

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

State of New York, Bureau of State Land Management

SCS-FM/COC-00104N

State of New York, DEC, Bureau of State Land Management
625 Broadway, Albany NY 12233-4233
Josh Borst, joshua.borst@dec.ny.gov
www.dec.ny.gov/about/27748.html

CERTIFIED	EXPIRATION
29 January 2013	27 January 2018

DATE OF FIELD AUDIT
10-13, 16 October 2017
DATE OF LAST UPDATE
22 January 2018

SCS Contact:

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



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

Foreword

SCS Global Services (SCS) is a certification body accredited by the Forest Stewardship Council to conduct forest management and chain of custody evaluations. Under the FSC / SCS certification system, forest management enterprises (FMEs) meeting international standards of forest stewardship can be certified as “well managed,” thereby permitting the FME’s use of the FSC endorsement and logo in the marketplace subject to regular FSC / SCS oversight.

SCS deploys interdisciplinary teams of natural resource specialists and other experts in forested regions all over the world to conduct evaluations of forest management. SCS evaluation teams collect and analyze written materials, conduct interviews with FME staff and key stakeholders, and complete field and office audits of subject forest management units (FMUs) as part of certification evaluations. Upon completion of the fact-finding phase of all evaluations, SCS teams determine conformance to the FSC Principles and Criteria.

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 30 days after issue of the certificate. Section B contains more detailed results and information for the use of by the FME.

Table of Contents

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY	4
1. GENERAL INFORMATION	4
1.1 Certificate Registration Information	4
1.2 FSC Data Request	5
1.3 Areas Outside of the Scope of Certification (Partial Certification and Excision)	8
1.4 Social Information	8
1.5 Pesticide and Other Chemical Use	8
1.6 Standards Used	10
1.7 Conversion Table English Units to Metric Units.....	10
2. DESCRIPTION OF FOREST MANAGEMENT	11
2.1 Management Context	11
2.2 Forest Management Plan.....	14
2.3 Monitoring System.....	15
3. CERTIFICATION EVALUATION PROCESS	16
3.1 Evaluation Schedule and Team	16
3.2 Evaluation of Management System	22
3.3 Stakeholder Consultation Process	22
4. RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION	23
4.1 Notable Strengths and Weaknesses of the FME Relative to the FSC P&C.....	24
4.2 Process of Determining Conformance	25
5. CERTIFICATION DECISION	34
SECTION B – APPENDICES (CONFIDENTIAL).....	36
Appendix 1 – Current and Projected Annual Harvest for Main Commercial Species.....	36
Appendix 2 – List of FMUs Selected for Evaluation	36
Appendix 3 – List of Stakeholders Consulted.....	36
Appendix 4 – Additional Evaluation Techniques Employed	36
Appendix 5 – Certification Standard Conformance Table	36
Appendix 6 – Tracking, Tracing and Identification of Certified Products	76
Appendix 7 – FME staff consulted	83

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY

1. General Information

1.1 Certificate Registration Information

1.1.1.a Name and Contact Information

Organization name	State of New York, DEC, Bureau of State Land Management		
Contact person	Josh Borst, Forester 2, Bureau of State Land Management, Division of Lands and Forests		
Address	625 Broadway, 5th Floor Albany, NY 12233-4255	Telephone	518-473-9209
		Fax	518-402-9028
		e-mail	joshua.borst@dec.ny.gov
		Website	www.dec.ny.gov

1.1.1.b FSC Sales Information

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

1.1.2 Scope of Certificate

Certificate Type	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Single FMU	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple FMU
	<input type="checkbox"/> Group	
Number of FMUs in scope of certificate	1	
Geographic location of non-SLIMF FMU(s)	<i>Latitude & Longitude:</i>	
Forest zone	<input type="checkbox"/> Boreal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Temperate
	<input type="checkbox"/> Subtropical	<input type="checkbox"/> Tropical
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is: Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac		
privately managed		
state managed	780,849	
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	1
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is included in FMUs that: Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac		
are less than 100 ha in area	0	
are between 100 ha and 1000 ha in area	0	

meet the eligibility criteria as <i>low intensity</i> SLIMF FMUs	0
Division of FMUs into manageable units:	
<p>This FME maintains 9 regional offices located throughout the state of which 7 regional areas are certified. Within each region, the Division of Operations supports the Bureau of State Land Management, BSLM, by providing technical services, facilities management, and maintenance of physical assets. The Bureau of Fish, Wildlife and Marine Resources assists with developing management decisions to protect species and habitat. The Division of Law Enforcement provides support through law enforcement, education and public outreach. Personnel from each Division are assigned to regional offices and collaborate to manage the State Forests, Unique Areas, and State Nature and Historic Preserves within the scope of this assessment.</p> <p>Land within each region is grouped into planning units. A Unit Management Plan is written for each unit and includes objectives and activities that are designed to accomplish specific management goals. This FME maintains 82 planning units.</p>	

1.2 FSC Data Request

1.2.1 Production Forests

Timber Forest Products	Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac
Total area of production forest (i.e. forest from which timber may be harvested)	687,000
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	20,000
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by natural regeneration, or by a combination of natural regeneration and coppicing of the naturally regenerated stems	650,000
Silvicultural system(s)	Area under type of management
Even-aged management	
Clearcut (clearcut size range) (clearcut size range 2-40 acres or > 40 acres requires SEQR review)	702
Shelterwood	866
Other: Thinning and salvage	4422
Uneven-aged management	
Individual tree selection	1784
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)	115,019 Mbf/year

Non-timber Forest Products (NTFPs)	
Area of forest protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for the production of NTFPs or services	0
Other areas managed for NTFPs or services	0
Approximate annual commercial production of non-timber forest products included in the scope of the certificate, by product type	0
Explanation of the assumptions and reference to the data source upon which AAH and NTFP harvest rates estimates are based:	
The Strategic Plan for State Forest Management (2010) and Estimating Periodic Annual Increment (EPAI) on State Forest Lands in New York (2010) state that calculations were based on documented growth rates for acreages of each forest type/age class and species distribution. The EPAI was updated in 2015 with results given in, "Updating of Periodic Annual Increment on State Forest Lands in New York". This update uses the same assumptions and references, includes procedures for updating growth data, and identifies areas for potential data improvements.	
Species in scope of joint FM/COC certificate: (Scientific / Latin Name and Common / Trade Name)	
<i>Acer rubrum</i> , Red Maple; <i>Acer saccharum</i> , Sugar Maple; <i>Prunus serotina</i> , Black Cherry; <i>Quercus rubra</i> , Red Oak; <i>Quercus alba</i> , White Oak; <i>Fraxinus americana</i> , White Ash; <i>Tsuga canadensis</i> , Eastern Hemlock; <i>Abies balsamea</i> , Balsam Fir; <i>Larix laricina</i> , Eastern Larch; <i>Picea abies</i> Norway Spruce; <i>Pinus strobus</i> , White Pine; <i>Pinus resinosa</i> , Red Pine; <i>Picea rubens</i> , Red Spruce	

1.2.2 FSC Product Classification

Timber products		
Product Level 1	Product Level 2	Species
Logs W1	W1.1	Refers to species list above
Fuelwood W1 Fuelwood W1	W1.2	Refers to species list above

1.2.3 Conservation Areas

Total area of forest and non-forest land protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for conservation objectives	59,000 ac (within the scope of this certificate) Note: Total conservation and HCV areas may differ since these may serve different functions in the FME's management system. Designation as HCV may allow for active management. Conservation areas are typically under passive management, but may undergo invasive species control, prescribed burns, and other management activities intended to maintain or enhance their integrity. In all cases, figures are reported by the FME as it pertains local laws & regulations, management objectives, and FSC requirements.		
High Conservation Value Forest / Areas			
High Conservation Values present and respective areas:			Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac
Code	HCV Type	Description & Location	Area
HCV1	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g. endemism, endangered species, refugia).	Special Treatment: New York Natural Heritage Element Occurrences (non-community type only) with survey dates between 1990-2013 with a state "rarity" rank of S1, S2,	10,691

		and S1S2. Clipped to State Forests	
HCV2	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant large landscape level forests, contained within, or containing the management unit, where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance.		
HCV3	Forests or areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems.	Rare Community: New York Natural Heritage Element Occurrences (community type only) with survey dates between 1990-2013 with a state “rarity” rank of S1, S2, and S1S2. Clipped to State Forests	9,314
HCV4	Forests or areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g. watershed protection, erosion control).	Watershed: Portions of State Forests that overlay Sole and Primary Source Aquifers, have public water supply intakes downstream within the Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC) 12 watershed or are within the Department of Health Source Water Assessment Program Plan (DOH SWAPP) delineated buffers (zone of influence) around public ground water wells that are surface water influenced.	124,336
HCV5	Forests or areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g. subsistence, health).	Cultural Heritage: Currently over 725 point locations that are delineated on the ground by forestry/field staff representing any number of culturally significant/historic sites in our state land assets data set.	n/a
HCV6	Forests or areas critical to local communities’ traditional cultural identity (areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in	Cultural Heritage: Currently over 725 point locations that are delineated on the ground by forestry/field staff representing any number of culturally significant/historic	

	cooperation with such local communities).	sites in our state land assets data set.	
Total Area of forest classified as 'High Conservation Value Forest / Area'			

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

<input type="checkbox"/> N/A – All forestland owned or managed by the applicant is included in the scope.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Applicant owns and/or manages other FMUs not under evaluation.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Applicant wishes to excise portions of the FMU(s) under evaluation from the scope of certification.	
Explanation for exclusion of FMUs and/or excision:	New York State owns and manages 2,700,000 acres of Forever Wild Forests within the Adirondack Forest Preserve and 300,000 acres within the Catskill Forest Preserve. These acreages are part of a preserve system where harvesting is not allowed and excluded from this certificate. Additional acreages located on Long Island are not harvested and are not included within this certificate.
Control measures to prevent mixing of certified and non-certified product (C8.3):	Harvesting does not take place in the excluded acreage.
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac)
Adirondack Forest Preserve	NY, USA
Catskill Forest Preserve	NY, USA
NY DEC Region 1	Suffolk County, NY, USA
NY DEC Region 2	Bronx, Richmond and Queens Counties (Long Island), NY, USA

1.4 Social Information

Number of forest workers (including contractors) working in forest within scope of certificate (differentiated by gender):	
# male workers: 57	# female workers: 18

1.5 Pesticide and Other Chemical Use

Commercial name of pesticide/ herbicide	Active ingredient	Quantity applied annually (gallons)	Size of area treated annually (ac)	Reason for use
Makaze	Glyphosate	1.9875	5.3	Weed control
Strategy	Clomazone + Ethalfluralin	6	8	Weed control
Quintec	Quinoline	0.625	8	Weed control

Outlook	Dimethenamid	3.140625	33.5	Weed control
Callisto	Mesotrione	1.5703125	33.5	Weed control
Radiant SC	Spinotram	2.625	33.5	Weed control
Accord XRT II	glyphosate	96	522	control beech, striped maple, ironwood, fern, giant hogweed and Japanaese knotweed
Rodeo	glyphosate	150	1236.7	control beech, striped maple, ironwood, fern and black swallow-wort
Accord	glyphosate	94	309.5	control beech, ironwood, red maple, striped maple
Oust	sulformetron methyl	7	364.5	control beech, striped maple, and invasive species
Oust XP	Sulfometuron	1	92.7	Foliar spray to control NY and Hayscented Fern
Arsenal	imazapyr	3	247.0	control beech, striped maple, ironwood
Impel Basal Oil and Element 4	triclopyr	6	31.0	control beech, striped maple, red maple, ironwood and fern
ELEMENT 4	triclopyr	3	24.0	control beech
Garlon 4	triclopyr	4	21.0	control beech, ironwood and striped maple
RoundUp Promax	glyphosate	0.4	1.8	control of invasive black swallow-wort
Tank mix of - Rodeo / Escort XP / Polaris carried in Thinvert RTU	glyphosate / metsulfuron methyl methyl 2 / isopropylamine salt of imazapyr	19	9.6	control Japanese knotweed
Pathfinder II	Triclopyr	71	32.0	control beech

1.6 Standards Used

1.6.1 Applicable FSC-Accredited Standards

Title	Version	Date of Finalization
FSC-US Forest Management Standard	V1-0	8 July 2010
FSC-STD-50-001, Requirements for Trademark Use	V1-2	25 November 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).		

1.6.2 SCS Interim FSC Standards

Title	Version	Date of Finalization
SCS FSC Chain of Custody Indicators for Forest Management Enterprises	6-0	5 December 2016
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).		

1.7 Conversion Table English Units to Metric Units

Length Conversion Factors		
To convert from	To	multiply by
Mile (US Statute)	Kilometer (km)	1.609347
Foot (ft)	Meter (m)	0.3048
Yard (yd)	Meter (m)	0.9144
Area Conversion Factors		
To convert from	To	multiply by
Square foot (sq ft)	Square meter (m ²)	0.09290304
Acre (ac)	Hectare (ha)	0.4047
Volume Conversion Factors		
To convert from	To	multiply by
Cubic foot (cu ft)	Cubic meter (m ³)	0.02831685
Gallon (gal)	Liter (l)	4.546
Quick reference		
1 acre	= 0.404686 ha	
1,000 acres	= 404.686 ha	
1 board foot	= 0.00348 cubic meters	
1,000 board feet	= 3.48 cubic meters	
1 cubic foot	= 0.028317 cubic meters	

2. Description of Forest Management

2.1 Management Context

2.1.1 Regulatory Context

<p>Pertinent Regulations at the National Level</p>	<p>Endangered Species Act Clean Water Act (Section 404 wetland protection) Occupational Safety and Health Act National Historic Preservation Act Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act Americans with Disabilities Act U.S. ratified treaties, including CITES Lacey Act Forest Resources Conservation and Shortage Relief Act National Resource Protection Act National Environmental Protection Act National Wild and Scenic River Act Native American Grave Protection and Repatriation Act Rehabilitation Act Architectural Barriers Act</p>
<p>Pertinent Regulations at the State / Local Level</p>	<p>6 NYCRR Part 190 Article XIV, §3 of the New York State Constitution Articles 8 and 9 of the Environmental Conservation Law Article 8 - (8-0101 - 8-0117) Environmental Quality Review Article 9 - LANDS AND FORESTS Title 1 - (9-0101 - 9-0113) GENERAL PROVISIONS Title 3 - (9-0301 - 9-0307) USE OF LANDS AND FORESTS Title 5 - (9-0501 - 9-0509) REFORESTATION AREAS Title 7 - (9-0701 - 9-0717) COOPERATIVE FOREST MANAGEMENT PROGRAM Title 8 - (9-0801 - 9-0815) FOREST RESOURCES PLANNING Title 9 - (9-0901 - 9-0903) RECREATION Title 11 - (9-1101 - 9-1123) FOREST FIRE CONTROL Title 13 - (9-1301 - 9-1303) FOREST INSECT AND DISEASE CONTROL Title 15 - (9-1501 - 9-1503) REMOVAL OF TREES AND PROTECTED PLANTS</p>
<p>Regulatory Context Description</p>	<p>The NY DEC is highly regulated with well-developed strategic plan, policies and manuals that apply to management of state forest lands and facilities. The following is excerpted or adapted from the <i>Strategic Plan for State Forest Management</i> (SPSFM, 2011):</p> <p>Public use of State Forests is regulated under 6 NYCRR Part 190, Chapter II. This includes general regulations that apply to all State Forests, as well as regulations that apply only to specific parcels of state land. The following is a brief summary of the subject areas covered by regulations that pertain to the use and management of lands (full listing see pages 318-319 of SPSFM): Fires; Signs and structures; camping sites; camping permits; permissible structures; open camps; prohibitions (activities, equipment, use, damage, recreation); pesticides; unique areas; environmentally sensitive lands, boat launch sites, and location specific</p>

	regulations. Additional policies and guidelines also apply, page 319 SPSFM, including: Motor vehicle access; boundary line maintenance; timber cutting; land adoption programs; policy and procedure Manual; naming state lands and facilities; trail construction and manuals.
--	---

2.1.2 Environmental Context

Environmental safeguards:
Landscape-level biodiversity goals have been clearly established in The Strategic Plan For State Forest Management (2010). SMZ guidelines and Retention on State Forests (2011) guidelines have been developed and implemented for stand level guidance. Regulations protect from general public Rare, Threatened and Endangered species by prohibiting individuals from taking any tree, flower, shrub, fern, fungi or other plant-like organisms, moss or other plant, rock, soil, fossil or mineral or object of archaeological or paleontological interest found or growing on State land, with the exception that Recreationists may collect fungi, fruit or berries for their personal consumption. Forest management activities are managed under pre-assessment procedures or environmental quality review (including SEQR), forest management contractor language, implementation administration of forest management activities, and monitoring of activities that may yield negative environmental impacts with corresponding mechanisms in place to adjust policies and procedures to avoid unanticipated impacts when and if they occur.
Management strategy for the identification and protection of rare, threatened and endangered (RTE) species and their habitats:
Landscape-level biodiversity goals have been clearly established in The Strategic Plan For State Forest Management (2010). This FME works in cooperation with the Natural Heritage Program and has completed biodiversity surveys in each region. Known locations and management recommendations for these species and habitats are routinely used during management planning to minimize impacts. A new database that predicts sites that may include rare species and communities (Predicted Richness Overlay, PRO) is being used during the planning process. Old-growth stands are found within the Forest Preserve system which is owned and managed by this FME but is not part of this FME’s certified land base. As part of the Forest Preserve system, these old growth stands are protected from harvesting and other timber management activities.

2.1.3 Socioeconomic Context

The socioeconomic context is summarized in the “*The Economic Importance of New York’s Forest-Based Economy 2015*” including an overview of the land base in New York and a summary of federal and state data. According to this report,

The New York forest-based manufacturing system includes timber harvesting and associated trucking, primary manufacturing and secondary manufacturing. Primary manufacturers convert raw material into lumber, veneer, pulp and paper and various other products. Some of these products are shipped out of state for further processing, while some are manufactured locally including for example furniture, baseball bats, log homes, wine racks, cable and wire spools, pallets and wood energy. New York is a net exporter of timber products. Canada is the primary importer of New York wood including saw logs, veneer logs and pulpwood. New York timber products are also exported to other states and worldwide.

