10 deal specifically with the subject of monitoring.
7.1.o The management plan includes maps describing the 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.	C	MD DNR maintains maps on GIS and many maps are available online to the public that address this indicator. Detailed maps are available in the SFMP and AWP for each state forest.
7.1.p The management plan describes and justifies the types and sizes of harvesting machinery and techniques employed on the FMU to minimize or limit impacts to the resource.	C	See response to Minor CAR 2014.11.
7.1.q Plans for harvesting and other significant site-disturbing management activities required to carry out the management plan are prepared prior to implementation. Plans clearly describe the activity, the relationship to objectives, outcomes, any necessary environmental safeguards, health and safety measures, and include maps of adequate detail.	C	AWP's summary includes goals for the upcoming fiscal year's management activities. AWP includes a description of proposed management activities, such as silvicultural prescriptions. The prescriptions include an analysis of resources that could be impacted and how to reduce/mitigate those risks, as well as objectives and desired outcomes. Pre-sale conferences are held in which a checklist is filled out by loggers and MD DNR staff to review the sale prior to operations. Sediment and erosion control permits may also be required prior to plan implementation and are considered a part of the site-plan. See response to Minor CAR 2014.11.
7.1.r The management plan describes the stakeholder consultation process.	C	The SFMP describes the role of the Citizens Advisory Committee for each state forest in the development of the plan (Appendix A). The SFMP also includes a flow chart on how AWP's are developed, including when stakeholder consultation and review occurs. The AWP's summary includes a description of how MD DNR Forestry Division works with other agencies and local colleges/universities. Citizen Advisory Committee and public comments are included at the end of each AWP.
7.2 The management plan shall be periodically revised to incorporate the results of monitoring or new scientific and technical information, as well as to respond to changing environmental, social and economic circumstances.	C	
7.2.a The management plan is kept up to date. It is	C	See OBS 2015.5 .

<p>reviewed on an ongoing basis and is updated whenever necessary to incorporate the results of monitoring or new scientific and technical information, as well as to respond to changing environmental, social and economic circumstances. At a minimum, a full revision occurs every 10 years.</p>		
<p>7.3 Forest workers shall receive adequate training and supervision to ensure proper implementation of the management plans.</p>	NE	
<p>7.4 While respecting the confidentiality of information, forest managers shall make publicly available a summary of the primary elements of the management plan, including those listed in Criterion 7.1.</p>	C	
<p>7.4.a While respecting landowner confidentiality, the management plan or a management plan summary that outlines the elements of the plan described in Criterion 7.1 is available to the public either at no charge or a nominal fee.</p>	C	<p>The entire management plan is available freely to the public at http://www.dnr.state.md.us/forests/mdforests.asp.</p>
<p>7.4.b Managers of public forests make draft management plans, revisions and supporting documentation easily accessible for public review and comment prior to their implementation. Managers address public comments and modify the plans to ensure compliance with this Standard.</p>	C	<p>All draft AWP's are available for comment at http://www.dnr.state.md.us/forests/workplans/index.asp. When SFMP's are up for revision, these also are made available publicly through the website and submitted to the Citizen Advisory Committee for review. Once draft plans undergo complete public review, the revised plan becomes the final plan presented on the website. See response to OBS 2014.12.</p>
<p>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.</p>		
<p>8.1 The frequency and intensity of monitoring should be determined by the scale and intensity of forest management operations, as well as, the relative complexity and fragility of the affected environment. Monitoring procedures should be consistent and replicable over time to allow comparison of results and assessment of change.</p>	NE	
<p>8.2. Forest management should include the research and data collection needed to monitor, at a minimum, the following indicators: a) yield of all forest products harvested, b) growth rates,</p>	C	

<p>regeneration, and condition of the forest, c) composition and observed changes in the flora and fauna, d) environmental and social impacts of harvesting and other operations, and e) cost, productivity, and efficiency of forest management.</p>		
<p>8.2.a.1 For all commercially harvested products, an inventory system is maintained. The inventory system includes at a minimum: a) species, b) volumes, c) stocking, d) regeneration, and e) stand and forest composition and structure; and f) timber quality.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Chesapeake Forest / Pocomoke State Forest Collected forest wide CFI data. Regeneration inspections and seedling counts on past harvest sites.</p> <p>Green Ridge State Forest Forest wide stand inventory project continued this past year. Data collection on approximately 9000 acres was completed.</p> <p>Potomac Garrett State Forest Completed 20% of the 5-year, forest-wide forest inventory as planned.</p> <p>Savage River State Forest On going forest inventory</p> <p>FME maintains an inventory system that covers the topics of this indicator. See 5.6.a for a description. Volume can be estimated from area control through use of site index ranges. The inventory system for the Eastern Region is about to be updated. The Western Region is four years into a five-year project to update its inventory system.</p> <p>SILVAH inventory is used for MD DNR acreage - even those that have been reserved from active timber management (e.g. ESA's or HCVF's). As described in each State Forest management plan, sample points for sensitive resources are selected through the use of random sampling or stratified random sampling. Cluster sampling is occasionally used for rare plants and monitoring may be ongoing or of limited duration. Broader monitoring efforts are part of the program as well. Standard methods available in federal or state manuals or published peer-reviewed research are used to collect data for the following resources: water quality indicators including for example stream nutrient export, wetland condition, fish and aquatic macro invertebrate assemblages; forest stand condition indicators including for example vegetative structure and composition including (a) species; (b) volumes; ((c) stocking; (d) regeneration; (e) stand composition and structure and (f) timber quality, invasive species, natural plant communities, insect and disease impacts, fuel loading and stand density;</p>

		<p>rare, threatened and endangered species presence, diversity and abundance; and presence of invasive species that threaten the survival of rare, threatened or endangered species; natural community diversity metrics; and other indicators of ecosystem recovery and function.</p> <p>As confirmed through interviews with field foresters, regeneration surveys are conducted following regeneration treatments within one or two years for loblolly in the eastern region and after 3-5 years for hardwood stands in the western region. If regeneration surveys conclude that regeneration levels are not sufficient, planting or other measures are discussed. CFI summary and the stand data collection program (SILVAH protocol) are detailed in SFMP Chapter 12. The inventory and monitoring programs are linked to a GIS-based data management system.</p>
<p>8.2.a.2 Significant, unanticipated removal or loss or increased vulnerability of forest resources is monitored and recorded. Recorded information shall include date and location of occurrence, description of disturbance, extent and severity of loss, and may be both quantitative and qualitative.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>CFI summary and current stand data collection program (SILVAH OAK protocol in the western region) provides monitoring and records as confirmed through review of SFMP Chapter 12 and interviews. For example the 160-acre gypsy moth mortality (SR-01-11) was first documented in 2009 including a salvage prescription. Records are linked to the GIS-based data management system and include dates and locations, description of the gypsy moth and ice storm incident, acreage and percent mortality estimates including maps of the area. In another example > 400 acres of GRSF received overstory mortality that approaches 100% as a result of a Memorial Day 2011 hail storm. The affected areas are mapped. Records include required details.</p> <p>In the Western Region, the winter storms of 2011 led to much loss. Some of the affected areas were salvaged. FME detected the losses after post-storm monitoring.</p> <p>No significant timber theft was reported by MD DNR staff or stakeholders for the Eastern Region in 2015.</p>
<p>8.2.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>Chesapeake Forest / Pocomoke State Forest 49,710 tons Green Ridge State Forest 239,430 bf hardwood sawtimber, 28,180bf hard pine sawtimber, 577cds hardwood pulp, 24 cds hard pine pulp. Potomac Garrett State Forest FY-15 AWP contracts have</p>