Statewide, New York's forests cover just over 19 million acres of land or 63% of the State land area and have increased rapidly beginning in early 20th century and largely been at current levels since the 1980s. Northern hardwood forests, dominated by beech, birch and maple, make up over 53% of the forest cover. New York's forests continue to be largely privately owned by individuals/families and businesses who together own over 76% of the forest. The annual value of sales or output of New York's forest products industry totals over \$ 9.9 billion while the forest-based recreation economy is worth \$8.2 billion. Approximately 43,912* workers are employed in the forest products, maple and Christmas tree sectors while another 31,926 jobs are found in the sectors that include and support the forest recreation economy.

Using multipliers generated through IMPLAN, an economic model, it is estimated that the forest products sector has \$12.4 billion in economic output and 61,171 jobs when taking into account the rippling effect this industry has on the other parts of the economy. Economic output and number of jobs in the forest products sector have been reduced since peaks in the 1990s and early 2000s.

Indigenous People*

Although there are no tribal lands in the NY DEC state forests, there are nine Indian Nations that reside within, or have common geographic borders with New York State: the Mohawk, Oneida, Onondaga, Cayuga, Seneca, Tonawanda Seneca, Tuscarora, Unkechaug, and Shinnecock. The United States formally recognizes all but the Unkechaug and Shinnecock Nations. The State of New York recognizes all nine Nations.

The Mohawk, Oneida, Onondaga, Cayuga, Seneca, Tonawanda Seneca, and Tuscarora are known as the Six Nations or Haudenosaunee. Relations between the Department and the Haudenosaunee are conducted in the spirit of Peace and Friendship established in the 1794 Treaty of Canandaigua. All nine Indian Nations and their diverse governments and governmental entities may share mutual interests with the Department concerning environmental and cultural resources.

(*This information from CP-42, NYDEC, March 2009.)

2.1.4 Land use, Ownership, and Land Tenure

This FME manages more 440 separate parcels, covering about 780,000 acres in 48 counties. Most of these properties were acquired when NY DEC began purchasing abandoned farmland properties in 1929 under authorization from the Hewitt Amendment. The Amendment authorized the Conservation Department to acquire for the State, by gift or purchase, reforestation areas consisting of not less than 500 acres of contiguous land to be forever devoted to "reforestation and the establishment and maintenance thereon of forests for watershed protection, the production of timber and for recreation and kindred purposes." Current use of these lands includes timber harvest activities, forest-based recreation and tourism, watershed protection, wildlife habitat and management of surface disturbances related to subsurface mining leases.

Indigenous People*

There are no tribal lands in the scope of the certificate. However, there are nine Indian Nations that reside within, or have common geographic borders with New York State: the Mohawk, Oneida, Onondaga, Cayuga, Seneca, Tonawanda Seneca, Tuscarora, Unkechaug, and Shinnecock. The United States formally recognizes all but the Unkechaug and Shinnecock Nations. The State of New York recognizes all nine Nations.

The Mohawk, Oneida, Onondaga, Cayuga, Seneca, Tonawanda Seneca, and Tuscarora are known as the Six Nations or Haudenosaunee. Relations between the Department and the Haudenosaunee will be conducted in the spirit of Peace and Friendship established in the 1794 Treaty of Canandaigua.

All nine Indian Nations and their diverse governments and governmental entities may share mutual interests with the Department concerning environmental and cultural resources..

*(This information from NYDEC, CP42, March 27, 2009.)

2.2 Forest Management Plan

<p>Management Objectives:</p>
<p>The Strategic Plan for State Forest Management including generic environmental impact statement (GEIS) guides management of the state's 780,849 acres under certification in Regions 3-9.. Key goals and objectives focus on ecosystem health and diversity, economic benefits, recreational opportunities, forest conservation and sustainable management. The full plan may be found here, http://www.dec.ny.gov/docs/lands_forests_pdf/spsfmfinal.pdf.</p>
<p>Forest Composition and Rationale for Species Selection:</p>
<p>The Strategic Plan for State Forest Management (2010) includes the following New York GAP Cover type Summary (p. 58) which includes the following general forest types: Evergreen-northern hardwoods (36.7%), Sugar maple mesic (26.5%), oak (8.3%), successional hardwoods (8.3%), Evergreen plantation (4.3%), spruce-fir (2%), deciduous wetland (1.8%), pitch pine-oak (1.2%), evergreen wetland (1%) and Appalachian oak-pine (0.6%). GAPS in forest-related habitat that exist at the state level are best filled by management practices that enhance the proportion of late successional, early successional and evergreen forest cover, maintain forests on a wide variety of landforms and include a mix of native species. This FME’s plantation policy that describes the gradual removal of non-native species resulting in the conversion of most plantations to a mix of native species.</p>
<p>General Description of Land Management System(s):</p>
<p>The silvicultural systems used by this FME are described each unit management plan as well as The Strategic Plan for State Forest Management (2010). The choice of silvicultural system depends on several biological factors including the requirements of the desired trees species, wildlife habitat requirements, climate, size, age, and vigor of existing trees in the stand, insects and diseases, and management constraints.</p> <p>This FME has defined and implemented two systems – uneven-aged and even-aged management. Uneven-aged management is used when it is desirable to perpetuate large quantities of tolerant species, where site conditions prevent the use of even-aged management, or where recreation, esthetics, wildlife, and similar land use are of such importance that they preclude any cutting that completely removes the overstory. Mature and immature trees are removed singly or in groups at varying intervals. Regeneration is established almost continuously. The objective is creation and maintenance of stands with trees of different ages. This FME uses the following uneven-age</p>

<p>silvicultural systems: Single-tree Selection, Group Selection and Patch Cuts. This FME uses the following even-aged silvicultural systems where it is desirable to perpetuate intolerant species: Shelterwood System, Seed-Tree System and Clearcutting.</p> <p>Existing plantations are managed for volume growth and yield and at maturity, management activities are designed to return the stands to a mix of native species.</p>
<p>Harvest Methods and Equipment used:</p>
<p>This FME uses a combination of harvest methods and equipment although totally mechanized systems are not as common in some parts of this region. Whole tree harvesting is used in limited capacity in parts of this region where biomass markets exist.</p>
<p>Explanation of the management structures:</p>
<p>NY DEC's executive and administrative personnel (Commissioner, Assistant Commissioner, Director, Assistant Director, Bureau Chief, Certification Coordinator, Historic Preservation and GIS staff) develop policy and provide training and supervision while located within the state office located in Albany.</p> <p>This FME under scope of this certificate maintains 17 certified regional offices located within 7 regions throughout the state with staff that work on certified lands. Within each certified region, personnel from several Divisions collaborate to manage the State Forests, Unique Areas, and State Nature and Historic Preserves. For example, the Division of Operations provides technical services, facilities management and maintenance of physical assets; the Bureau of Fish, Wildlife and Marine Resources assists with management decisions and actions that protect species and habitats and the Division of Law Enforcement provides law enforcement, education and public outreach. Full time and seasonal forestry personnel are also located in the regional offices and are responsible for a variety of management tasks including forest inventory, monitoring, development and implementation of prescriptions and the development of unit management plans. Contractors are used to conduct timber harvest removals and complete chemical treatments.</p> <p>FMU land has been divided into 82 planning units. Each Unit Management Plan details objectives and activities that will be used to accomplish management goals.</p>

2.3 Monitoring System

<p>Growth and Yield of all forest products harvested:</p>
<p>The SFID database includes this FME's growth and yield inventory data. This database is routinely updated as each season's data is collected.</p>
<p>Forest dynamics and changes in composition of flora and fauna:</p>
<p>The Strategic Plan For State Forest Management (2010) and/or the current revision of each unit management plan and the SFID database include the best available information including data from relevant databases, local knowledge and experience as an assessment for example of the insect/pest/storm damage and inventory and regeneration status. Forest surveys are used to track forest pests, diseases, storm events and damage.</p>
<p>Environmental Impacts:</p>
<p>The Strategic Plan For State Forest Management (2010) and/or the current revision of each unit management plan include the best available information including data from relevant databases, local knowledge and experience as an assessment for example of the condition of RTEs, water resources, unique habitat and insect/pest/storm damage.</p>
<p>Social Impacts:</p>

This FME completed a Summary Report of the New York State Social Impact Assessment of State Land Management during summer 2012 that was based on a survey of user groups. This FME also maintains a system for notifying the public, receiving comments and incorporating comments into management plans and proposed activities. The social impacts associated with archeological sites are minimized through consultation with tribal groups and consultation with Chuck Vandrei, Historic Preservation Officer for the Division of Lands and Forests who maintains a database of known cultural sites and provides this information to staff during the Unit Management Planning process. This information is also incorporated into a GIS data layer. The Strategic Plan for State Forest Management includes sections on archeological, cultural, historical and community resources. The Strategic Plan for State Forest Management and each unit management plan include a section on social impacts associated with visual and aesthetic resources. Each revised unit management plan solicits and includes a summary of stakeholder comments.

Costs, Productivity, and Efficiency:

As confirmed through the review of quarterly reports and the annual total harvest .xls spreadsheet and individual contracts itemized elsewhere in this report, this FME maintains records including for example harvest volume, product, species and acreage. The cost of management is monitored as described during interviews and this information has been used to assess productivity and efficiency of management projects.

3. Certification Evaluation Process

3.1 Evaluation Schedule and Team

3.1.1 Evaluation Itinerary and Activities

Date: 10 October 2017, Tuesday	
FMU/Location/ sites visited	Activities/ notes
Allegany Office	Opening Meeting: Introductions, client update, review audit scope, audit plan, intro/update to FSC and SCS standards and protocols, review of open CARs/OBS, final site selection or adjustments. Document review as listed in Section 7 of FSC Audit Plan.
Region 9, Allegany Office	
On-site chemical storage	Checked the flammable cabinet – Checks being made of the contents, SDS (MSDS) binder on top, spill kit in place, items organized and labeled in flammable cabinets and forester labeled and quarantined the item that appeared in the cabinet from Wildlife Department. No issues. Field inspection form used to help.
Pine Hill State Forest: CAT 9(207) X010426, Stand 17, 266 acres	Allegheny hardwood, active sale, 266, White Ash Salvage Revenue sale. Site of first Emerald Ash Borer confirmed in NY state. Started as a pre-salvage harvest to capture volume/value prior to anticipated mortality but mortality occurred very quickly and sale became true salvage harvest. Horse trail on property in close proximity of harvest. Pre-planning met with horse club members for input, open/close trail plans for safety communicated to clubs; other safety measures and visual considerations modified harvest plans and layout

	<p>Road material brought on site to upgrade the prior skid trail into a haul road from the landing to the main road. Two cross-drains installed with some ditching to keep water off the newly built access. Some sediment in the cross drain; no silt fencing or bales of hay in place as a preventative measure. NYDEC forester was going to contact logging company to get something installed to ensure that no further sediment would continue in the lower cross drain. Stump heights per the contact language were an issue. Field monitoring site inspections were noted in the document in the forester field folder, however no notation on the stump height issues that were discussed with the logger two times. Within the sale was a spray block for a release, 40 acres.</p> <p>Discussions: EAB quarantine, forestry training, logger qualifications and training, timber contracts (examined and discussed), logo use, deer browsing, inspection reports (stumps, rutting), road BMPs, recreational slash requirements, stump heights, herbicide spray requirements, SQER, SFID, Silvah, water bars and cross drains.</p>
South Valley State Forest: CAT 2(184) X010432	<p>Ash salvage, harvest all ash in 85 acre stand dominated by sugar maple and white ash with black cherry, beech and other hardwoods. Thinning removing ash and other hardwoods down to 60 ft² basal area. Class C trout stream requiring permit for crossing and bridge installation. Two holding ponds, silt fending, and bales of hay installed for landing protection. Cross-drains installed. Discussion: Road construction, water bars, BMP manual, timber contract specifications (log landings, page 6), Road Building Manual, siltation remediation, Bureau of Real Properties.</p>
Elkdale State Forest: CAT 23(19) X010420 (addl)	<p>Ash salvage sale combined with thinning in adjacent and surrounding stand. Marked to cut, sold not yet cut. Discussion: regeneration planning and monitoring, post-harvest inventory, completion reports, SILVA research. KY Notes: Stop #3 Elkdale State Forest X010420 Ash salvage, marked to cut, discussion on regeneration and SILVAH</p>
Swift Hill State Forest: Overstory removal (unscheduled)	<p>Japanese larch removal combined into a hardwood thinning of red and white pine for natural regeneration. Trees marked to keep, 28 acres. Stop #4 Allegany 19 Swift Hill State Forest 28 acres' larch sale. Over story removal with a clear cut- not cut area was oak pocket this was delineated in the GIS and was protected by the forester. B & L Logging – Seed tree left White Pine natural regeneration- unplanned stop</p>
Swift Hill State Forest: ALL 19(261) X010632	<p>Blowdown salvage from 2016 summer storm. Additional block added for hardwood crown thinning. 51 acres. Sold, not yet cut. Finger Lakes Trail running through the sale area to be rerouted for safety. Trail aesthetic considerations incorporated into planning. Equipment exclusion zones in wet buffers. Temporary corduroy for crossings and related requirements for use and removal (contract section VII, page 6). Small right of way area considered for planting. Discussion: UMP approval process</p>
Date: 11 October 2017, Wednesday	
Region 8, Bath Office	
TRP Site #1 – Birdseye Hollow State Forest:	<p>Cooperative work done under TRP with Upper Susquehanna Coalition. Berm Removal and stream bank restoration. Planted a variety of lowland hardwood species as an experiment and restoration of trees to the site.</p>

<p>Steuben Reforestation Area #8</p>	<p>Species planted to be considered for planting as ecological equivalent to ash killed by EAB. Discussed permitting, deer browse, and survival rate for plantings. Two different TRPs for this site, both closed.</p>
<p>South Bradford State Forest: TRP #2 - Steuben Reforestation Area #3</p>	<p>CP3 / MAPPWD site, Commissioners Policy 3, Motorized Access Program People with Disabilities. Designated routes statewide using ATV or pick-up truck. Non-ambulatory permit may be pursued with other organizations (Special Licenses Unit with Fish and Wildlife). CCC Road inspection. Roads addressed in UMP, DEC Division of Operations performs road work upon request within staff and budget constraints. Road projects are prioritized.</p>
<p>South Bradford State Forest: Bird's Eye Ash Mortality (HCV), North Urbana Hill Road</p>	<p>EAB mortality over approximately 100 acres in wetland draw. Working with Upper Susquehanna Coalition, who has received grant funding to conduct under-planting of tree species as potential replacement for ash mortality resulting from EAB. HCV as a watershed, discussion of management/monitoring. Although salvage harvest was considered the market conditions make this a low priority for harvest. Discussed benefits of standing stags to pileated woodpecker and other similar avian species.</p>
<p>South Bradford State Forest: X00991, Closed Sale Site #1 – South Bradford State Forest (Steuben Reforestation Area #3)</p>	<p>Sale is closed and clean-up is complete (closed in 2016). Stands B-5 and B-6 total treatment area of 66 acres. One block overstory removal unit. One block prep cut for 1st of 2 stage shelterwood cut. Abundant advanced regeneration of oak and other hardwood species, about 12,000 trees per acre. Retention patch inspected. Cultural feature inspected which was a CCC 6-ft stone wall built in 1930's, protected by sale design and layout, flagged for no equipment. Also a site for the deer enclosure project. Rattlesnake habitat consultation with wildlife biologist. Identified as potential Coal Skink habitat and mapped in Prescription form. Water bars properly installed and functioning appropriately. Spring seeps avoided in prescription.</p>
<p>South Bradford Well Pad Site</p>	<p>Well pad, 3 pipe crossings for consideration (Talisman Energy); will use mats for crossing, and Talisman Energy will meet with staff and logger to confirm that crossings sufficient. Identified for potential rattlesnake habitat, consultation conducted with wildlife biologist and cleared. Discussed monitoring of active job: Forester confirmed Timber Sale Contract on-site; crossing specifications checked; consultation with gas company; regular inspections during harvest (documented/confirmed), at least 1x/wk and up to 3x/wk; contract diary with notes from site visits in project folder; Completion of Inspection Report.</p>
<p>Goundry Hill State Forest: X010360, Sale Area #2 – Schuyler Reforestation Area #1</p>	<p>Complete but not yet closed out. Prescription, Maps, etc. available on site. Potential Coal Skink habitat identified. Utilization very poor and large amounts of debris left on site potentially impacting growing space, regeneration recruitment. Justifications for poor utilization included: market for large logs only, poor market for firewood and other low value products. Benefits of debris justified by staff included deer browsing inhibition and other wildlife habitat benefits.</p>
<p>X010546, Mead's Creek State Forest</p>	<p>Walked main skid trail into sale area after some heavy rains. Significant rutting issue was encountered (approx. 20" deep x 15 ft long). Siltation visible in small perennial channel that ended along the unit (i.e., no</p>

	downstream water body, so the siltation was contained). Forester had identified spot as potential rutting area and entered contract specifications for corduroy as damage prevention. Forester had corrective action plan in place, followed established protocols and conveyed corrections required to logger prior to returning to office from the field. Trees hung up along main skid trail presented hazard but identified by field staff and inquiry/explanation provided. All sites to this point in conformance with the standards for rutting and tree harvest (other than one site with high stumps).
Date: 12 October 2017, Thursday	
Region 7 Sherburne	
Charles E Barker State Forest: Campground	Supplemental planting done for aesthetics including: white oak, red oak, white pine, black cherry, black oak, larch (nursery overstock species). Viewed historic sign, kiosk, horse trail (trail head for 130 miles of horse trails). Winter serves as snowmobile trail.
Charles E Barker State Forest: Unscheduled	Norway spruce salvage. Original salvage done in September 2015 following July 2014 windstorm event. Additional mortality led to a new salvage harvest which was set up and will be bundled with a nearby spruce sale. Discussions: insects and diseases, forest tent caterpillar
Madison Reforestation Area: X010313, #4, Stands A-47 and A-49	Active sale. Logger interview: PPE, First aid/CPR, spill kit, contract, and map all verified. Confirmed knowledge of job requirements including: spill reporting, training, BMPs, contract requirements. Water damage was observed at this site, determined likely missing water bars.
Madison Reforestation Area: #12, Beaver Creek State Forest, Stands B-66, B-68, and B-97	Temporary sign with forestry and certification information posted; FSC and SFI logos on sign adhere to trademark requirements. Sale take into account aesthetics along road. Plan is to convert back to hardwood-only stand. Glyphosate applied last year by subcontractor; subcontractor is aware of requirements for PPE, but DEC staff did not visit to confirm adherence to label. The subcontractor had posted at least three different DEC warning signs with the times and dates written in to notify the public on the herbicide work being done. He had posted signs along the FPR while actively spraying the site. The subcontractor left the signs up for weeks after the spraying was done and staff forester removed by the start of deer season that year. Discussion about monitoring herbicide application and effectiveness.
Clearcut to restore native trees (unscheduled)	Stand about 9.5-acres of Japanese larch that was planted in the 1950s. Objectives were to restore to native hardwood species using natural regeneration. Retained about 0.5-acre untouched in two patches.
RSA Site (unscheduled)	The area is a Natural Heritage Area comprised of a balsam-white pine-cedar swamp (Beaver Creek, a Class C trout stream). Area is a unique ecological feature in this part of the state. Attracts recreationists, especially horse trail riders (the 130-mile trail crosses the swamp on a multi-use bridge). Natural Heritage Foundation monitors ecological values of RSA.
Region 7: Herkimer Office	
Oneida Reforestation Area #13	Open larch timber sale with some Norway spruce and red pine. Wet/warm weather during a winter thinning triggered a forester inspection who then shut down the harvest operations per DEC procedures due to rutting risk.

<p>Webster Hill State Forest: X010224</p>	<p>Harvest was begun winter 2016, shut down occurred in January 2017. Due to wet weather and logger election the job has not been completed and remains operationally inactive. Notice to Correct form that was sent 17 January 2017 to logger was provided to auditors.</p>
<p>Date: 13 October 2017, Friday</p>	
<p>Region 4: Schenectady Office</p>	
<p>Pittstown State Forest: Active Timber Sale, X009985</p>	<p>Harvest operator interview: PPE, First aid/CPR, spill kit, contract, and map all verified. Confirmed knowledge of job requirements including: spill reporting, training, BMPs, contract requirements. Confirmed logger certification was up to date. Partial completed cut. Prescription includes hack and squirt for beech with goal being to grow maple. Mountain bikers had been scoping for new trail, but NY DEC stopped it. Mountain bikes are allowed on all logging and skid roads unless marked otherwise. Temporary water bars along skid road sufficient for temporary nature. Each water bar was located by the forester with blue flagging. Property boundary clearly marked by axe blaze and yellow paint and corresponded to map. Skid trail crossed small perennial seep, but well armored with rock and no siltation visible.</p> <p>Temporary bridge crossing of stream examined. Well-constructed with three untreated oak panels, a bumper tree, and no siltation visible. Permit posted (no. 4-3836-00100-00002, exp. 6-23-2020).</p>
<p>Pittstown State Forest: X006256? Stand C-9 (Completion Report review – no report)</p>	<p>Timber sale closed 5/1/09. A 47 acre northern hardwood even-aged management harvest. Examined regeneration (adequate). Regeneration data monitoring data unavailable. Missing completion report.</p>
<p>Pittstown State Forest: Hilltop Trail</p>	<p>A multi-use trail system designed for mountain bikes. Approximately 8 miles of trails that were constructed and are maintained through a Volunteer Stewardship Agreement (VSA) with the Saratoga Mountain Bike Association. Additional information here, http://saratogamtb.org/pittstown/. Reviewed campsite, informational kiosk at SF entrance.</p>
<p>Tibbits State Forest: Sale with closed and active sites</p>	<p>345-acre sale. Includes closed site along State Route 7 with aesthetic considerations in prescription. Large water bars throughout sale properly constructed. Two bridge site crossings (temporary bridges had been pulled) resulting; no sign of erosion at these crossings. Had been site of significant rainfall (7" in one hour) earlier in summer, washing out state highway, but BMPs on logging site held up. Logger had used existing landing along highway.</p> <p>Active site includes access road to small parking area that is used for skidding. Will be graveled up 200 ft from entrance as part of closure of sale. Weekly check-ins by DEC, but not documented. Power line in sale with crossing rights deeded to DEC. Recent work by power company contractor was supposed to include installation of water bars on main access road; contractor did not do so, and forester is planning to have logger install them at closure of sale. Recreation area for hunters and hikers. Hiking trail (Tibbits Trail) temporarily closed (signage visible) during active sale; the trail will be rerouted slightly as part of project. Minor residual damage in stand and</p>

	along roadway. Loader on landing showed signs of leakage of hydraulic fluid that was well-contained by rags and buckets; little leakage on soil.
Date: 16 October 2017, Monday	
Albany Office	Auditor deliberations. Closing Meeting Preparation: Auditor(s) take time to consolidate notes and confirm audit findings
Albany Office	Closing Meeting and Review of Findings: Convene with all relevant staff to summarize audit findings, potential non-conformities and next steps

3.1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation

A. Number of days spent on-site assessing the applicant:	4.5
B. Number of auditors participating in on-site evaluation:	3
C. Additional days spent on preparation, stakeholder consultation, and post-site follow-up:	3
D. Total number of person days used in evaluation:	16.5

3.1.3 Evaluation Team

Auditor Name:	Beth Jacqmain	Auditor role:	FSC Lead Auditor, SFI Auditor
Qualifications:	Beth Jacqmain is a Certification Forester with SCS Global Services. Jacqmain has MS Forest Biology from Auburn University and a BS Forest Management from Michigan State University. Jacqmain is Society of American Foresters (SAF) Certified Forester (#1467) with 20+ years’ experience in the forestry field including private corporate, private consulting, and public land management. Jacqmain is a qualified ANSI RAB accredited ISO 14001 EMS Lead Auditor and is a qualified FSC Lead Auditor for Forest Management/Chain of Custody. Jacqmain has audited and led FSC certification and precertification evaluations, harvest and logging operations evaluations, and has participated in joint SFI and American Tree Farm certifications. Jacqmain is a 9 year member of the Forest Guild and 20 year adjunct-Faculty with Itasca Community College, Natural Resources Department. Jacqmain’s experience is in forest management and ecology; the use of silviculture towards meeting strategic and tactical goals; forest timber quality improvement, conifer thinning operations, pine restoration, and fire ecology in conifer dominated systems.		
Auditor Name:	Keri Yankus	Auditor role:	SFI Lead Auditor, FSC Team
Qualifications:	Keri Yankus has over 20 plus years of experience in the forestry industry. She has a B.S. in Forest Management and Recreation and Park Management from the University of Maine. She has worked as an employee for the following: US Army Corps of Engineers, MA, West Virginia Division of Forestry, National Park Service (South Dakota and Pennsylvania), Bureau of Land Management (31 States East of MS and Washington D.C.), NRCS (Michigan and Ohio), USDA Wildlife Services and joint with the Marines, Airforce, Navy and Coast Guard, DOD (North Carolina and New Hampshire), US Forest Service in Michigan and West Virginia. She worked for private industry as forester with Weyerhaeuser and Bioforest Technologies in USA and Canada. Keri holds current professional forestry licenses for West Virginia, and North Carolina, and is an SAF Certified Forester and an active SAF member. She is currently active GSD SAF and is serving on the board for NH Project Learning Tree. She has worked for NSF as an auditor since 2000. She also holds her certification as		

	Exemplar Global Lead Auditor. She has conducted numerous EMS, SFI (FM, FS, CS and COC/PEFC), TLMI & ATFS audits.		
Auditor Name:	Stefan Bergmann	Auditor role:	FSC/SFI Team Member
Qualifications:	Mr. Bergmann has been in the forestry and wood products field for 15 years, working across the US in forest policy, landowner extension, executive leadership, and forest certification. Prior to joining SCS in July 2017, he previously worked for another certification body overseeing Forest Stewardship Council® (FSC®) forest management auditing program in the US. Stefan is a qualified FSC FM Lead Auditor and is qualified for Sustainable Forestry Initiative® auditing. He holds a BS in Wildlife Science and an MS in Forest Resources, both from Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon, USA, and is presently pursuing an MBA at the University of California Davis.		

3.2 Evaluation of Management System

3.2.1 Methodology and Strategies Employed

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.

3.2.2 Pre-evaluation

- A pre-evaluation of the FME *was not* required by FSC norms.
- A pre-evaluation of the FME was conducted as required by and in accordance with FSC norms.

3.3 Stakeholder Consultation Process

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 the pre-evaluation (if one was conducted), 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:

3.3.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted During Evaluation for Certification

FME Management and staff	Pertinent Tribal members and/or representatives
Consulting foresters	Members of the FSC National Initiative
Contractors	Members of the regional FSC working group
Lease holders	FSC International
Adjacent property owners	Local and regionally-based environmental organizations and conservationists
Local and regionally-based social interest and civic organizations	Forest industry groups and organizations
Purchasers of logs harvested on FME forestlands	Local, state, and federal regulatory agency personnel
Recreational user groups	Other relevant groups

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. A public notice was sent to stakeholders at least 6 weeks prior to the audit notifying them of the audit and soliciting comments. 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.

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

Stakeholder Comments	SCS Response
Economic Concerns	
None received.	
Social Concerns	
None received.	
Environmental Concerns	
None received.	

4. Results of the Evaluation

Table 4.1 below, contains the evaluation team’s findings as to the strengths and weaknesses of the subject forest management operation relative to the FSC Principles of forest stewardship. Weaknesses are noted as Corrective Action Requests (CARs) related to each principle.

4.1 Notable Strengths and Weaknesses of the FME Relative to the FSC P&C

Principle / Subject Area	Strengths Relative to the Standard	Weaknesses Relative to the Standard
P1: FSC Commitment and Legal Compliance	None noted.	None noted.
P2: Tenure & Use Rights & Responsibilities	None noted.	None noted.
P3: Indigenous Peoples' Rights	There is a high level of commitment to building relationships with Indian Nations at the state level. For example, since 2015 the Office of Environmental Justice has held an Annual DEC/Indian Nations Leaders Meeting to discuss mutual interests. In addition, there is a mechanism in place at the state level for Indian Nations to submit issues/complaints: the Indian Nations Affairs Coordinator forwards issues/complaints to the appropriate subsection in the NY DEC and ensures resolution.	See Minor CAR 2017.1
P4: Community Relations & Workers' Rights	None noted.	See Minor CAR 2017.2
P5: Benefits from the Forest	The NYDEC Division of Land and Forest has established an exemplary recreation program to allow multi-user access, while concur traditional forestry operations happen and excellent educational kiosk in recreational areas.	None noted.
P6: Environmental Impact	The NYDEC Division of Land and Forest has established and incorporated aesthetic considerations in various aspects of planning and management activities (harvesting, and landing design) to minimize visual impacts or concerns in an exemplary manner.	None noted.
P7: Management Plan	None noted.	See Minor CAR 2017.3
P8: Monitoring & Assessment	None noted.	See Minor CAR 2017.4
P9: High Conservation Value Forests	The DEC has instituted a robust system for monitoring HCVFs leveraging state-of-the art GIS databases and strong collaboration with internal and external partners. See closure of CAR 2016.2 for additional detail.	None noted.
Chain of custody	None noted.	

4.2 Process of Determining Conformance

4.2.1 Structure of Standard and Degrees of Nonconformance

FSC-accredited forest stewardship standards consist of a three-level hierarchy: principle, the criteria that correspond to that principle, and the performance indicators that elaborate each criterion. Consistent with SCS Forest Conservation Program evaluation protocols, the team collectively determines whether or not the subject forest management operation is in conformance with every applicable indicator of the relevant forest stewardship standard. Each nonconformance must be evaluated to determine whether it constitutes a major or minor nonconformance at the level of the associated criterion or sub-criterion. Not all indicators are equally important, and there is no simple numerical formula to determine whether an operation is in nonconformance. The team therefore must use their collective judgment to assess each criterion and determine if the FME is in conformance. If the FME is determined to be in nonconformance at the criterion level, then at least one of the applicable indicators must be in major nonconformance.

Corrective action requests (CARs) are issued for every instance of a nonconformance. Major nonconformances trigger Major CARs and minor nonconformances trigger Minor CARs.

4.2.1 Interpretations of Major CARs, Minor CARs and Observations

Major CARs: Major nonconformances, either alone or in combination with nonconformances of all other applicable indicators, result (or are likely to result) in a fundamental failure to achieve the objectives of the relevant FSC Criterion given the uniqueness and fragility of each forest resource. These are corrective actions that must be resolved or closed out before a certificate can be awarded. If Major CARs arise after an operation is certified, the timeframe for correcting these nonconformances is typically shorter than for Minor CARs. Certification is contingent on the certified FME's response to the CAR within the stipulated time frame.

Minor CARs: These are corrective action requests in response to minor nonconformances, which are typically limited in scale or can be characterized as an unusual lapse in the system. Most Minor CARs are the result of nonconformance at the indicator-level. Corrective actions must be closed out within a specified time period of award of the certificate.

Observations: These are subject areas where the audit team concludes that there is conformance, but either future nonconformance may result due to inaction or the FME could achieve exemplary status through further refinement. Action on observations is voluntary and does not affect the maintenance of the certificate. However, observations can become CARs if performance with respect to the indicator(s) triggering the observation falls into nonconformance.

4.2.2 Major Nonconformances

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Major CARs were issued to the FME during the evaluation. Any Minor CARs from previous surveillance audits have been reviewed and closed prior to the issuance of a certificate.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Major CARs were issued to the FME during the evaluation, which have all been closed to the satisfaction of the audit team and meet the requirements of the standards. Any Minor CARs from previous surveillance audits have been reviewed and closed prior to the issuance of a certificate.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Major CARs were issued to the FME during the evaluation and the FME has not yet satisfactorily closed all Major CARs.

4.2.3 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations

Finding Number: 2016.1	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify): June 30 th , 2016
FSC Indicator:	1.6.c
Background: “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.” The annual data update form submitted to SCS prior to the audit listed the same acreages for the FMU as did the form in 2015. When questioned during the audit, a staff member produced a listing of state forest lands that included some new acquisitions.	
Observation: BSLM often acquires new parcels of state forests, but there does not appear to be a consistent practice of reporting changes in ownership to the Certifying Body. Recognizing that it is not clear what defines “significant changes,” the FME should establish a clear procedure for such reporting.	
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	FME provided an updated <i>State Forest Acreage Handbook</i> , August 2017 during the 2017 audit.
SCS review	Selections throughout the handbook were examined during the audit and confirmed with staff. New properties were identified and confirmed to be in the Handbook. DEC has set up systems to consistently report changes in ownership.
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: 2016.2	
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 type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input checked="" 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:	9.4.a
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): FME did not close Finding 2015.2. BSLM did not provide sufficient information to document a program of annual monitoring of HCVFs.	
Corrective Action Request: BSLM shall address the system of annual monitoring of HCVFs and devise, if necessary, a more formal protocol for monitoring and reporting.	
FME response October 2016 (including any evidence submitted)	The auditor was informed verbally that the Section Chief had sent a memo (only shortly before the annual audit) to Regional Offices asking that they report any and all monitoring activities in HCVF.
SCS review October 2016	BSLM did not take this CAR seriously. Even if the Regional Offices fully comply with the request to document monitoring in HCVFs, the Bureau has not addressed the need to develop a consistent program of monitoring “the status of specific HCV attributes.” The CAR is sustained.