		<p>sold 492,401 Bd. Ft. of timber. (AWP called for 552,000 Bd. Ft., difference lost to field delineated buffer and protective areas.)</p> <p>Savage River State Forest 353,427 Bd.Ft.</p> <p>Ledgers, annual timber summaries and compartment files that relate to harvested timber are maintained in the state office. MD DNR maintains records of harvested timber on GIS and a timber sale contract database (area, acres, volumes, income tracking). These records are used to compare projected harvest to actual harvest.</p>
<p>8.2.c The forest owner or manager periodically obtains data needed to monitor presence on the FMU of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Rare, threatened and endangered species and/or their <i>habitats</i>; 2) Common and rare plant communities and/or habitat; 3) Location, presence and abundance of invasive species; 4) Condition of protected areas, set-asides and buffer zones; 5) High Conservation Value Forests (see Criterion 9.4). 	<p>C</p>	<p>See also 8.2.a.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) RTE data and monitoring is accomplished through the ID team process and an established relationship with the MD Natural Heritage Program as confirmed through interviews with Natural Heritage Program staff. 2) Common and rare plant communities and habitats are monitored through the use of SILVAH OAK inventory system. In addition, the Wildlife and Heritage Service, and Fresh Water Fisheries gather information on plant and animal populations. 3) The recently developed Early Detection and Rapid Response Plan, associated monitoring protocol and 2 associated recent research projects are led by DNR’s Heritage program to monitor invasive species. SILVAH OAK inventory system also includes documentation of the presence of invasive plants. In addition, it is clear from site observations and staff interviews that the DNR staff is well-trained and knowledgeable about this issue. 4) Zones including protected HCVF, buffer zones, Wildlands, RSAs and Old Growth are monitored through stand level inventory (SILVAH OAK protocol). <p>Chesapeake Forest / Pocomoke State Forest RTE species surveys have been conducted in ESAs with management being implemented. Management includes cutting of loblolly pine or Rx Fire for habitat improvement. Additional to RTE species surveys having been done by the Regional Ecologist. The Invertebrate Ecologist and State Zoologist have conducted surveys for various listed Invertebrate</p>

		<p>Species. FME’s Community Ecologist has also conducted inventory work toward a classification of Non-Riverine Atlantic White Cedar Forests and Pond Pine Forests.</p> <p>Green Ridge State Forest Woodcock singing ground survey, annual wood turtle survey and herp surveys, wild turkey poult production survey, ber den reproduction surveys, bear bait survey, shale barren plant community survey,.</p> <p>Potomac Garrett State Forest A) Completed 20% of the 5Yr, forest wide forest inventory as planned. B) Completed NNIS assessment/inventory in High Priority Watersheds, per 6.9-3 above.</p> <p>Savage River State Forest DNR Wildlife & Heritage Service monitored for black bear and golden eagles.</p>
<p>8.2.d.1 Monitoring is conducted to ensure that site specific plans and operations are properly implemented, environmental impacts of site disturbing operations are minimized, and that harvest prescriptions and guidelines are effective.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Chesapeake Forest / Pocomoke State Forest Bi-weekly logging inspections & seedling survival/regeneration counts. Trail counters have been installed on recreational trails.</p> <p>In the eastern region, Parker Forestry completes inspection forms on Chesapeake Forest Project and MD DNR foresters also inspect tracts and fill out reports. Pocomoke State Forest inspections are completed solely by DNR forestry staff. In the western region, MD DNR field foresters conduct post-harvest monitoring and complete Timber Sale Inspection Reports that were presented and reviewed for each of the sites visited during this audit program. This FME also instituted an internal silvicultural audit system to examine the environmental and management impacts of silvicultural activities. This monitoring system was recently been expanded to include a post-harvest review by the ID team.</p> <p>Logging contractors reported that MD DNR staff conduct site visits at least once per week during active harvests. Timber Sale Inspection forms are maintained for these visits. This form is used for the final inspections.</p>
<p>8.2.d.2 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</p>

		<p>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>A bill was introduced in the current session of the Maryland Legislature that annually adds funds into State Forest roads maintenance projects. The road inventory portion of this process has been completed as confirmed through interviews and review of the prioritization list of road inventory improvement projects. MD DNR also instituted an internal monitoring system to examine the environmental and management impacts of silvicultural activities. This monitoring system was recently been expanded to include a post-harvest review by the ID team as described elsewhere in this report.</p>
<p>8.2.d.3 The landowner or manager monitors relevant socio-economic issues (see Indicator 4.4.a), including the social impacts of harvesting, participation in local economic opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.g), the creation and/or maintenance of quality job opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.b), and local purchasing opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.e).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Potomac Garrett State Forest Visitor use / car counts conducted monthly to monitor trends in general visitor use over time.</p> <p>Savage River State Forest In conjunction with Garrett Trails that the FME examined the impact of bike trails on the forest.</p> <p>See response to Minor CAR 2014.13.</p>
<p>8.2.d.4 Stakeholder responses to management activities are monitored and recorded as necessary.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>MD DNR maintains a complaint log in field offices. Records were examined for the Eastern shore state forests.</p> <p>Each forest manager responds to inquiries and complaints with direct communications. When these cannot be resolved locally the issue is occasionally referred to the Annapolis office. The main mechanism for soliciting comments is response to each posted State Forest Management Plans and Annual Work Plan that details the proposed activities for the upcoming year.</p>
<p>8.2.d.5 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 FME lands. However, FME offered this opportunity to Tribes participating in the CAC. In addition, FME is cooperating with the MD Commission of Indian Affairs.</p>
<p>8.2.e The forest owner or manager monitors the costs and revenues of management in order to assess productivity and efficiency.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Chesapeake Forest / Pocomoke State Forest Bi-weekly meetings between the Forest Manager and the Contract Management. Individual harvests are reviewed along with</p>