<p>FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i></p>	<p>Monitoring of <u>Special Treatment Areas (STA) and Rare Communities (RC) HCVFs:</u> These two HCVF types will be monitored by the NYS Natural Heritage Program (NYNHP) (see attached proposal). The NHP will monitor all of these HCVFs (287 STAs and 50 RCs) over a 5-year period as outlined in the attached proposal. Monitoring data and associated information for these HCVF types will be entered into NYNHP databases and then summarized and made available via NYNHP data layers using the DEC GIS Data Selector tool. A table listing and summarizing yearly HCVF monitoring visits on state forests and cooperator data received will be included as a section in an October progress report to DEC’s Division of Lands and Forests on work conducted for the Division throughout the year. Draft management recommendations will be made after data have been processed and analyzed as needed with an attachment covering any specific management and protection recommendations for surveyed HCVFs included as an attachment to an April progress report. Division of Lands and Forests staff will review the draft management recommendations to ensure they are consistent with State Land management policies and compatible with our Forest Certification program prior to finalizing any recommendations.</p> <p>Monitoring of <u>Watershed HCVFs:</u> Forest harvesting within a watershed has been found to increase stream flows and nutrient exports. It is widely recognized that maintaining an intact forest canopy contributes positively to both watershed protection and, subsequently, water quality. A study in central New Brunswick (<i>Watershed responses to clear-cutting: Effects on soil solutions and stream water discharge in central New Brunswick</i>, Jewett, et al. 1995) reveals that approximately 10-12 years are required for complete hydrological rehabilitation following clearcutting, however, most of the recovery occurs within the first 4 to 5 years’ post-harvest.</p> <p>In order to protect 116 designated Watershed Protection HCVFs the NYS Division of Lands and Forests (DLF) will manage these HCVFs where no more than 30% of a particular Watershed Protection HCVF will be clearcut in a 10-year period. A clearcut is considered “contiguous treatment area that either does not have adequate, desirable advanced regeneration or 75% or more of the adequate, desirable advanced regeneration is less than five feet tall,” as defined by DEC Program Policy ONR-DLF-3 “Clearcutting on State Forests” (attached). Deviations from this guideline may be allowed under extenuating circumstances such as forest health concerns (insect/disease outbreak), wind/weather damage or habitat management for rare, threatened or endangered species and species of greatest conservation need.</p> <p>Additionally, during all timber harvesting operations and construction projects, staff are already required to adhere to the DLF’s “Rules for Establishment of Special Management Zones on State Forests and Wildlife Management Areas” (attached) and “State Forest Rutting Guidelines” and follow the guidelines presented in the “New York State Forestry BMPs for Water Quality Field Guide” (BMP Field Guide) to protect water resources and mitigate erosion potential.</p> <p>A baseline assessment will be conducted for each HCVF to determine the percentage of each that has been clearcut within the past 10 years by September 2017. A reassessment will be conducted prior to annual surveillance or re-certification audits to assess compliance.</p>
--	--

	<p>Monitoring of Cultural Heritage HCVFs:</p> <p>In 2009, the NYS DEC issued Commissioner Policy 42 (CP-42) “Contact, Cooperation, and Consultation with Indian Nations” (attached). Specifically, “this policy formally recognizes that relations between the Department and Indian Nations will be conducted on a government-to-government basis, identifies the protocols to be followed by Department staff in working with Indian Nations and endorses the development of cooperative agreements between the Department and Indian Nations to address environmental and cultural resource issues of mutual concern.”</p> <p>During the development of Unit Management Plans (and their subsequent updates every 10 years) and prior to undertaking management actions where Indian Nations may have an interest, individual nations are solicited for comments. Additionally, the Unit Management Planning process affords the general public and local municipalities alike an opportunity for public review and comment on draft UMPs prior to their final adoption.</p> <p>Pertaining to additional monitoring of cultural resources, field staff routinely review the NYS DEC “Archeological Sites of Sensitivity” GIS data layer to assess potential impacts to these resources during the planning of timber sales or other active management. A follow up consultation with the NYSDEC Historic Preservation Officer is conducted when the presence of a sensitive site is indicated via a GIS review. In areas where appropriate, a Tribal Historic Preservation Officer may be consulted so that they can indicate whether there is a resource concern or interest where we do not have that information.</p> <p>In order to formally document this review, our “Prescription for State Land Timber Harvests” template will be revised by May 2017 to include information regarding the presence of and planned protection measures of cultural resources identified through GIS review as well as on the ground field observations noted during project reconnaissance. Additionally, our Strategic Plan for State Forest Management states: “Timber harvesting, well site construction and recreational activities that would impact historic properties should be avoided. Haul roads, skid trails, landings, trailheads and parking areas should not be located in the vicinity of historic resources that might be damaged by such activities. A <i>do-no-harm</i> approach should be applied where possible artifacts are identified, until such time as a full archeological review can be conducted to establish the true nature of the find.”</p>
<p>SCS review</p>	<p>To support its summary response, FME provided an HCVF monitoring protocol developed in cooperation with the New York Natural Heritage Program. Monitoring methods and timelines are described therein. Some examples of supporting documents and policies were also provided, such as the communications with tribes and applying the clearcut policy. FME has demonstrated that it has a framework in place to systematically monitor HCV attributes over time to ensure that measures are effective and that HCVs are being protected.</p>
<p>Status of CAR:</p>	<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>

4.2.4 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations

Finding Number: 2017.1	
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/recertification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 12 months or next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Observation – response is optional <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC US FM, 3.2.b
<p>Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):</p> <p>The FME’s policy, <i>Contact, Cooperation, and Consultation with Indian Nations (CP-42)</i>, requires that the NY DEC undertake good faith efforts to consult with Indian Nations on any Department decision or action which could foreseeably have Indian Nation implications. During discussions with NY DEC staff, the auditors learned that the level of consultation with Indian Nations at the local level varies across the state. For example, Region 6 staff confirmed that no effort was made to contact Indian Nations as part of developing the Oneida Hills UMP. Discussions with staff in other regions suggest that not all employees are aware of the requirement for consulting with Indian Nations on forest management planning; this observation and the variability in consultation was confirmed by state-level staff.</p> <p>At the state level, there seems to be a commitment to building relationships with Indian Nations. For example, since 2015 the Office of Environmental Justice has held an Annual DEC/Indian Nations Leaders Meeting to discuss mutual interests. In addition, there is a mechanism in place at the state level for Indian Nations to submit issues/complaints: the Indian Nations Affairs Coordinator forwards issues/complaints to the appropriate subsection in the NY DEC and ensures resolution. However, this awareness of the need to consult with Indian Nations is not reflected at the local level. Consultation with Indian Nations affected by the FMU’s management operations, regardless of whether they own property within or adjacent to lands managed by NY DEC, must be completed in order to comply with the FSC Standard.</p>	
<p>Corrective Action Request (or Observation):</p> <p>Demonstrable actions must be taken so that forest management does not adversely affect tribal resources. When applicable, evidence of, and measures for, protecting tribal resources must be incorporated in the management plan. This applies to tribal resources that may be located either within or off the FMU, but are affected by management operations within the FMU (for example, effects on fish and game populations).</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: 2017.2	
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/recertification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 12 months or next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Observation – response is optional <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC US FM 4.2a and 4.2b
<p>Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):</p> <p>Isolated and minor safety issues were observed during the 2017 audit. Overall, the DEC has a functioning health and safety system with policies and procedures that are well developed and largely understood by staff, as observed and confirmed through interviews during the audit. Several types of safety training are offered and completed by staff as confirmed by review of training records. However, retirements over the last several years combined with a growing body of new staff (either full-time or part-time, temporary) have contributed to gaps in understanding and/or following DEC safety procedures. Individually these gaps may be isolated and minor but in combination warrant a Minor finding.</p> <p>Over several Regions, the PPE available to and being used by staff was not consistent. DEC has not clearly determined and communicated to all staff which PPE is required for job functions such as active timber sales. For example, the required use of hard hats on active timber sales and what defines an “active timber sale” was poorly understood by staff. See DEC SOP B-11, Log landing Timber Harvest Jobsite Awareness Training. This DEC procedure suggests steel-toed boots, hi-vis vests, and safety glasses should be used for active timber sale sites and requirement for use were generally not understood consistently by forestry staff. Auditors encountered staff with inadequate knowledge of requirements or use of available PPE across all Regions.</p> <p>Finally, indicator 4.2, including full intent and guidance, requires machinery and equipment be well-maintained and in working order for worker safety. Vehicles available to forestry staff must be in working order to access and work in sometimes remote and difficult terrain (off-road). During the audit there was an example of a vehicle in poor working condition that was obtained as a temporary loan vehicle while the two other primary field vehicles were in for repairs (X010224). This also highlights potential inadequacies around replacement and maintenance programs for state vehicles. Noted that vehicle breakdown was experienced during prior audits.</p>	
<p>Corrective Action Request (or Observation):</p> <p>The NY DEC must meet or exceed all applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of employees and their families. The forest owner or manager and their employees and contractors must demonstrate a safe work environment. Applicable in this case is understanding of the full intent and guidance provided in the FSC US Forest Management Standard (2010) under indicators 4.2.b and 4.2.c.</p>	

FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	11/21/2017: DEC provided additional information following the audit. There is a Commissioner Policy (CP) 61 / DEC Vehicle Policy outlining the vehicle replacement requirements. Additionally, correspondence from the Chief of the Bureau of Transportation Services, Division of Operations confirms to me that “While DLF may not have control over when new vehicles are allocated, [DEC staff] does have the ability to voice prioritized needs for replacement, up through the Division Director, who would then provide the info to DLF for consideration when developing the next vehicle purchase plan.” DEC requested this nonconformance as vehicle replacement is something our Division ultimately has no control over. DEC concludes that they do not have authority for directly acquiring new vehicles but only for requesting new ones.
SCS review	11/21/2017: The Minor CAR remains open. For the first issue, although the PPE discussions in the field and interviews revolved around suggested PPE, the primary issue was lack of knowledge by staff of what PPE should be used versus what is required. Auditors conclude that such knowledge is important for demonstrating a safe work environment. For the second issue, DEC may not have direct authority over vehicle purchases however field staff is either unaware of procedures for requesting new vehicles or there is some other breakdown in DEC system for such requests and NY DLF replacements such that unsafe vehicles are being used in the field.
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i>

Finding Number: 2017.3	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification/recertification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 12 months or next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Observation – response is optional <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC US FM 7.3.a
Non-Conformity <i>(or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):</i> This indicator requires that loggers and other operators participate in informal and formal training, such as Forest Industry Safety Training Alliance, Game of Logging and similar programs. The DEC requires harvest operators be certified through the Trained Logger Certification (TLC) program. Details for this program may be found here, http://www.newyorkloggertraining.org/ . An incident was reported that identifies a gap in the DEC process. DEC Timber contracts require a TLC logger be present on-site during harvest operations. A TLC logger, although confirmed as certified prior to start of the logging job, left the job site leaving only a Trainee logger. An injury occurred and subsequent investigation discovered the logger certification had expired.	

Corrective Action Request (or Observation): Forest workers shall receive adequate training and supervision to ensure proper implementation of the management plan. Workers must be qualified to properly implement the management plan; all forest workers are provided with sufficient guidance and supervision to adequately implement their respective components of the plan.	
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2017.4	
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/recertification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 12 months or next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Observation – response is optional <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC US FM 8.2.d.1
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): Isolated and minor situations were observed during this audit around BMPs. Examples of BMP issues observed in the field included non-conforming stump heights, cross-drains, and water bars (across two Regions). Stumps heights did not follow contract requirements and although interviews describe measures taken with the logger to correct the issue, it was not documented (Contract # X010426). Further reviews across several Regions discovered inconsistent recording measures taken by forestry staff and overall insufficient documentation for monitoring purposes. Issues with cross-drains (X010426, X010432) and water bars (X010426, X010313) were noted. Completion Reports, which are evidence of ensuring BMP conformance where harvest operations take place, were not supplied when requested. For example the DEC was not able to provide a Completion Report for Pittstown State Forest: Stand C-9.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): 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. Short-term impacts must be monitored during and at the close of operations. Long-term impacts must be monitored at an appropriate length of time after the operation to ensure that protection measures (e.g., water bars) are stable and functioning until protection measures are determined to be stable and effective.	
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	

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

Finding Number: 2017.5	
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/recertification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 12 months or next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Observation – response is optional <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC-STD-50-001, 1.15
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): The standard timber sale contract template used by the NY DEC includes the use of “FSC” without the corresponding trademark symbol. The DEC website and all other reviewed materials and documents used correct trademark symbology.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): The use of the FSC “checkmark-and-tree” logo shall be directly accompanied by the trademark symbols ® or ™ (in superscript font). The symbol, which represents the registration status of an FSC trademark in the country in which FSC certified products or materials are to be distributed, is an intrinsic part of the logo. The appropriate symbol shall also be added to “FSC” or “Forest Stewardship Council” for the first use in any text. The registration status of the FSC trademarks for the US is listed in Annex 1.	
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. Certification Decision

Certification Recommendation	
FME be awarded FSC certification as a “Well-Managed Forest” subject to the minor corrective action requests stated in Section 4.2.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
The SCS evaluation team makes the above recommendation for certification based on the full and proper execution of the SCS Forest Conservation Program evaluation protocols. If certification is recommended, the FME has satisfactorily demonstrated the following without exception:	
FME has addressed any Major CAR(s) assigned during the evaluation.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>

<p>FME has demonstrated that their system of management is capable of ensuring that all of the requirements of the applicable standards (see Section 1.6 of this report) are met over the forest area covered by the scope of the evaluation.</p>	<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>FME has demonstrated that the described system of management is being implemented consistently over the forest area covered by the scope of the certificate.</p>	<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Comments:</p>	

SECTION B – APPENDICES (CONFIDENTIAL)

Appendix 1 – Current and Projected Annual Harvest for Main Commercial Species



sustainableharvestth
reshold.pdf



Statewide BSLM 1st
+ 2nd + 3rd & 4th Qr

Appendix 2 – List of FMUs Selected for Evaluation

- FME consists of a single FMU
 FME consists of multiple FMUs or is a Group

Appendix 3 – List of Stakeholders Consulted

List of FME Staff Consulted

See Appendix 7 for FME Staff Consulted, Opening, Field, and Closing meeting sign in sheets.

List of other Stakeholders Consulted

Name	Organization	Contact Information	Consultation method	Requests Cert. Notf.
See Master Stakeholder List maintained by SCS				

Appendix 4 – Additional Evaluation Techniques Employed

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

Appendix 5 – Certification Standard Conformance Table

C= Conformance with Criterion or Indicator
C/NC= Overall Conformance with Criterion, but there are Indicator nonconformances
NC= Nonconformance with Criterion or Indicator
NA= Not Applicable

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

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

<p>1.1.a Forest management plans and operations demonstrate compliance with all applicable federal, state, county, municipal, and tribal laws, and administrative requirements (e.g., regulations). Violations, outstanding complaints or investigations are provided to the Certifying Body (CB) during the annual audit.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The legal framework for management of state forest lands in New York is found in the Strategic Plan for State Forest Management (<i>Strategic Plan</i>) (e.g., pages 33 and 317) and is referenced in each Unit Management Plan (UMP). The Strategic Plan may be found in its entirety here, http://www.dec.ny.gov/lands/64567.html. Also, each UMP includes an appendix outlining compliance with the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA). No evidence of non-compliance with applicable statutes was submitted to auditors, or otherwise detected.</p>
<p>1.1.b To facilitate legal compliance, the forest owner or manager ensures that employees and contractors, commensurate with their responsibilities, are duly informed about applicable laws and regulations.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Central office personnel provided several examples of mechanisms used to inform employees about applicable statutes. Examples were provided on the internal website (In-Site) used for reference, and from specific training exercises. Interviews with new employees confirmed such training.</p>
<p>1.2. All applicable and legally prescribed fees, royalties, taxes and other charges shall be paid.</p>		
<p>1.2.a The forest owner or manager provides written evidence that all applicable and legally prescribed fees, royalties, taxes and other charges are being paid in a timely manner. If payment is beyond the control of the landowner or manager, then there is evidence that every attempt at payment was made.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>State forest lands are subject to local property taxes. Taxes are paid by the NYS Department of Taxation and Finance. A spreadsheet detailing such payments for every parcel of state forest land was provided to auditors.</p> <p>By statute the DEC pays taxes on reforestation areas. Three Town, County, School taxes only pay Town and School. Amounts calculated by Department of Taxation and finance on a per acre basis.</p>
<p>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.</p>		
<p>1.3.a. Forest management plans and operations comply with relevant provisions of all applicable binding international agreements.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>New York State is a hub for international trade, and thus has substantial law enforcement capabilities, both federal and state. On state forests, the Divisions of Law Enforcement and Forest Protection assist with compliance.</p>
<p>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.</p>		
<p>1.4.a. Situations in which compliance with laws or regulations conflicts with compliance with FSC Principles, Criteria or Indicators are documented and referred to the CB.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>No such conflicts have occurred between FSC and the FME.</p>
<p>1.5. Forest management areas should be protected from illegal harvesting, settlement and other unauthorized activities.</p>		

<p>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).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>UMPs present known cases of disputes over property ownership and/or property rights and efforts to resolve them. Boundary lines are maintained (inspected in the field on several occasions), and appropriate signs are posted and maintained. Gated roads and trails are common.</p> <p>Gates and signs are used effectively to prevent unauthorized activities. Gates and signs were observed during on-site visits to regions visited in 2017. This FME maintains support from conservation officers and rangers who patrol the FME and from legal counsel.</p>
<p>1.5.b. If illegal or unauthorized activities occur, the forest owner or manager implements actions designed to curtail such activities and correct the situation to the extent possible for meeting all land management objectives with consideration of available resources.</p>		<p>Environmental Conservation Officers (ECOs) and Forest Rangers are available for enforcement and are well-staffed. DEC maintains a robust staff of attorneys in Central Office and Regional Offices to pursue illegal actions and conflicts.</p>
<p>1.6. Forest managers shall demonstrate a long-term commitment to adhere to the FSC Principles and Criteria.</p>		
<p>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.</p>		<p>DEC web page has a detailed statement of commitment to FSC principles and to the management of the FMU in conformance to the standards. The Deputy Commissioner conveyed this commitment on behalf of the new DEC Commissioner.</p>
<p>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.</p>		<p>BSLM has consistently excluded two of eight regions near NYC that no forest management. The Bureau also excludes Forest Preserve lands, consistent with the State Constitution.</p>
<p>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.</p>		<p>The annual data update form submitted to SCS prior to the audit listed the same acreages for the FMU as did the form in 2015. When questioned during the audit, a staff member produced a listing of state forest lands that included some new acquisitions. BSLM often acquires new parcels of state forests, but there does not appear to be a consistent practice of reporting changes in ownership to the Certifying Body. Recognizing that it is not clear what defines “significant changes,” the FME should establish a clear procedure for such reporting.</p> <p>Bureau of Real Property (RPP) tracks all of DEC acquisitions DEC SLIM, State Lands Interactive Mapper.</p>
<p>Principle #2: Long-term tenure and use rights to the land and forest resources shall be clearly defined, documented and legally established.</p>		

<p>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.</p>		
<p>2.1.a The forest owner or manager provides clear evidence of <i>long-term</i> rights to use and manage the FMU for the purposes described in the management plan.</p>	C	NY DEC has a Bureau of Real Property functions job is to verify property boundaries and ownership.
<p>2.1.b The forest owner or manager identifies and documents legally established use and access rights associated with the FMU that are held by other parties.</p>	C	Bureau of Real Property maintains records of deeded rights for use and access. Such records are clearly researched in the process of preparing and revising UMPs (e.g., Shawangunk Ridge UMP in Region 3.
<p>2.1.c Boundaries of land ownership and use rights are clearly identified on the ground and on maps prior to commencing management activities in the vicinity of the boundaries.</p>	C	Boundary lines are well maintained, and special uses are clearly posted by signs. Numerous examples were observed during audit for 2017.
<p>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. <i>Applicability Note: For the planning and management of publicly owned forests, the local community is defined as all residents and property owners of the relevant jurisdiction.</i></p>		
<p>2.2.a The forest owner or manager allows the exercise of <i>tenure</i> and <i>use rights</i> allowable by law or regulation.</p>	C	Examples of such allowances were discussed in the Central Office.
<p>2.2.b In FMUs where tenure or use rights held by others exist, the forest owner or manager consults with groups that hold such rights so that management activities do not significantly impact the uses or benefits of such rights.</p>	C	Many such examples on NY state forests, but perhaps no better example than Stewart State Forest, where farmland is still leased to former owners. In several Regions, many similar situations exist, e.g., bicycle trails and hunting camps. See site notes.
<p>2.3. Appropriate mechanisms shall be employed to resolve disputes over tenure claims and use rights. The circumstances and status of any outstanding disputes will be explicitly considered in the certification evaluation. Disputes of substantial magnitude involving a significant number of interests will normally disqualify an operation from being certified.</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	Most tenure claims relate to property boundaries, but significant boundaries have all been surveyed and marked, so disputes usually are settled within the regions where the properties occur. If necessary, DEC has adequate legal staff to address more serious disputes. Bureau Chief related several examples of ongoing trespass disputes and their resolution.
<p>2.3.b The forest owner or manager documents any significant disputes over tenure and use rights.</p>	C	Files that document past disputes are available in regional offices visited during the audit.
<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>		Tribal forests are not included in this FMU.

<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>	<p>C</p>	<p>Tribal forests are not included in this FMU.</p>
<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>	<p>C</p>	<p>Tribal forests are not included in this FMU.</p>
<p>3.2. Forest management shall not threaten or diminish, either directly or indirectly, the resources or tenure rights of indigenous peoples.</p>		
<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>	<p>C</p>	<p>Auditors interviewed David Witt, Indian Nation Affairs Coordinator, Office of Environmental Justice. Among other initiatives, the DEC conducts annual meetings with Indian Nations.</p>
<p>3.2.b Demonstrable actions are taken so that forest management does not adversely affect tribal resources. When applicable, evidence of, and measures for, protecting tribal resources are incorporated in the management plan.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>See Minor CAR 2017.1 for detail.</p>
<p>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.</p>		
<p>3.3.a. The forest owner or manager invites consultation with tribal representatives in identifying sites of current or traditional cultural, archeological, ecological, economic or religious significance.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Public hearings notices including meetings to discuss proposed management actions by this FME are mailed to representatives of tribal groups as confirmed through stakeholder interviews and contact list review. The FME understands that updates to the contact list for tribal representatives is periodically required and continues to work on this list. The FME continue to use mailings and electronic notifications to reach stakeholders.</p>
<p>3.3.b In consultation with tribal representatives, the forest owner or manager develops measures to protect or enhance areas of special significance (see also Criterion 9.1).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Public hearing and management review notices including meetings to discuss proposed management actions by this FME are mailed to representatives of tribal groups. To date, tribal groups have not suggested measures to protect or enhance areas of special significance.</p> <p>As confirmed through interviews with a cultural resource specialist and review of GIS data layers, areas of special significance have been identified throughout the state of New York (mostly on private land) and this layer is available to land managers who consult with the Historic Preservation Officer when areas of special significance overlap with active management prescriptions.</p>
<p>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</p>		

operations. This compensation shall be formally agreed upon with their free and informed consent before forest operations commence.		
3.4.a The forest owner or manager identifies whether traditional knowledge in forest management is being used.	C	Traditional knowledge has not been used.
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.	C	Traditional knowledge has not been used.
3.4.c The forest owner or manager respects the confidentiality of tribal traditional knowledge and assists in the protection of such knowledge.	C	Traditional knowledge has not been used.
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.		
4.1.a Employee compensation and hiring practices meet or exceed the prevailing local norms within the forestry industry.	C	Full time employee compensation packages include competitive wages, benefits, training and decision-making opportunities. As confirmed through interviews and observations, 80% employees work 80% of a work week and often remain in these positions for a long period of time while waiting for a permanent vacancy to occur. This FME has developed measures to ensure that these employees’ actual duties remain within their job descriptions.
4.1.b Forest work is offered in ways that create high quality job opportunities for employees.	C	Safety expectations and requirements are specified in all contracts; auditors found conformance by all contractors interviewed.
4.1.c Forest workers are provided with fair wages.	C	Logging contractors are the most common service providers. They are selected through well-established bidding processes with detailed contract provisions. New York Logger Training – Trained Logger Certification requirement in Timber Sale Contracts. (sample <i>Notice of Sale of Forest Products</i> Article XIII)
4.1.d Hiring practices and conditions of employment are non-discriminatory and follow applicable federal, state and local regulations.	C	Interviews with a variety of employees confirm that hiring practices and conditions are in compliance with applicable laws and regulations. Posters observed in the work rooms of offices during the 2017 audit included the FME’s written policy and demonstrated commitment to comply with equal employment opportunities, anti-discrimination and anti-harassment measures, workers’ compensation, right to know, prevailing wages, workers’ right to organize and occupational health and safety.
4.1.e The forest owner or manager provides work opportunities to qualified local applicants and seeks opportunities for purchasing local goods and services of equal price and quality.	C	Some bid opportunities are small contracts that work effectively as local opportunities. In addition, in the several western regions, local logging contractors bid on harvest projects and in turn sell logs to local Amish mills.

		Bath office area example of offering smaller sales for smaller operators.
4.1.f Commensurate with the size and scale of operation, the forest owner or manager provides and/or supports learning opportunities to improve public understanding of forests and forest management.	C	Public meetings and interpretive trails are used to improve public understanding for forests and forest management. Kiosks were also observed in some state forests and provide an opportunity for users to pick up new information about the state forest. In addition, the use of informal informational signs was observed in the past in association with management activities in some locations including Cold Spring Brook State Forest's herbicide treatment of the non-native plant, Pale Swallowwort (<i>Cynanchum rossicum</i>).
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.	C	Foresters participate in logger training workshops, environmental education and outreach and local advisory committees. Specific recent examples also include participation in the outdoor writers association meeting, Lewis/Jefferson/Duchess county envirothon, Lewis/Jefferson county conservation field days, State fair exhibit staffing, forestry awareness day, Dutchess county fair exhibits, eagle scout lean-to project on state land and earth day booth at the Albany Office. Stakeholder comments in the past indicate a high level of staff engagement in local community activities.
4.2. Forest management should meet or exceed all applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of employees and their families.		
4.2.a The forest owner or manager meets or exceeds all applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of employees and their families (also see Criterion 1.1).	N (2017.2)	NY State has a well-developed bureaucracy that establishes appropriate laws and regulations for safety, and there is, in general evidence of conformance by BSLM employees. However, see Minor CAR 2017.2 for additional detail.
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.	N (2017.2)	Timber sale contracts and employee handbooks were examined during the audit to confirm that expectations for safety were specified. Auditors found consistency in the Notice of Sale requirements and compliance by the one contractor interviewed on site. However, for employees see Minor CAR 2017.2 for additional detail.
4.2.c The forest owner or manager hires well-qualified service providers to safely implement the management plan.	C	Logging contractors are the most common service providers. They are selected through well-established bidding processes with detailed contract provisions. Trained Logger Certification is a requirement in Timber Sale Contracts. Interviews on-site and separate confirmations with logger training programs confirmed.
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>4.3.a Forest workers are free to associate with other workers for the purpose of advocating for their own employment interests.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The workers’ rights to organize are understood as confirmed through interviews; posters that explain these rights were observed posted in a variety of workplace locations including for example Regions 9 and 8.</p>
<p>4.3.b The forest owner or manager has effective and culturally sensitive mechanisms to resolve disputes between workers and management.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Standard union negotiation processes provide effective mechanisms for conformance with this section of the standard. Interviews with management and employees in region 8 and 9 confirmed that mechanisms are in place.</p>
<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>		
<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, historical and community significance (on and off the FMU); • Public resources, including air, water and food (hunting, fishing, collecting); • Aesthetics; • Community goals for forest and natural resource use and protection such as employment, subsistence, recreation and health; • Community economic opportunities; • Other people who may be affected by management operations. <p>A summary is available to the CB.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>This FME completed a Summary Report of the New York State Social Impact Assessment of State Land Management during summer 2012 that was based on a survey of user groups. This FME also maintains a system for notifying the public, receiving comments and incorporating comments into management plans and proposed activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The social impacts associated with archeological sites are minimized through consultation with tribal groups and consultation with Chuck Vandrei, Historic Preservation Officer for the Division of Lands and Forests who maintains a database of known cultural sites and provides this information to staff during the Unit Management Planning process. This information is also incorporated into a GIS data layer as confirmed during a demonstration of the GIS system. The Strategic Plan for SF Management (p. 137, 181) includes sections on archeological, cultural, historical and community resources. • The Strategic Plan for SF Management (for example p. 107, 181, 189-192) includes sections on air, water and subsistence resources. Each unit management plan incorporates local details into the text. • The Strategic Plan for SF Management (p. 125) and each unit management plan include a section on visual and aesthetic resources. Aesthetic considerations were specifically incorporated into roadside harvest operations observed during field visits to contract # X008350, X009355, X008999 and X009379. • The Strategic Plan for SF Management (p. 181, 243) includes sections on supporting local communities. Each unit management plan

		<p>incorporates local details into the text including for example the Six Nations Unit Management Plan (p. 81) that describes that gates on 2 roads continue to be opened for hunting season and a description for example fishing opportunities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Strategic Plan for SF Management (p. 243) includes a section on community economic opportunities. A variety of timber harvest project sizes are designed to provide local opportunities including for example smaller (“local”) sales that were visited during this audit program in association with contract # X009187, X009000 and TX009305. • The Strategic Plan for SF Management (for example p. 171-244) includes a section for example on public/permitted uses including for example universal access, motorized access for people with disabilities, formal and informal partnerships. For example during the implementation of contract X009329, staff recognized previously existing skid trails that are currently used for recreation (mountain bikes). The local forester worked with recreation club in relation to the timing of this activity and the location of these trails. In another example, contract # X008044 a signed recreation trail (hiking) was relocated during active operation and then re-opened in the original location. The section of hiking trail that crossed this now complete salvage operation was hiked by audit team to confirm the conditions are acceptable. <p>The Summary Report of the New York State Social Impact Assessment of State Land Management was presented and reviewed and includes a review of the likely social benefits and concerns of management activities.</p> <p>As a state agency, BSLM relies on input from the public and to asses social impacts of resource management. Social impacts are addressed in the <i>Strategic Plan</i>, and in detail as UMPs are revised. A summary can be found on public DEC web pages.</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>	<p>C</p>	<p>This FME maintains a system for notifying the public for example of proposed management activities and planning documents in conformance with the requirements of 4.4a and 4.4b. This step is completed during the draft planning process and again in each final plan. Written comments and FME responses are incorporated into Unit Management Plan documents. FME responses were reviewed and</p>

		<p>reflected well on the agency’s ability to consider input effectively.</p> <p>BSLM seeks input from the public at all levels of planning, especially in development of Unit Management Plans (public process discussed during audit in Regions 3 and 5).</p> <p>Stakeholder comments and responses are found in appendices of each UMP, e.g., Shawangunk Ridge UMP, and these were illustrated in a field visit to Roosa Gap SF.</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>	<p>C</p>	<p>This FME maintains a system for notifying the public for example of proposed management activities. This step is completed during the draft planning process and again in each final plan. Written comments and FME responses are incorporated into Unit Management Plan documents for example. FME responses were reviewed and confirmed the agency’s ability to consider input effectively.</p> <p>Foresters interviewed on site visits indicated that they use judgement in determining the level of contact with nearby landowners prior to any harvesting activities. Most commonly, landowners observe activities of foresters during sale layout and take the initiative to inquire about planned management. This was the case on Duketown SF in Region 5, where forester discussed some concerns by neighboring property owners and his concessions to address these concerns.</p>
<p>4.4.d For <i>public forests</i>, 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>	<p>C</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This FME maintains a system for notifying the public for example of proposed management activities and planning documents. This step is completed during the draft planning process and again in each final plan. A draft schedule of harvest plans is included within each draft and final unit management plan. Kiosks are also used in some SFs and provide an opportunity for users to provide a response directly to SF staff. SFs offices are also open to the public and provide another accessible location for comment. 2. This FME generally uses a 30-day public comment period. For example, the notification of the Six Nations meeting was mailed on 12/15/08 in advance of the 1/22/09 meeting and the notification of the Hemlock-Canadice meeting was mailed on 9/27/10 in advance of the 10/26/10 meeting. 3. This FME’s appeals processes are transparent and affordable. For example, the agency website includes a section for public involvement

		<p>including links to “have a question?”; “make your voice heard”; “find out what is happening”; “public access to DEC documents” and “more about public involvement and news”.</p> <p>Written comments and FME responses are incorporated into Unit Management Plan Appendix A. For example, the Six Nations Unit Management Plan includes a summary of the FME’s response (pp 141-156).; FME responses were reviewed and reflected well on the agency’s ability to consider input effectively. Draft unit management plans and final unit management plans are available electronically on the FME’s website and in hard copy.</p> <p>See 4.4a-c: BSLM staff are aware of the importance of consulting with the public. The DEC has clearly defined processes for appeals from the public. All UMPs include summary of public comments and responses to them.</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>		
<p>4.5.a The forest owner or manager does not engage in negligent activities that cause damage to other people.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>A variety of management plans, implemented management activities and other documents described elsewhere in this report were reviewed. Management activities were reviewed on-site; negligent activities were not found.</p>
<p>4.5.b The forest owner or manager provides a known and accessible means for interested stakeholders to voice grievances and have them resolved. If significant disputes arise related to resolving grievances and/or providing fair compensation, the forest owner or manager follows appropriate dispute resolution procedures. At a minimum, the forest owner or manager maintains open communications, responds to grievances in a timely manner, demonstrates ongoing good faith efforts to resolve the grievances, and maintains records of legal suites and claims.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Comments and responses are received for example on the FME’s website, at regional offices, at Kiosks, during public meetings and at the state office. FME responses were reviewed and reflected well on the agency’s ability to consider input effectively. As confirmed through unit management plan review and including public comment that are published as part of each plan, a relatively high level of satisfaction exists as a result of public comment period associated for example with the unit management planning process.</p> <p>This FME has a clear process for resolving grievances and providing compensation. Grievances that have been filed in recent years have been resolved by regional managers, have not been significant and have not been elevated to the state office.</p>
<p>4.5.c Fair compensation or reasonable mitigation is provided to local people, communities or adjacent</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>None reported or discovered during the audit. Management activities were reviewed on-site; negligent activities were not found.</p>

landowners for substantiated damage or loss of income caused by the landowner or manager.		
Principle #5: Forest management operations shall encourage the efficient use of the forest’s multiple products and services to ensure economic viability and a wide range of environmental and social benefits.		
5.1. Forest management should strive toward economic viability, while taking into account the full environmental, social, and operational costs of production, and ensuring the investments necessary to maintain the ecological productivity of the forest.		
5.1.a The forest owner or manager is financially able to implement core management activities, including all those environmental, social and operating costs, required to meet this Standard, and investment and reinvestment in forest management.	C	New York State is solvent and capable of implementing core management activities. There have been numerous retirements in recent years and although some have been filled others are on hold for budgetary considerations.
5.1.b Responses to short-term financial factors are limited to levels that are consistent with fulfillment of this Standard.	C	Even though BSLM was short-handed for several years during the recent financial crisis, existing personnel were still able to carry on operations consistent with the Standard.
5.2. Forest management and marketing operations should encourage the optimal use and local processing of the forest’s diversity of products.		
5.2.a Where forest products are harvested or sold, opportunities for forest product sales and services are given to local harvesters, value-added processing and manufacturing facilities, guiding services, and other operations that are able to offer services at competitive rates and levels of service.	C	All products sold from certified lands are offered on a bid basis after public advertisement and bidder notification. The only “products” sold from certified state lands include standing timber and leased rights to maple sap.
5.2.b The forest owner or manager takes measures to optimize the use of harvested forest products and explores product diversification where appropriate and consistent with management objectives.	C	Because BSLM, by law, sells timber on the stump by bid, the agency has little say about the disposition of products. However, the variety of timber advertised for bid ensures a diversity of products.
5.2.c On public lands where forest products are harvested and sold, some sales of forest products or contracts are scaled or structured to allow small business to bid competitively.	C	Sales less than \$10,000 are offered as “local sales”, as opposed to “revenue sales.” Operators of individually owned businesses were interviewed during the audit.
5.3. Forest management should minimize waste associated with harvesting and on-site processing operations and avoid damage to other forest resources.		
5.3.a Management practices are employed to minimize the loss and/or waste of harvested forest products.	C	BSLM’s <i>Notice of Sale</i> specifies proper use of products, confirmed by field visits where efficient use was noted.
5.3.b Harvest practices are managed to protect residual trees and other forest resources, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • soil compaction, <i>rutting</i> and erosion are minimized; • residual trees are not significantly damaged to the extent that health, growth, or values are noticeably affected; • damage to NTFPs is minimized during management activities; and 	C	BSLM’s <i>Notice of Sale</i> includes language to restrict rutting of soil, damage to residual trees, stone walls, recreational trails, etc. See Sections VI Log Landings; VII Access System; VII Harvesting for examples. The field audit confirmed compliance with such conditions.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> techniques and equipment that minimize impacts to vegetation, soil, and water are used whenever feasible. 		
<p>5.4. Forest management should strive to strengthen and diversify the local economy, avoiding dependence on a single forest product.</p>		
<p>5.4.a The forest owner or manager demonstrates knowledge of their operation’s effect on the local economy as it relates to existing and potential markets for a wide variety of timber and non-timber forest products and services.</p>	C	Interviews with staff in regional offices confirmed close connections with local stakeholders and concern for the local economy. Revenue versus informal sales are designed specifically to ensure small sales are available for smaller operations.
<p>5.4.b The forest owner or manager strives to diversify the economic use of the forest according to Indicator 5.4.a.</p>	C	The <i>Strategic Plan</i> (pages 245-248) addresses the topic of supporting local communities through a variety of uses of public land. An entire chapter (Chap. 5) addresses public uses. Several individual <i>Unit Management Plans</i> (UMPs) provide more specific information.
<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>		
<p>5.5.a In developing and implementing activities on the FMU, the forest owner or manager identifies, defines and implements appropriate measures for maintaining and/or enhancing forest services and resources that serve public values, including municipal watersheds, fisheries, carbon storage and sequestration, recreation and tourism.</p>	C	All of the items in this indicator are addressed in the <i>Strategic Plan</i> , as would be expected for a public agency. Interviews with regional staff confirm an awareness of the many services to be provided by the lands they manage.
<p>5.5.b The forest owner or manager uses the information from Indicator 5.5.a to implement appropriate measures for maintaining and/or enhancing these services and resources.</p>	C	Field visits confirmed management for diverse services and values.
<p>5.6. The rate of harvest of forest products shall not 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; 	C	<p>This FME is harvesting at a conservative rate as confirmed through review of AAC calculations and harvest data from the past 5 years.</p> <p>This FME’s harvest level is determined as part of the unit management plan process. The sustained yield calculation is based on inventory data that include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As confirmed on p. 251 in The Strategic Plan for SF Management (2010) and Estimating Periodic Annual Increment on SF Lands in New York (2010) and through interviews itemized elsewhere in this report, calculations were based on documented growth rates for acreages of each forest type/age class and species distribution. As confirmed on p. 252 in The Strategic Plan for SF Management (2010) and interviews itemized