		<p>productivity per site. Quarterly reports are also provided to the Forest Manager, which include volume and income.</p> <p>Savage River State Forest As a result of a study of its harvesting levels, FME has implemented an accelerated harvest plan for approved harvests. Also, it has been part of a planned reorganization that the administration of both Savage River Potomac Garrett State Forests would be combined for agency efficiencies. As a result of retirement announcements, the Savage River State Forest silvicultural management has been combined with that of Potomac Garrett State Forest, both in Garrett County.</p> <p>Cost and revenue is monitored as part of the Annual Work Plan process. The current Annual Work Plan contains 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>8.3 Documentation shall be provided by the forest manager to enable monitoring and certifying organizations to trace each forest product from its origin, a process known as the "chain of custody."</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>8.3.a When forest products are being sold as FSC-certified, the forest owner or manager has a system that prevents mixing of FSC-certified and non-certified forest products prior to the point of sale, with accompanying documentation to enable the tracing of the harvested material from each harvested product from its origin to the point of sale.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>See COC indicators for FMEs.</p>
<p>8.3.b The forest owner or manager maintains documentation to enable the tracing of the harvested material from each harvested product from its origin to the point of sale.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>See COC indicators for FMEs.</p>
<p>8.4 The results of monitoring shall be incorporated into the implementation and revision of the management plan.</p>	<p>NE</p>	
<p>8.5 While respecting the confidentiality of information, forest managers shall make publicly available a summary of the results of monitoring</p>	<p>NE</p>	

indicators, including those listed in Criterion 8.2.		
<p>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.</p> <p>High Conservation Value Forests are those that possess one or more of the following attributes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Forest areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant: concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g., endemism, endangered species, refugia); and/or large landscape level forests, contained within, or containing the management unit, where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance b) Forest areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems c) Forest areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g., watershed protection, erosion control) d) Forest areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g., subsistence, health) and/or critical to local communities’ traditional cultural identity (areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in cooperation with such local communities). 		
<p>9.1 Assessment to determine the presence of the attributes consistent with High Conservation Value Forests will be completed, appropriate to scale and intensity of forest management.</p>	NE	
<p>9.2 The consultative portion of the certification process must place emphasis on the identified conservation attributes, and options for the maintenance thereof.</p>	NE	
<p>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.</p>	NE	
<p>9.4 Annual monitoring shall be conducted to assess the effectiveness of the measures employed to maintain or enhance the applicable conservation attributes.</p>	C	
<p>9.4.a The forest owner or manager monitors, or participates in a program to annually monitor, the status of the specific HCV attributes, including the effectiveness of the measures employed for their maintenance or enhancement. The monitoring program is designed and implemented consistent with the requirements of Principle 8.</p>	C	<p>Chesapeake Forest / Pocomoke State Forest Monitoring of ESA restoration projects by Heritage. Cooperation with the USFWS on the delisting of the Delmarva Fox squirrel based on current habitat conditions from management activities. A summary table of annual HCVF activities.</p> <p>Potomac Garrett State Forest NNIS inventory in the HCVF / High Priority Watershed per 6.9-3 above. Data to be analyzed.</p>
<p>9.4.b When monitoring results indicate increasing</p>	C	<p>Monitoring activities have not indicated any increasing risks</p>