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> management objectives and desired future conditions. The calculation is made by considering the effects of repeated prescribed harvests on the product/species and its ecosystem, as well as planned management treatments and projections of subsequent regrowth beyond single rotation and multiple re-entries. 		<p>elsewhere in this report, calculations include mortality and decay.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As confirmed on p. 251 in The Strategic Plan for SF Management (2010) and Estimating Periodic Annual Increment on SF Lands in New York (2010) and through interviews itemized elsewhere in this report, all forest acres were used to complete this growth and sustained yield harvest calculation. Annual harvest levels are based on silvicultural practices on areas subject to harvests as described in each unit management plan. Annual harvest levels accurately but conservatively reflect the management objectives and desired future conditions as described by each unit management plan. For example, the draft Hemlock-Candice Unit Management Plan includes text and a table describing Management Objectives and Actions (pp 55-60 and the desired future condition (pp 64-71)). <p>The harvest level is conservative as confirmed through review of AAC calculations and harvest data from the past 10 years and p. 252 in The Strategic Plan for SF Management (2010). Current harvests average around 43 million bf per year.</p> <p>Management units are defined by each region, and harvest schedules are planned for these units based on conditions in each stand and appropriate silviculture and desired future conditions. These plans do not set a sustained harvest level per se. As public lands, there is a history of harvesting less than the annual increment of growth in order to meet other management objectives. Periodically, DEC analyzes inventory data and confirms that harvest is well below annual growth.</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>This FME is harvesting at a conservative rate as confirmed through review of AAC calculations and harvest data from the past 10 years and p. 252 in The Strategic Plan for State Forest Management (2010). Current harvests yield 17,485 Mbf plus 27,000 cords (~ 31 million bf/per year).</p> <p>DEC has contracted analysis of Periodic Annual Increment (PAI) to researchers at SUNY-ESF, the first in 2010 and a follow-up in 2015. In both studies, the finding was that DEC is cutting considerably less than what is being grown. Current estimate is 25-30% of growth. See <i>Updating of Periodic Annual Increment on State Forest Lands in New York</i>, September, 2015. Auditors were presented with actual harvest data for</p>

		<p>the past year, confirming that harvesting has been conservative with regard to a sustained yield harvest level.</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>C</p>	<p>This FME’s desired future condition includes the creation and maintenance of a variety of age and size classes within healthy high quality stands. Desired stocking levels and composition were observed throughout the audit excluding some salvage sales for emerald ash borer. See site notes.</p> <p>This FME’s desired future condition includes the creation and maintenance of a variety of age and size classes within healthy high quality stands. Significant early-successional habitat has been created through a variety of silvicultural treatments including for example patch and cuts and salvage operations. See site notes.</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>C</p>	<p>There are no NTFP claims being made.</p> <p>Additionally, there is no significant harvest of NTFPs, although there are a few leases for the tapping of maple trees for syrup production. Harvest levels are set by specifying the numbers of taps based on conservative regional guidelines. Hay is sold from a small number of non-forested tracts.</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 the impacts of on-site processing facilities. Environmental impacts shall be assessed prior to commencement of site-disturbing operations.</p>		
<p>6.1.a Using the results of <i>credible scientific analysis, best available information</i> (including relevant databases), and local knowledge and experience, an assessment of conditions on the FMU is completed and includes: 1) Forest community types and development, size class and/or successional stages, and associated <i>natural disturbance regimes</i>; 2) <i>Rare, Threatened and Endangered (RTE) species</i> and <i>rare ecological communities</i> (including plant communities); 3) Other habitats and species of management concern; 4) Water resources and associated riparian habitats and</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Based on information from a variety of sources:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Strategic Plan For SF Management (2010) and each revised unit management plan includes descriptions of forest community types, size class and natural disturbance regimes. 2. Each revised unit management plan includes a list of RTE species and rare communities (Appendix B). 3. Each revised unit management plan includes a list of other habitats and species of management concern including for example the Six Nations Unit Management Plan (p. 26-29 and the draft

<p>hydrologic functions; 5) Soil resources; and 6) Historic conditions on the FMU related to forest community types and development, size class and/or successional stages, and a broad comparison of historic and current conditions.</p>		<p>Hemlock-Canadice Unit Management Plan (p. 18, 21, 24) and Appendix B of each Unit Management Plan.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Each revised unit management plan includes a list of water resources, associated riparian habitat and hydrologic functions and maps (Appendix M). 5. Each revised unit management plan includes a description of the soils and maps (Appendix M). 6. Each revised unit management plan includes a description of the historic conditions related to forest types, site class within the introduction. The Strategic Plan for SF Management (2010) includes a broad comparison of historic and current conditions.
<p>6.1.b Prior to commencing site-disturbing activities, the forest owner or manager assesses and documents the potential short and long-term impacts of planned management activities on elements 1-5 listed in Criterion 6.1.a.</p> <p>The assessment must incorporate the best available information, drawing from scientific literature and experts. The impact assessment will at minimum include identifying resources that may be impacted by management (e.g., streams, habitats of management concern, soil nutrients). Additional detail (i.e., detailed description or quantification of impacts) will vary depending on the uniqueness of the resource, potential risks, and steps that will be taken to avoid and minimize risks.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The Strategic Plan for SF Management (2010) states that the Division of lands and Forests is responsible for managing surface impacts from oil and gas exploration and development on SFs (p. 223). New surface disturbance has not occurred during at least the past 5 years.</p> <p>The Strategic Plan For SF Management (2010) and each revised unit management plan includes an assessment of the short and long-term impacts of management activities. For example, the Oneida Hills UMP includes a summary of proposed goals, objectives and management actions as well as the State Environmental Quality Review and negative determination. The draft is available online here, http://www.dec.ny.gov/docs/regions_pdf/oneidahillsdrump.pdf.</p> <p>The Strategic Plan for SF Management, each unit management plan and each SEQR cite policies, standards, plans, handbooks, management zones and each of these documents cite literature and experts. These assessments identify resources that will be impacted by management activities.</p>
<p>6.1.c Using the findings of the impact assessment (Indicator 6.1.b), management approaches and field prescriptions are developed and implemented that: 1) avoid or minimize negative short-term and long-term impacts; and, 2) maintain and/or enhance the long-term ecological viability of the forest.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Management prescriptions appropriately incorporate the impact assessment findings. Numerous sites examined during the 2017 audit were found to be in conformance with this indicator. For example, ash salvage sales are being planned and designed prior to, and during mortality events with specific regeneration plans in mind in order to maintain ecological viability of wetlands containing ecologically appropriate species in replacement. See site notes.</p>
<p>6.1.d On public lands, assessments developed in Indicator 6.1.a and management approaches developed in Indicator 6.1.c are made available to the public in draft form for</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The Strategic Plan For SF Management (2010) and unit management plans are available to the public for comment on-line, on disk or as paper copies.</p>

<p>review and comment prior to finalization. Final assessments are also made available.</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>		
<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>	<p>C</p>	<p>Natural Heritage Surveys have been completed in all regions. It is routine for foresters to consult the GIS database of RTE species when planning a harvest. A second database, Predicted Richness Overlay (PRO) has been developed by the Natural Heritage Program to predict sites that may include rare species and communities. Evidence that both sources of information are being used was found on all three <i>Stand Diagnosis and Prescription</i> forms examined during the audit and in repeated questioning of foresters in the field.</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>	<p>C</p>	<p>In Region 8, several examples were presented and discussed where measures were taken in planning and implementation of harvest to protect unique habitats and rare species. Personnel from the Natural Heritage Program and Bureau of Wildlife are available for consultation on appropriate conservation measures to protect RTE species and communities.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The <i>Strategic Plan</i> contains landscape-level biodiversity plans. Some of these feature the recovery of rare species. Efforts to protect habitat for timber rattlesnakes in Region 3 was such an example during the audit. BSLM and Bureau of Wildlife work closely on many fronts, so it should be expected that recovery efforts would be coordinated.</p>
<p>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).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>DEC's Conservation Officers are well equipped to enforce the many state and federal regulations pertinent to this indicator. Gated roads are maintained to restrict vehicle access in many places. Collecting materials from state forests is regulated through Part 190 of the Environmental Conservation Law and the Temporary Revocable Permitting process.</p>
<p>6.3. Ecological functions and values shall be maintained intact, enhanced, or restored, including: a) Forest regeneration and succession. b) Genetic, species, and</p>		

<p>ecosystem diversity. c) Natural cycles that affect the productivity of the forest ecosystem.</p>		
<p>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.</p>	C	<p>Ecoregional Landscape Assessments, in the <i>Strategic Plan</i>, present summaries of landscape assessments for seven ecoregions in the state. Land cover and age-class distributions were examined. UMPs build on the <i>Strategic Plan</i> and provide details of current and planned distributions of forest types and age classes. The Six Nations UMP confirms this.</p>
<p>6.3.a.2 When a rare ecological community is present, modifications are made in both the management plan and its implementation in order to maintain, restore or enhance the viability of the community. Based on the vulnerability of the existing community, conservation zones and/or protected areas are established where warranted.</p>	C	<p>Rare communities are part of the Natural Heritage database and are treated in the same manner as rare species during harvest planning and management.</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>	C	<p>Old-growth stands are found almost exclusively within the Forest Preserve system which owned and managed by this FME but is not part of this FME's certified land base. As part of the Forest Preserve system, these old growth stands are protected from harvesting and other timber management activities. Where other old-growth stands are found, they are classified as HCVF and protected from harvest.</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>	C	<p>Habitat for wildlife is a major objective for BSLM, as confirmed by examining both the Strategic Plan and various UMPs. Wildlife biologists from Bureau of Wildlife are often housed with BSLM personnel and participate in UMP development. Most recently, the “young forest initiative” of the Wildlife Bureau has increased such cooperation and is contributing to addressing the overall lack of early-successional habitat on the landscape. One example discussed during audit was habitat for New England cottontails, a Threatened species.</p>
<p>6.3.c Management maintains, enhances and/or restores the plant and wildlife habitat of Riparian Management Zones (RMZs) to provide:</p> <ol 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. 	C	<p>RMZs are addressed in DEC’s <i>Guidelines for Special Management Zones</i>. Guidelines are clear, but there is an often-used exemption for intrusions into buffer zones in cases where existing or former trails or roads still exist. Approval of such exemptions is required at both regional and state levels. Only one such example was observed and discussed during the field audit, a marked sale in Ulster 8. See <i>DEC Division of Lands and Forests Management Rules for Establishment of Special Management Zones on State Forests (SMZ Rules)</i>.</p>
<p>Stand-scale Indicators</p> <p>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>	C	<p>Management plans and harvest prescriptions address plant species composition. Site conditions are routinely used to determine appropriate species. This FME’s clear-cut policy and plantation policy provide direction toward natural species distributions. As existing plantations mature and are converted to a mix of native species</p> <p>UMPs and the <i>Strategic Plan</i> emphasize the importance of using an analysis of site conditions to determine management goals and objectives for forest types. Field visits confirmed efforts to promote natural regeneration.</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</p>	C	<p>Planting is not widely used for regeneration. The state nursery provides planting materials that are from local sources when supplemental planting is the preferred option. Some use of Norway spruce (<i>Picea</i></p>

<p>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><i>abies</i>) continues and has been documented to be non-invasive in this region.</p> <p>Most regeneration is natural, but some planting is still done, using local stock from state. See Policy ONR-DLF-1 Plantation Management on State Forests: http://www.dec.ny.gov/lands/69658.html</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>Trees selected for retention are generally representative of the dominant species found on the site.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The Strategic Plan For State Forest Management (2010) and this FME’s retention policy include guidelines for these habitat features. These guidelines have also been integrated into revisions of each unit management plan.</p> <p>Importance of these habitat elements has been clearly stated in both <i>Strategic Plan</i> and in most recent UMPs. Field foresters interviewed during the audit are aware of these habitat elements and take pride in demonstrating trees marked for retention to protect such habitat components. Examples were evident in most field sites visited. See Policy ONR-DLF-2 Retention on State Forests: http://www.dec.ny.gov/lands/69658.html</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>More than half of the harvesting on state forests is even-aged and a number of examples were provided during site visits. See site notes. The FME has addressed this topic in detail and developed two relevant policies: ONR-DLF-2, Retention on State Forests and ONR-DLF-3, Clearcutting on State Forests: http://www.dec.ny.gov/docs/lands_forests_pdf/policiesclearcutting.pdf</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. 	<p>C</p>	<p>Departures from opening sizes have not been requested.</p>

<p>4. Demonstrates that the variations will result in equal or greater benefit to wildlife, water quality, and other values compared to the normal opening size limits, including for sensitive and rare species.</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 <i>invasive species</i>, 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. 	C	<p>Risks of invasive species are articulated in both the <i>Strategic Plan</i> and in recently-prepared UMPs. The extent of invasive species in state forests varies among regions, but all regions have programs to identify, treat, and monitor key species. Interviews with the Section Chief revealed that DEC has promoted the “Competing Vegetation Program” by supporting staff to maintain and gain their pesticide applicators license with the goal of conducting spot treatments for invasive species. Also, DEC has a newly formed Bureau of Invasive Species and Ecosystem Health which continues to monitor and control the establishment and spread of exotic and invasive species. The field audit visited a site on Stewart State Forest where a weevil has been used successfully to control mile-a-minute weed.</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>	C	<p>Prescribed burning is used occasionally on state forests, most often to maintain openings for wildlife. A burn permit is required. Wildfires are not common, but when they do occur BSLM is equipped to participate in suppression. For example, during the 2016 audit the audit team visited Roosa Gap SF to view recovery from a large wildlife in 2015. The fire burned mostly in a pitch pine-chestnut oak forest, a fire-dependent community.</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>6.4.a The forest owner or manager documents the ecosystems that would naturally exist on the FMU, and assesses the adequacy of their representation and protection in the <i>landscape</i> (see Criterion 7.1). The assessment for medium and large forests include some or all of the following: a) <i>GAP analyses</i>; b) collaboration with state natural heritage programs and other public agencies; c) regional, landscape, and watershed planning efforts; d) collaboration with universities and/or local conservation groups.</p> <p>For an area that is not located on the FMU to qualify as a Representative Sample Area (RSA), it should be under permanent protection in its natural state.</p>	C	<p>As part of the process for development of the <i>Strategic Plan</i>, completed in 2010, BSLM worked with a number of cooperators to conduct an Ecoregional Landscape Assessment and a GAP analysis of community representation. Designation of RSAs followed and continues today when field assessments identify appropriate sites.</p>

<p>6.4.b Where existing areas within the landscape, but external to the FMU, are not of adequate protection, size, and configuration to serve as representative samples of existing ecosystems, forest owners or managers, whose properties are conducive to the establishment of such areas, designate ecologically viable RSAs to serve these purposes.</p> <p>Large FMUs are generally expected to establish RSAs of purpose 2 and 3 within the FMU.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Many RSAs are in the Forest Preserve, wildlands in the Adirondack and Catskill Mountains. Although the 2.8 million acres+ in these preserves identified as HCVF are not part of the certified database, they are managed by DEC and partners and contributed to goals for representation.</p>
<p>6.4.c Management activities within RSAs are limited to low impact activities compatible with the protected RSA objectives, except under the following circumstances: a) harvesting activities only where they are necessary to restore or create conditions to meet the objectives of the protected RSA, or to mitigate conditions that interfere with achieving the RSA objectives; or b) road-building only where it is documented that it will contribute to minimizing the overall environmental impacts within the FMU and will not jeopardize the purpose for which the RSA was designated.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Many of the communities identified as RSAs are in Forest Preserves, so management activities are minimal, mostly directed toward recreation, protection against pathogens, etc. Upon questioning by auditors, no examples of RSAs being managed for harvest were provided, and also no examples of road construction within RSAs. Guidance for staff is found on internal DEC web pages and was viewed by auditors.</p>
<p>6.4.d The RSA assessment (Indicator 6.4.a) shall be periodically reviewed and if necessary updated (at a minimum every 10 years) in order to determine if the need for RSAs has changed; the designation of RSAs (Indicator 6.4.b) is revised accordingly.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The Bureau Chief confirmed that a re-assessment of RSA delineation and guidance will be reviewed before 2022 (final guidance was developed in 2012).</p>
<p>6.4.e Managers of large, contiguous public forests establish and maintain a network of representative protected areas sufficient in size to maintain species dependent on interior core habitats.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>As described above, NY DEC maintains the largest Forest Preserve system in the country, protected by an 1894 amendment to the state constitution.</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>6.5.a The forest owner or manager has written guidelines outlining conformance with the Indicators of this Criterion.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Written evidence was reviewed during the audit, including for example contract language found in sections 6, 7, 12, 13, 15; Streamside <i>Management Zone (SMZ) buffer</i> management guidelines; Forest Retention Guidelines; new Rutting Guidelines for Timber Harvests and New York State Forestry Best Management Practices.</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>As confirmed during field site visits described elsewhere in this report, harvest operations in general meet or exceed BMPs including wetland crossings observed at several sites. See site notes.</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</p>	<p>C</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slash was uniformly distributed throughout as confirmed at nearly all sites visited in 2017. See site notes.

<p>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. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Top soil disturbance was minimal as confirmed at sites described elsewhere in this report. Timing restrictions were used effectively in some of these examples. • The Rutting Guidelines for Timber Harvests • Best management practices are used effectively to minimize soil erosion as demonstrated at sites visited during this audit program and described elsewhere in this report. Timing restrictions and other BMP tools are used effectively. Evidence of accelerated soil erosion was checked and not found. • The use of fire as a management tool is uncommon in this region. • Natural ground cover was maintained and observed in completed operations as confirmed at sites visited during this audit program and described elsewhere in this report. Timing restrictions were used effectively in at least some of these examples. • Whole tree harvesting is not common in this region and was not observed during this audit. • Low impact equipment options are not widely available in this region. Other methods including for example timing restrictions are used to mitigate impacts.
<p>6.5.d 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:</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>C</p>	<p>The existing transportation system is, for the most part, adequate for most management needs. Transportation is addressed In each process of revising a UMP, but a review of several UMPs shows and emphasis on maintenance and not new construction. Auditors visited a short section of new road on Stewart State Forest, built to allow access for recreation and nature study via a new boardwalk in a major wetland area. Other examples of road improvements and parking area construction or enlargement were observed as well. BMPs are routinely followed, as determined by field observation. Gates and signs are widely used to prevent unwanted vehicle access.</p>

<p>6.5.e.1 In consultation with appropriate expertise, the forest owner or manager implements written Streamside Management Zone (SMZ) buffer 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 those SMZs. These are outlined as requirements in Appendix E.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>This FME maintains written guidelines for <i>Streamside Management Zone (SMZ) buffer</i> management guidelines and BMPs that include vegetative buffer widths and protection measures. These guidelines include specific measures to protect for example water quality, wetlands, vernal pools, seeps and springs, lake and pond shorelines and including explicit limitations associated with activities that can and cannot occur within each SMZ. For example, main skid trails are not allowed within 100' of a vernal pool and construction of main haul roads are avoided within 250' of a vernal pool. In association with vernal pools, crown cover retention has been developed.</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>Minor variations from stated minimum SMZ widths have not been implemented.</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>As confirmed during field observations the number of stream and wetland crossings have been minimized and avoided in other cases. This FME's SMZ policy refers to the New York State Forestry BMPs for Water Quality Field Guide as well as stream crossing permit procedures. Several examples were observed during 2017 site visits that included installation of bridges or temporary site crossings. See site notes.</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>Gates and signs are used effectively to prevent unauthorized activities. This FME maintains support from conservation officers and rangers.</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>This FME does not allow grazing.</p>
<p>6.6. Management systems shall promote the development and adoption of environmentally friendly non-chemical methods of pest management and strive to</p>		

<p>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>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>	C	<p>Prior to the audit, BSLM submitted a full listing of chemicals used on the FMU since the last audit. No products on the list are found on the FSC list of Highly Hazardous Pesticides. New procedures established in 2015-2016 were reviewed during the 2017 audit.</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 eliminating chemical use.</p>	C	<p>a-d) Herbicides are used to control undesirable competing vegetation and non-native invasive plants; other effective methods are not available. Management actions are required to conform to this indicator and plans for chemical use must undergo a SEQR review. For example, the SEQR alternative analysis and thresholds for invasive species are described in The Strategic Plan For State Forest Management (2010) p. 288 and includes the application of all components of an integrated pest management system including the use of chemicals when all other options have been exhausted (item a and item c).</p> <p>The Strategic Plan For State Forest Management (2010) includes a written strategy with alternative options to the use of chemicals. For example p. 286-286 include a description of 5 alternatives to the use of chemicals to control interfering vegetation (do nothing, hand pulling, chainsaw removal, mechanical removal and fire).</p> <p>Herbicide treatments for silvicultural operations are not common, but when they do occur contract language specifies licensed applicators and a SEQR review is required.</p> <p>The policy on clearcutting addresses management designed to reduce dependence on chemical treatment.</p>
<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>Where herbicides are used, ground application is normal procedure, and licensed applicators are required. A number of BSLM foresters and technicians hold pesticide application licenses, but their uses are small in scale and designed to combat invasive species.</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. 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>	<p>C</p>	<p>The <i>Strategic Plan</i> (page 100) specifies that chemical application will be conducted according to and approved Pesticide or Herbicide Application Plan written for each specific instance of application.</p> <p>Written prescriptions are part of each unit management plan. Herbicide treatment are applied by New York State Certified Pesticide Applicators using the most conservative application methods. Only ground applications are used by this FME. The management system is designed to conform to this indicator and plans for chemical use undergo a SEQOR review; plans include maps and are approved and monitored at the regional offices. Employees in regions 4, 6, 7, 8 and 9 who are trained to apply chemicals were interviewed; risks and safety procedures/equipment were described.</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>	<p>C</p>	<p>Monitoring occurs during inventory and at periodic intervals following. Records of pest occurrences, control measures and worker exposure to chemicals are maintained in unit management plans and at the regional offices. Control measures are generally described in The Strategic Plan For State Forest Management (2010) p. 94-96.</p> <p>Monitoring is part of the Application Plan and also occurs during inventory. No examples were seen in the field on this audit.</p>
<p>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.</p>		
<p>6.7.a The forest owner or manager, and employees and contractors, have the equipment and training necessary to respond to hazardous spills</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Timber sales contracts (<i>Notice of Sale</i> Section XIV) specify that contractors will be responsible for control and collection of any fluids leaking from equipment on site. Spill kits are required of all operators and must be on site. TLC training includes procedures for preventing and containing spills.</p>
<p>6.7.b In the event of a hazardous material spill, the forest owner or manager immediately contains the material and engages qualified personnel to perform the appropriate removal and remediation, as required by applicable law and regulations.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Required by contract section XIV. As confirmed through document review and interviews, hazardous spill have not yet occurred. No spills observed during visits to field sites in 2017 audit.</p>
<p>6.7.c. Hazardous materials and fuels are stored in leak-proof containers in designated storage areas, that are outside of riparian management zones and away from other ecological sensitive features, until they are used or transported to an approved off-site location for disposal. There is no evidence of persistent fluid leaks from</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Locked chemical storage cabinets were observed at each of the Regional offices visited. Chemicals are stored in leak-proof containers; evidence of leaks was checked and not found.</p> <p>Sites visited during the audit were not close to any sensitive sites; hazardous materials were stored in a</p>

equipment or of recent groundwater or surface water contamination.		supply trailer on one site and in the operator’s truck on another site.
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.		
6.8.a Use of <i>biological control agents</i> are used only as part of a pest management strategy for the control of invasive plants, <i>pathogens</i> , insects, or other animals when other pest control methods are ineffective, or are expected to be ineffective. Such use is contingent upon peer-reviewed scientific evidence that the agents in question are non-invasive and are safe for native species.	C	This FME does not currently use biological control agents.
6.8.b If biological control agents are used, they are applied by trained workers using proper equipment.	C	This FME does not currently use biological control agents.
6.8.c If biological control agents are used, their use shall be documented, monitored and strictly controlled in accordance with state and national laws and internationally accepted scientific protocols. A written plan will be developed and implemented justifying such use, describing the risks, specifying the precautions workers will employ to avoid or minimize such risks, and describing how potential impacts will be monitored.	C	This FME does not currently use biological control agents.
6.8.d Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) are not used for any purpose	C	This FME does not use GMOs.
6.9. The use of exotic species shall be carefully controlled and actively monitored to avoid adverse ecological impacts.		
6.9.a The use of <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	Planting is not widely used for regeneration. The state nursery provides planting materials that are from local sources when supplemental planting is the preferred option. Norway spruce is planted in limited quantities. Managers have determined through experience and document review that this species is considered non-invasive in this landscape.
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	Planting stock is acquired from the state nursery, including provenance. Success of planting and any evidence of invasion are monitored during the inventory process. One incident was described during the audit without sufficient time to follow up. Seedling failure occurred and there was no seedling stock available from state nursery (per interview). Additionally, budgetary restrictions did not allow purchase of seedlings from external supplier. This topic will be revisited during the 2018 audit.

<p>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</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>BSLM’s Plantation Policy (<i>Strategic Plan</i>) is to move away from planting for regeneration, but Norway spruce has been successful on some sites where natural regeneration is not adequate for successful restocking. Several Norway spruce harvests with planned shift to native species were visiting during the 2017 audit. See site notes.</p>
<p>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.</p>		
<p>6.10.a Forest <i>conversion</i> to non-forest land uses does not occur, except in circumstances where conversion entails a very limited portion of the forest management unit (note that Indicators 6.10.a, b, and c are related and all need to be conformed with for conversion to be allowed).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>There is no conversion of natural forest to plantations. In fact, an estimated 60% of plantation harvests are being converted to natural forest.</p>
<p>6.10.b Forest <i>conversion</i> to non-forest land uses does not occur on high conservation value forest areas (note that Indicators 6.10.a, b, and c are related and all need to be conformed with for conversion to be allowed).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>No conversion has occurred on HCVF.</p>
<p>6.10.c Forest <i>conversion</i> to non-forest land uses does not occur, except in circumstances where conversion will enable clear, substantial, additional, secure, long term conservation benefits across the forest management unit (note that Indicators 6.10.a, b, and c are related and all need to be conformed with for conversion to be allowed).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>There has been no recent mineral development; very few new roads; and a few landings that have become openings.</p>
<p>6.10.d Natural or semi-natural stands are not converted to plantations. Degraded, semi-natural stands may be converted to restoration plantations.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>BSLM has a written policy (ONR-DLF-1) not to convert natural forest stands to plantations.</p>
<p>6.10.e Justification for land-use and stand-type conversions is fully described in the long-term management plan, and meets the biodiversity conservation requirements of Criterion 6.3 (see also Criterion 7.1.1)</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>UMPs reviewed during this audit did not include any plans for land-use conversion. Stand-type conversions are done mostly to meet requirements of biodiversity and natural stand dynamics.</p>
<p>6.10.f Areas converted to <i>non-forest use</i> for facilities associated with subsurface mineral and gas rights transferred by prior owners, or other conversion outside the control of the certificate holder, are identified on maps. The forest owner or manager consults with the CB to determine if removal of these areas from the scope of the certificate is warranted. To the extent allowed by these transferred rights, the forest owner or manager exercises control over the location of surface disturbances in a manner that minimizes adverse environmental and social impacts. If the certificate holder at one point held these rights, and then sold them, then subsequent</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Mineral exploration and leases have not occurred on State Forest lands since FSC certification. This subject has been thoroughly addressed in recent years, however, and is clearly addressed in the Strategic Plan (pages 225-244).</p>

conversion of forest to non-forest use would be subject to Indicator 6.10.a-d.		
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.		
<p>7.1. The management plan and supporting 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.</p> <p>i) Description and justification of harvesting techniques and equipment to be used.</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>The legal status of each parcel of state forest land is maintained by the Bureau of Real Property, but UMPs provide detailed maps of each parcel and an appendix that lists any easements, boundary disputes, etc. The library of UMPs contains the information that conforms to this indicator.</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>Detailed descriptions of land use, history, and current state of the landscape are found in UMPs (for example see Oneida Hills Draft UMP). More general discussions of natural disturbance regimes are found in the <i>Strategic Plan</i>.</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>Review of the several UMPs confirms that each addresses current and desired future conditions, historical conditions, and management objectives and plans. See site notes.</p>
<p>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.</p>	C	<p>The <i>Strategic Plan</i> includes a landscape assessment (page 70) as well as a table of ecoregional habitat assessments. UMPs present more detailed data on landscape condition.</p>
<p>7.1.e The management plan includes a description of the</p>	C	

<p>following resources and outlines activities to conserve and/or protect:</p> <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. 		<p>UMPs include lists of RTE species and natural communities and proposed management for those species and habitats, where appropriate. RSAs and HCVDs are included in the same sections of each plan. Likewise, soil and water resources are detailed in each plan (e.g., pages 64-66 of the Northern Piedmont Draft UMP) as are other types of special management areas.</p> <p>The <i>Strategic Plan</i> also addresses at-risk species, natural communities, and blocks of matrix forest.</p>
<p>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).</p>	C	<p>The <i>Strategic Plan</i> provides policies and guidelines for managing invasive species. UMPs examined during this audit included descriptions of invasive species.</p>
<p>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).</p>	C	<p>Similar to invasive plants, the <i>Strategic Plan</i> has general guidelines, with more specific mention of insects and diseases in the UMPs, as appropriate.</p>
<p>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.</p>	C	<p>The <i>Strategic Plan</i> has detailed policies and guidelines for use of chemicals. These are further addressed in some UMPs, but often only at the level of a written plan that is prepared for each application.</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>	C	<p>Chapter 6 in the <i>Strategic Plan</i> addresses Forest Health and includes guidelines for integrated pest management and biological controls.</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). 	C	<p>NY DEC has an extensive staff of public affairs personnel, in the central office and in regional offices. Solicitation of input from the public and analyses of public comments is a major effort in development of UMPs. Special efforts are made to solicit participation by Indian Nations. Responses to comments submitted by the public are included in appendices of UMPs.</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>	C	<p>UMPs routinely address issues of access, both for vegetation management and public use. Appendices list details about easements and rights-of-way and tables present needed maintenance and new</p>

		construction, usually with a timetable for each project. The transportation system is well documents in the agency's GIS system.
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.	C	The <i>Strategic Plan</i> describes silvicultural systems used on state forests and their purposes (pages 79-92). UMPs vary in the detail presented, but usually provide tables of stands scheduled for harvest and the system to be employed. Inventory records also contain management codes.
7.1.m The management plan describes how species selection and harvest rate calculations were developed to meet the requirements of Criterion 5.6.	C	The <i>Strategic Plan</i> (pages 249-259) describes harvest rate calculations and references the analysis of periodic annual increment. UMPs generally do not address harvest rate calculations in detail because management is oriented toward achieving desired future conditions and not desired levels of harvest.
7.1.n The management plan includes a description of monitoring procedures necessary to address the requirements of Criterion 8.2.	C	UMPs address monitoring at different levels, and in different sections of the plans, but monitoring is institutionalized in numerous ways that may be considered as part of a multi-layer management plan. The inventory and monitoring handbook is a guide for forest-stand monitoring. Forest health is monitored in cooperation with the Bureau of Invasive Species and Ecosystem Health.
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	Such maps are routinely included as Appendices of all unit management plans. For example, the Oneida Hills UMP pairs maps of land units with a description of the 10-year plan for each unit. Maps are a key part of soliciting public comments on draft UMPs.
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	Any specifications relating to harvest machinery and technique would be found at the level of a stand prescription and/or the advertised Request for Bids. Auditors have noticed wide variation among regions in the frequency of such specifications. More often, stand prescription describe precautions that need to be employed and let logging contractors sort out their bids and equipment accordingly.
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	Harvest plans are routinely prepared to address site conditions, biodiversity concerns, cultural considerations, safety, etc. Files of such plans were reviewed as auditors visited sites in Regions 3 and 5.
7.1.r The management plan describes the stakeholder consultation process.	C	

		The stakeholder consultation process is described in each unit management plan, confirmed by inspection of two plans selected for this audit.
7.2 The management plan shall be periodically revised to incorporate the results of monitoring or new scientific and technical information, as well as to respond to changing environmental, social and economic circumstances.		
7.2.a The management plan is kept up to date. It is reviewed on an ongoing basis and is updated whenever necessary to incorporate the results of monitoring or new scientific and technical information, as well as to respond to changing environmental, social and economic circumstances. At a minimum, a full revision occurs every 10 years.	C	The Strategic Plan for State Forest Management (2010) is up-to-date and includes new scientific and technical information. The task of writing and updating unit management plans is assigned on the basis of a schedule and this FME's management plans are up-to-date and in conformance with the FME's own schedule for plan completion. Plans that were late during the previous audit have been completed (Oneida, Winonah and North Clinton) as well as other plans that were due for completion in 2012 and most that are due for completion by the end of 2013.
7.3 Forest workers shall receive adequate training and supervision to ensure proper implementation of the management plans.		
7.3.a Workers are qualified to properly implement the management plan; All forest workers are provided with sufficient guidance and supervision to adequately implement their respective components of the plan.	C	Foresters hold professional degrees and have been provided with a variety of guidance documents and further trained for example in HCVF protection, BMPs, Rutting Guidelines and a variety of publications in relation to silvicultural prescriptions as confirmed through interviews and document review. During the 2017 audits forestry staff in separate regions (for example Region 8, 9 and 4) had available copies of applicable policies.
7.4 While respecting the confidentiality of information, forest managers shall make publicly available a summary of the primary elements of the management plan, including those listed in Criterion 7.1.		
7.4.a While respecting landowner confidentiality, the management plan or a management plan summary that outlines the elements of the plan described in Criterion 7.1 is available to the public either at no charge or a nominal fee.	C	The Strategic Plan for SF Management (2010) and unit management plans are available free of charge on the FME's website and in either paper or electronic form at regional offices and at public meetings.
7.4.b Managers of public forests make draft management plans, revisions and supporting documentation easily accessible for public review and comment prior to their implementation. Managers address public comments and modify the plans to ensure compliance with this Standard.	C	The Strategic Plan for SF Management (2010), draft management plans, revisions and supporting documentation are available free of charge on the FME's website and in either paper or electronic form at regional offices and at public meetings. Public comments and plan modifications are noted within The Strategic Plan for SF Management (2010) on p.