<p>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.</p>		<p>to specific HCV attributes, per interviews with staff. However, it is know that if certain activities are not implemented that HCVs may be temporarily lost in Delmarva Bays (see OBS 2015.2).</p>
<p>APPENDICES</p>		
<p>APPENDIX C: REGIONAL LIMITS AND OTHER GUIDELINES ON OPENING SIZES</p>		
<p>Indicator 6.3.g.1</p>		
<p>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</p>		
<p>APPALACHIA REGION</p>		
<p>6.3.g.1.a 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>Guidance: <i>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>C</p>	<p>See response to Minor CAR 2014.7.</p>
<p>6.3.g.1.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>Applicability note: <i>Uneven age silvicultural techniques are used when they maintain or enhance the overall species richness and biologic diversity, regenerate-shade tolerant or</i></p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Where uneven-aged management is in use, canopy openings are less than 2.5 acres in size. A very small amount of the Western Region is under this type of management.</p>

<p><i>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>SOUTHEAST REGION</p>		
<p>6.3.g.1.a Primary and natural forests: clear-cutting is not allowed. Harvesting is not allowed at all in primary forests.</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 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</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Within the eastern shore State Forests (Southeast Region) even-aged silviculture including final stage of shelterwood (overstory removal) are restricted to previously established pine plantations that are being managed as natural stands and openings that are less than 40 acres in size (except in the case of restoration plans developed by in cooperation with the MD DNR Natural Heritage and which is based on best available science).</p> <p>See also audit itinerary.</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 MD DNR 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., Indian Town Delmarva Bay Restoration Project). In these cases, wetland hydrology is often restored and pines are removed with the intent of restoring natural plant communities.</p> <p>As confirmed through interviews with biologists, MD DNR Heritage staff and plan review the completed Indian Town Delmarva Bay Restoration Project that has involved several smaller clearcuts (~30-40 acres) that effectively become a single large opening over what was once a Delmarva Bay Ecosystem.</p>

<p>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>		
--	--	--

APPENDIX E: STREAMSIDE MANAGEMENT ZONE (SMZ) REGIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Indicator 6.5.e

This Appendix addresses regionally explicit requirements for Indicator 6.5.e and includes SMZ widths and activity limits within those SMZs for the Appalachia, Ozark-Ouachita, Southeast, Mississippi Alluvial Valley, Southwest, Rocky Mountain, and Pacific Coast regions. The forest owner or manager will be evaluated based on the sub-indicators within their specific region, below.

APPALACHIA REGION

The SMZ is designed to allow harvesting and provide flexibility for silvicultural management.

<p>6.5.e.1.a All perennial streams have buffers (streamside management zones, SMZs) that include an inner SMZ and an outer SMZ. SMZ sizes are minimum widths that are likely to provide adequate riparian habitat and prevent siltation. If functional riparian habitat and minimal siltation are not achieved by SMZs of these dimensions, wider SMZs are needed.</p>	C	See response to Minor CAR 2014.8.
--	---	-----------------------------------

Table 6.5.f (APP only) Widths of inner and outer Streamside Management Zones. Widths of outer SMZs are applicable where data do not support narrower widths*

Stream Zone Type	SLOPE CATAGORY				
	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41%+
Inner Zone (Perennial)	25'	25'	25'	25'	25'

Outer Zone (Perennial)	55'	75'	105'	110'	140'
Total For Perennial	80'	100'	130'	135'	165'
Zone For Intermittent	40'	50'	60'	70'	80'
*All distances are in feet -slope distance and are measured from the high water mark.					
6.5.e.1.b (APP only) The inner SMZ for <i>non-high-quality waters</i> (see state or local listings describing the highest quality waters in the state or region) extends 25 feet from the high water mark. Single-tree selection or small group selection (2-5 trees) is allowed in the inner SMZ, provided that the integrity of the stream bank is maintained and canopy reduction does not exceed 10 percent (90 percent canopy maintenance). Trees are directionally felled away from streams. Note: The inner SMZ is designed as a virtual no-harvest zone, while allowing the removal of selected high-value trees.	C	See response to Minor CAR 2014.8.			
6.5.e.1.c (APP only) Along perennial streams that are designated as <i>high-quality waters</i> (see state or local listings describing the highest quality waters in the state or region), no harvesting is allowed in the inner SMZ (25 feet from the high water mark), except for the removal of wind-thrown trees. Stream restoration is allowed if a written restoration plan provides a rational justification and if the plan follows local and regional restoration plans.	C	See response to Minor CAR 2014.8.			
6.5.e.1.d (APP only) Outer SMZs, outside and in addition to inner SMZs, are established for all intermittent, and perennial streams, as well as other waters. When the necessary information is available, the width of a stream management zone is based on the landform, erodibility of the soil, stability of the slope, and stability of the stream channel as necessary to protect water quality and repair habitat. When such specific information is not available, the width of streamside management zone is calculated according to Table 6.5.f	C	See response to Minor CAR 2014.8.			
6.5.e.1.e (APP only) Harvesting in outer SMZs is limited to single-tree and group selection, while	C	See response to Minor CAR 2014.8.			

<p>maintaining at least 50 percent of the overstory. Roads, skid trails, landings, and other similar silviculturally disturbed areas are constructed outside of the outer SMZ, except for designated stream crossings or when placement of disturbance-prone activities outside of the SMZ would result in more environmental disturbance than placing such activities within the SMZ. Exceptions may be made for stream restoration.</p>		
<p>6.5.e.1.f (APP only) The entire SMZ of intermittent streams is managed as an outer buffer zone.</p>	C	See response to Minor CAR 2014.8.
<p>6.5.e.1.g (APP only) The activities of forest management do not result in observable siltation of intermittent streams. The activities of forest management do not result in observable siltation of intermittent streams.</p>	C	See response to Minor CAR 2014.8.
<p>SOUTHEAST REGION</p>		
<p>6.5.e.1 (SE only) Streamside or special management zones (SMZs) are specifically described and/or referenced in the management plan, included in a map of the forest management area, and designed to protect and/or restore water quality and aquatic and riparian populations and their habitats (including river and stream corridors, steep slopes, fragile soils, wetlands, vernal pools, seeps and springs, lake and pond shorelines, and other hydrologically sensitive areas). At a minimum, management of SMZs has the following characteristics: Management meets or exceeds state BMPs. SMZ width reflects changes in forest condition, stream width, slope, erodibility of soil, and potential hazard from windthrow along the length of the watercourse. SMZs provide sufficient vegetation and canopy cover to filter sediment, limit nutrient inputs and chemical pollution, moderate fluctuations in water temperature, stabilize stream banks, and provide</p>	C	<p>FME follows its BMP guidelines for water courses in the Eastern Region. Buffer widths and management practices are the same as for the Western Region, so retention is typically at a level that meets or exceeds the suggestions of this indicator. See http://www.dnr.state.md.us/forests/landplanning/bmp.html for further details.</p>

habitat for riparian and aquatic flora and fauna.		
Characteristic diameter-class distributions, species composition, and structures are adequately maintained within the SMZs.		

Appendix 6 – Chain of Custody Indicators for FMEs

REQUIREMENT	C/NC	COMMENT/CAR
1. Quality Management		
1.1 The organization shall appoint a management representative as having overall responsibility and authority for the organization’s compliance with all applicable requirements of this standard.	C	As confirmed through review of COC procedures, interviews with Jack Perdue and field staff, Jack Perdue has been appointed as the Chain of Custody Administrator with responsibility and authority for this FME’s conformance with the requirements of this standard.
1.2 The FME shall maintain complete records of all FSC-related COC activities, including sales and training, for at least 5 years.	C	FME’s sale records were presented and reviewed and are complete for at least the past 5 years. Special attention was given to 2014-15 sales, which are tracked using spreadsheets. COC procedures and training records have been created, maintained and presented.

<p>1.3 The FME shall define its forest gate(s) (check all that apply): <i>The forest gate is defined as the point where the change in ownership of the certified-forest product occurs.</i></p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Stump <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Stumpage sale or sales of standing timber; transfer of ownership of certified-forest product occurs upon harvest.</i></p> <p>On-site concentration yard <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Transfer of ownership of certified-product occurs at concentration yard under control of FME.</i></p> <p>Off-site Mill/Log Yard <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Transfer of ownership occurs when certified-product is unloaded at purchaser's facility.</i></p> <p>Auction house/ Brokerage <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Transfer of ownership occurs at a government-run or private auction house/ brokerage.</i></p> <p>Lump-sum sale/ Per Unit/ Pre-Paid Agreement <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>A timber sale in which the buyer and seller agree on a total price for marked standing trees or for trees within a defined area before the wood is removed — the timber is usually paid for before harvesting begins. Similar to a per-unit sale.</i></p> <p>Log landing <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Transfer of ownership of certified-product occurs at landing/yarding areas.</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other (Please describe):</p>
<p>1.4 The FME shall have sufficient control over its forest gate(s) to ensure that there is no risk of mixing of FSC-certified forest products covered by the scope of the FM/COC certificate with forest products from outside of the scope prior to the transfer of ownership.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>FME sells certified materials as stumpage and lump sum, pre-paid agreements from western MD State Forests In western MD volume is paid for before the trees are harvested with no risk of mixing certified products with non-certified products.</p> <p>FME sells certified materials as gate-wood (in essence stumpage sales; the contract for gate-wood specifies that the sale is at the stump) and stumpage and lump sum, pre-paid agreements from eastern shore State Forests. There is no risk of mixing of FSC-certified forest products with non-certified forest products (gate-wood sales) because deliveries include specific trip ticket delivery documents that are associated with each product sale area.</p> <p>Other lands owned and managed by this FME are not certified; however, those lands are geographically distinct from certified land as confirmed through interviews and review of the maps of the other properties and rarely include timber harvest activities.</p>

<p>1.5 The FME and its contractors shall not process FSC-certified material prior to transfer of ownership at the forest gate without conforming to applicable chain of custody requirements. <i>NOTE: This does not apply to log cutting or de-barking units, small portable sawmills or on-site processing of chips/biomass originating from the FMU under evaluation.</i></p>	<p>C</p>	<p>No processing occurs prior to transfer of ownership. FME sells certified materials as stumpage and lump sum, pre-paid agreements and gate-wood. The gate-wood sales include tree cutting and log hauling and are in conformance to the COC requirements.</p>
<p>2. Product Control, Sales and Delivery</p>		
<p>2.1. Products from the certified forest area shall be identifiable as certified at the forest gate(s).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>A variety of contracts were presented and reviewed. These documents include the identification of these products as certified (FSC 100%).</p>
<p>2.2 The FME shall maintain records of quantities/volumes of FSC-certified product(s).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>A variety of timber sale contracts, trip tickets, wood settlement sheets and a timber harvest summary spreadsheet (2004 to 2014) were presented and reviewed and include the volume of products sold. Records are maintained by the FME and by Parker Forestry on the Maryland shore state forests. Records were demonstrated at Parker Forestry.</p>

<p>2.3. The FME shall ensure that all sales documents issued for outputs sold with FSC claims include the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) name and contact details of the organization; b) name and address of the customer; c) date when the document was issued; d) description of the product; e) quantity of the products sold; f) the organization’s FSC Forest Management (FM/COC) or FSC Controlled Wood (CW/FM) code; g) clear indication of the FSC claim for each product item or the total products as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the claim “FSC 100%” for products from FSC 100% product groups; ii. the claim “FSC Controlled Wood” for products from FSC Controlled Wood product groups. h) If separate transport documents are issued, information sufficient to link the sales document and related transport documentation to each other. 	<p>C</p>	<p>Contracts were checked for all timber harvest sites visited, and include all information of this indicator (see Audit Itinerary) even when the purchaser does not maintain COC. Since most sales are lump-sum (i.e., ownership transferred before harvest), no load tickets would be issued with the FME’s information for those types of sales. Contracts contain COC information in item 22.</p> <p>Contracts are created on the basis of an existing template that includes each of the required items a-g. Specifically, this FME’s FSC Forest Management (FM/COC) code and a clear indication of the FSC claim (FSC 100%) are included in this template and recent contracts.</p> <p>Separate transport documents (item h) are used in Eastern shore State Forest contracts for gate-wood only and include sale name to link the trip ticket to the sale document (timber sale contract). Parker Forestry maintains a spreadsheet of all timber sales, including contract numbers. Trip ticket books are assigned to specific contractors and may be used on multiple tracts. Harvest contractors report used tickets to Parker Forestry, the numbers of which are entered into the spreadsheet and tied to each timber sale. Trip tickets contain reference to the specific sale contract and the information a)-d), f) and g). Quantity is obtained at the scale (e), which is then printed off and provided to FME by purchaser. This print off is traceable to the load ticket via the ticket’s number. Harvest contractors also provide a weekly report of loads delivered by load ticket, which is then compared to the spreadsheet.</p> <p>Gate-wood load tickets and wood settlement sheets associated with contracts were checked for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P01 Sturges Tract 1, Stand 15 (Contract P-23-13): 0309001, 0309201, and 03093-01. • P04 Dividing Greek, Tract 13, Stand 3 (Contract P-2-15): 03556-01, 03564-1, and 03571-01.
<p>2.4 The FME shall include the same information as required in 2.3 in the related delivery documentation, if the sales document (or copy of it) is not included with the shipment of the product.</p> <p>Note: 2.3 and 2.4 above are based on FSC-STD-40-004 V2-1 Clause 6.1.1 and 6.1.2</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>When FME sells certified materials as stumpage and lump sum, pre-paid agreements, the trees are paid for before the trees are harvested and the purchaser is responsible for shipping documents.</p> <p>When FME sells certified materials as gate-wood, the sales document (contract) is not included with the shipment of this product (eastern shore State Forest contracts only). In these cases, the shipping documents include each of the requirements (a-h) of section 2.3 and FSC-STD-40-004 V2-1 Clause 6.1.1. See 2.3 for more information.</p>

<p>2.5 When the FME has demonstrated it is not able to include the required FSC claim as specified above in 6.1.1 and 6.1.2 in sales and delivery documents due to space constraints, through an exception, SCS can approve the required information to be provided through supplementary evidence (e.g. supplementary letters, a link to the own company’s webpage with verifiable product information). This practice is only acceptable when SCS is satisfied that the supplementary method proposed by the FME complies with the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) There is no risk that the customer will misinterpret which products are or are not FSC certified in the document; b) The sales and delivery documents contain visible and understandable information so that the customer is aware that the full FSC claim is provided through supplementary evidence; c) In cases where the sales and delivery documents contain multiple products with different FSC Claims, a clear identification for each product shall be included to cross-reference it with the associated FSC claim provided in the supplementary evidence. <p><i>FSC-ADVICE-40-004-05</i></p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>No space constraints</p>
<p>3. Labeling and Promotion <input type="checkbox"/> n/a</p>		
<p>3.1 Describe where/how the organization uses the SCS and FSC trademarks for promotion.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>FME uses trademarks on its webpage within management plans for the Eastern Shore. See response to Minor CAR 2014.15.</p>
<p>3.2 The FME shall request authorization from SCS to use the FSC on-product labels and/or FSC trademarks for promotional use.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>See response to Minor CAR 2014.15.</p>
<p>3.3 Records of SCS and/or FSC trademark use authorizations shall be made available upon request.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Email correspondence from 2009 and 2011 between MD DNR and SCS were presented and reviewed.</p>
<p>4. Outsourcing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> n/a</p>		
<p>4.1 The FME shall provide the names and contact details of all outsourced service providers.</p>		<p>Logging and transportation of forest products are considered low risk and therefore these indicators are NA.</p>

<p>4.2 The FME shall have a control system for the outsourced process which ensures that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The material used for the production of FSC-certified material is traceable and not mixed with any other material prior to the point of transfer of legal ownership; b) The outsourcer keeps records of FSC-certified material covered under the outsourcing agreement; c) The FME issues the final invoice for the processed or produced FSC-certified material following outsourcing; d) The outsourcer only uses FSC trademarks on products covered by the scope of the outsourcing agreement and not for promotional use. 		
<p>5. Training and/or Communication Strategies</p>		
<p>5.1 All relevant FME staff and outsourcers shall be trained in the FME's COC control system commensurate with the scale and intensity of operations and shall demonstrate competence in implementing the FME's COC control system.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>FME staff members are knowledgeable of the COC control system and standard. A COC plan has been established, implemented, presented and reviewed.</p>
<p>5.2 The FME shall maintain up-to-date records of its COC training and/or communications program, such as a list of trained employees, completed COC trainings, the intended frequency of COC training (i.e. training plan), and related program materials (e.g., presentations, memos, contracts, employee handbooks, etc).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>A COC communications program and records of training were presented and reviewed.</p>