		340-353. Additionally such modifications were included in the UMPs examined during the audit.
<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><i>Applicability Note: On small and medium-sized forests (see Glossary), an informal, qualitative assessment may be appropriate. Formal, quantitative monitoring is required on large forests and/or intensively managed forests.</i></p>		
<p>8.1 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>		
<p>8.1.a Consistent with the scale and intensity of management, the forest owner or manager develops and consistently implements a regular, comprehensive, and replicable written monitoring protocol.</p>	C	The <i>State Forest Inventory Database</i> (SFID) is based on a series of systematic, replicable protocols. A detailed handbook assures that inventory monitoring is conducted consistently across state forests. Aerial photo surveys are scheduled on 4-5-year intervals and forest health surveys are conducted annually or as needed.
<p>8.2. Forest management should include the research and data collection needed to monitor, at a minimum, the following indicators: a) yield of all forest products harvested, b) growth rates, regeneration, and condition of the forest, c) composition and observed changes in the flora and fauna, d) environmental and social impacts of harvesting and other operations, and e) cost, productivity, and efficiency of forest management.</p>		
<p>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>	C	As confirmed through review of the SFID database and interviews itemized elsewhere in this report, this FME’s inventory includes items a-f. During the 2017 audit SFID was reviewed and noted that many of the stands reviewed were outdated. The program re-inventories harvested sites and seeks to re-inventory 10% of stands per Unit/Region. This topic area, forest inventory, is noted for review in 2018 and will specifically include a review of regeneration.
<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>	C	Special monitoring has been undertaken in recent years to assess levels of damage from wind storms and floods. Likewise, monitoring is being carried out for several exotic insect pests and diseases. Intensive monitoring is being done for Emerald Ash Borer with pre-salvage and salvage harvests resulting, see site notes.
<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>	C	BSFM maintains records of harvest volume, product, species and acreage. Summary reports are generated each quarter and were inspected during the audit.
<p>8.2.c The forest owner or manager periodically obtains data needed to monitor presence on the FMU of:</p>	C	Data associated with RTEs is primarily completed by Natural Heritage Program staff with assistance from

<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>foresters and are supplemented by Natural Heritage Program’s existing data. This data provides one method to identify historic locations of RTE species. Secondly, workshops have been designed and implemented to train forest management staff to supplement these inventories with the aid of predictive species overlays. Evidence that these methods of data acquisition have been implemented include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For example RTE lists are contained in Appendix B of each Unit Management Plan. 2. For example common and rare plant communities are described in included in The Strategic Plan for SF Management (2010) p. 45-78 and in UMPs examined during the 2017 audit. 3. Invasive species are itemized in the Strategic Plan for SF Management (2010) p. 275-288. 4. Resource maps that include HCVF delineations have been distributed to each region and observed in regions 4, 6, 7, 8 and 9 during the 2017 audit. 5. Foresters and NHP maintain a list of sites and visit sites classified as HCVF in an effort to monitor changes. <p>Data associated with RTEs is primarily gathered by Natural Heritage Program staff with assistance from foresters who have received training in recent workshops. Interview with Natural Heritage staff confirmed trainings. Trainings also confirmed by documentation of agendas with dates and topics covered. The Bureau of Wildlife conducts assessments of vertebrate species, with emphasis on RTE and game species. Rare plant communities are monitored by NHP; forest types by BSFM.</p> <p>Invasive species are monitored, as needed, on a regional basis, mostly as a product of the extensive field work done by foresters.</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 (2017.4)</p>	<p>Foresters normally visit harvesting sites 1-2 times/week to monitor compliance with harvest plans and conditions of the Notice of Sale. However, see Minor CAR 2017.4 for additional detail regarding monitoring.</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>The Operations Division of DEC maintains most roads on state forests and keeps records in a GIS data layer. UMPs provide an accounting of roads, needs for improvements, and plans for additional roads. Many roads in State Forests are town or county roads.</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</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>This FME completed studies related to socio-economic values of forests including the Department published the Statewide Forest Resources</p>

<p>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>Assessment & Strategy (2010) and “New York State Industrial Timber Harvest Production and Consumption Report-2011”.</p> <p>BSLM periodically contracts for studies of socio-economic impacts, and also has utilization and marketing specialists on staff. As a public agency, numerous branches of government monitor some elements of this indicator.</p>
<p>8.2.d.4 Stakeholder responses to management activities are monitored and recorded as necessary.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>BSLM conducts formal outreach to stakeholders as UMPs and <i>Strategic Plans</i> are prepared and revised. They also do so when new policies, e.g., extraction for natural gas, are developed and debated. Stakeholders are invited to visit regional offices, phone, or send email messages.</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>Sites of tribal significance are not known to occur on state forests (interview with David Witt), although tribal representatives are regularly invited to comment on management plans and their revisions.</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>As confirmed through the review of quarterly reports and the annual total harvest .xls spreadsheet and individual contracts itemized elsewhere in this report, this FME maintains records including for example harvest volume, product, species and acreage. The cost of management is monitored as described during interviews with Rob Messenger. The information that has been collected is sufficient and has been used to assess productivity and efficiency of harvest projects.</p> <p>According to this data, a large number of small (local sale) projects are administered in some regions by this FME; based on the FMEs analysis, these small local sale projects are not as efficient or productive as larger projects due to the high level of administrative overhead. These smaller sales yield a much lower value per unit of volume. While the completion of some small sale projects is desirable for a variety of reasons including but not limited to conformance with indicator 5.2.c, an increase in the proportion of longer-term (usually larger) contracts and the resulting decrease in the proportion of short-term (usually smaller) contracts in some regions may be a desired approach for this FME during these challenging economic times. Interviews conducted during this audit confirm that this FME has submitted a proposal to the state legislature that will increase the current small/local Timber sale contract cap to \$50,000 from \$10,000. If approved, this change will mean that the comptroller’s office will no longer need to approve timber harvest contracts that are less than \$50,000. This approval process will require a</p>

		<p>change to state law for revenue sales but will significantly enhance and speed up the process for timber sale contract approval.</p> <p>As confirmed through the review of quarterly reports and the annual total harvest .xls spreadsheet and individual contracts itemized elsewhere in this report, this FME maintains records including for example harvest volume, product, species and acreage. The cost of management is monitored as described during interviews with Rob Messenger. The information that has been collected is sufficient and has been used to assess productivity and efficiency of harvest projects.</p> <p>As a public agency, costs and revenues are carefully monitored. Summary statistics are found on the DEC web pages.</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>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>	C	<p>This FME sells forest products on the stump. Timber sale contracts include for example location of harvest and FM/COC code and maps of the harvested stand(s). There is no risk of mixing certified and non-certified products prior to the point of sale. All land where products are harvested is certified; none are excised from the certified land base.</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>	C	<p>This FME sells forest products on the stump. Timber sale contract copies are maintained as confirmed through examination of every timber sale examined during the 2017 audit. Each contract includes for example location of harvest and the FM/COC code and maps of the harvested stand(s).</p>
<p>8.4 The results of monitoring shall be incorporated into the implementation and revision of the management plan.</p>		
<p>8.4.a The forest owner or manager monitors and documents the degree to which the objectives stated in the management plan are being fulfilled, as well as significant deviations from the plan.</p>	C	<p>Each unit management plan includes a table of scheduled management actions (Appendix F). Each revised unit management plan includes a text description of current and future management. Regional managers maintain records of unit management plan goals, objectives and targets and completed activities.</p>
<p>8.4.b Where monitoring indicates that management objectives and guidelines, including those necessary for conformance with this Standard, are not being met or if changing conditions indicate that a change in management strategy is necessary, the management plan, operational plans, and/or other plan implementation measures are revised to ensure the objectives and guidelines will be</p>	C	<p>The Forest Certification Coordinator maintains data including for example details related to conformance to the certification standard. Regular staff meetings address requirements of certification as confirmed during interviews with staff.</p>

<p>met. If monitoring shows that the management objectives and guidelines themselves are not sufficient to ensure conformance with this Standard, then the objectives and guidelines are modified.</p>		
<p>8.5 While respecting the confidentiality of information, forest managers shall make publicly available a summary of the results of monitoring indicators, including those listed in Criterion 8.2.</p>		
<p>8.5.a While protecting landowner confidentiality, either full monitoring results or an up-to-date summary of the most recent monitoring information is maintained, covering the Indicators listed in Criterion 8.2, and is available to the public, free or at a nominal price, upon request.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>This FME’s web page includes a “State Forests Accomplishment Report,” which includes an annual summary of inventory, maintenance, and treatments. This summary includes some of the indicators listed in 8.2. In addition the web-site states “...For more information about inventory, maintenance and treatments on State Forest please call the Bureau of State Land Management at (518) 402-9428...” Other monitoring details are included in unit management plan revisions and in the Strategic Plan for State Forest Management (2010).</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.

High Conservation Value Forests are those that possess one or more of the following attributes:

- a) Forest areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant: concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g., endemism, endangered species, refugia); and/or large landscape level forests, contained within, or containing the management unit, where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance**
- b) Forest areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems**
- c) Forest areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g., watershed protection, erosion control)**
- d) Forest areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g., subsistence, health) and/or critical to local communities’ traditional cultural identity (areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in cooperation with such local communities).**

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

Central Hardwoods:

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

North Woods/Lake States:

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

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

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

Note: Old forests (see Glossary) may or may not be designated HCVFs. They are managed to maintain or recruit: (1) the existing abundance of old trees and (2) the landscape- and stand-level structures of old-growth forests, consistent with the composition and structures produced by natural processes.

Old forests that either have or are developing old-growth attributes, but which have been previously harvested, may be designated HCVFs and may be harvested under special plans that account for the ecological attributes that make it an HCVF.

Forest management maintains a mix of sub-climax and climax old-forest conditions in the landscape.

<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>		
<p>9.1.a The forest owner or manager identifies and maps the presence of High Conservation Value Forests (HCVF) within the FMU and, to the extent that data are available, adjacent to their FMU, in a manner consistent with the assessment process, definitions, data sources, and other guidance described in Appendix F.</p> <p>Given the relative rarity of old growth forests in the contiguous United States, these areas are normally designated as HCVF, and all old growth must be managed in conformance with Indicator 6.3.a.3 and requirements for legacy trees in Indicator 6.3.f.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The most recent HCVF assessment was completed as part of the NY DEC’s Strategic Plan for State Forest Management (2010), which is reviewed every 10 years.</p> <p>The FME maps HCVF acres in GIS and provided auditors with printed maps with HCVFs clearly identified. Many of the acres protected as HCVF are located within the Adirondack and Catskills Forest Preserve owned and managed by the FME (almost 3 million acres). However, the Adirondack and Catskills Forest Preserve is not part of the certified acreage. Other acreages located within the State Forests are identified as RSAs and also included in the mapped HCVF acreage.</p> <p>Stands that are older than 140 years old are rare in the state of New York (less than 1% of the state’s forest resource). Documented old growth has been designated as HCVF. In addition, the preserve status of the FME’s Adirondack and Catskill Forest Preserves, where commercial harvesting is not</p>

		<p>permitted, have the greatest potential to develop late succession forest characteristics. Although Adirondack Forest Preserve and Catskill Forest Preserve are not covered under the scope of this certificate, it is managed by the state of New York and as such represents 2,864,549 acres contributing towards HCVF, OG, and RSAs goals, objectives, and targets.</p>
<p>9.1.b In developing the assessment, the forest owner or manager consults with qualified specialists, independent experts, and local community members who may have knowledge of areas that meet the definition of HCVs.</p>		<p>The 2010 HCVF assessment was conducted in cooperation with the New York Natural Heritage Program, a partnership between the NY DEC and the State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry. The Natural Heritage Program is staffed by ecologists, zoologists, and botanists, among other qualified specialists.</p>
<p>9.1.c A summary of the assessment results and management strategies (see Criterion 9.3) is included in the management plan summary that is made available to the public.</p>		<p>The complete Strategic Plan for State Forest Management, which outlines the assessment that included HCVF identification, is available on the agency website in an easily accessible location.</p>
<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>		
<p>9.2.a The forest owner or manager holds consultations with stakeholders and experts to confirm that proposed HCVF locations and their attributes have been accurately identified, and that appropriate options for the maintenance of their HCV attributes have been adopted.</p>		<p>The FME consulted The Nature Conservancy, Natural Heritage Program, and other experts and stakeholders in the development of the Strategic Plan for State Forest Management. Consultation included confirming the location, attributes, and accuracy of HCVFs. As part of monitoring HCVFs, Natural Heritage Program staff visit HCVF locations to confirm maintenance of HCV attributes.</p>
<p>9.2.b On public forests, a transparent and accessible public review of proposed HCV attributes and HCVF areas and management is carried out. Information from stakeholder consultations and other public review is integrated into HCVF descriptions, delineations and management.</p>		<p>The development of the Strategic Plan for State Forest Management included public review. The plan includes a summary of substantive revisions and responses to public comments, including elements of HCVFs.</p>
<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>		
<p>9.3.a The management plan and relevant operational plans describe the measures necessary to ensure the maintenance and/or enhancement of all high conservation values present in all identified HCVF areas, including the precautions required to avoid risks or impacts to such values (see Principle 7). These measures are implemented.</p>		<p>Management and operational plans reviewed by auditors included measures to ensure the maintenance and/or enhancement of conservation values in HCVF areas. Protection measures for RTE species, RSAs, watershed protection zones, and rare communities were clearly identified on a sample of maps provided by the regions. Sampled sites confirmed that sufficient protection measures for HCVFs are implemented.</p>

<p>9.3.b All management activities in HCVFs must maintain or enhance the high conservation values and the extent of the HCVF.</p>		<p>The Natural Heritage Program has written guidelines for managing selected natural communities. These guidelines are referenced by foresters along with the GIS HCVF-related data layers when planning timber harvests. Several examples of the implementation of HCV-protection measures were observed in the field.</p>
<p>9.3.c If HCVF attributes cross ownership boundaries and where maintenance of the HCV attributes would be improved by coordinated management, then the forest owner or manager attempts to coordinate conservation efforts with adjacent landowners.</p>		<p>Each unit management plan describes the adjacent land and existing uses, including management activities. While HCV attributes often cross ownership boundaries, no examples of coordinated management across property boundaries were presented or reviewed.</p>
<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>		
<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>Interviews with NY DEC staff and visual examination of GIS databases confirmed that that regular monitoring of HCV attributes occurs by the FME and other DEC bureaus. Results are documented and recorded in relevant GIS HCVF data layers. The GIS data layers and recent relational database records of monitoring were demonstrated for the audit team during this audit program.</p>
<p>9.4.b When monitoring results indicate increasing risk to a specific HCV attribute, the forest owner/manager re-evaluates the measures taken to maintain or enhance that attribute, and adjusts the management measures in an effort to reverse the trend.</p>	C	<p>Management actions related to HCV attributes were reviewed. None were associated with increasing risk.</p>
<p>Principle #10: Plantations shall be planned and managed in accordance with Principles and Criteria 1-9, and Principle 10 and its Criteria. While plantations can provide an array of social and economic benefits, and can contribute to satisfying the world's needs for forest products, they should complement the management of, reduce pressures on, and promote the restoration and conservation of natural forests.</p> <p>Principle 10 is determined by the audit team to be not applicable to the evaluation of the FME as the type of silviculture practiced on the state forestlands, and the forest conditions that result from these practices, do not meet the FSC definition of "plantation forest management."</p>		

APPENDICES

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

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

NORTHEAST REGION:

<p>6.3.g.1.a Silvicultural systems favor natural regeneration where appropriate, and forest operations are planned to protect pre-established natural regeneration of desirable species.</p>	C	<p>See site notes. All sites inspected were naturally regenerated. There are written policies, procedures and forest management plans (strategic and unit FMPs) that specify use of natural regeneration.</p>
---	---	---

Appendix 6 – Tracking, Tracing and Identification of Certified Products

SCS FSC Chain of Custody Indicators for Forest Management Enterprises

Version 6-0

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 interviews with Rob Messenger as well as field forestry staff, Josh Borst has been appointed as the Chain of Custody Administrator and Certification Coordinator 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	This FME’s sale records were available for review and interviews confirm records are maintain for at least 5 years.
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><input type="checkbox"/> Stump <i>Stumpage sale or sales of standing timber; transfer of ownership of certified-forest product occurs upon harvest.</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> On-site concentration yard <i>Transfer of ownership of certified-product occurs at concentration yard under control of FME.</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Off-site Mill/Log Yard <i>Transfer of ownership occurs when certified-product is unloaded at purchaser’s facility.</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Auction house/ Brokerage <i>Transfer of ownership occurs at a government-run or private auction house/ brokerage.</i></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lump-sum sale/ Per Unit/ Pre-Paid Agreement <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><input type="checkbox"/> Log landing <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>This FME sells certified materials as a lump sum, pre-paid agreement. The trees are paid for before the trees are harvested with no risk of mixing certified products with non-certified products. Other lands owned and managed by this FME are not certified however those lands are geographically distinct from certified land. Harvesting does not occur within The Forest Preserves and Wildlife Management Areas are geographically distinct properties with separate boundaries and landings as confirmed through interviews and review of the Strategic Plan for State Forest Management for example.</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>This FME sells certified materials as a lump sum, pre-paid agreement. The trees are paid for before the trees are harvested as confirmed through contract review and interviews itemized elsewhere in this report.</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 for lump sum pre-paid (forest gate) agreements were presented and reviewed and include the identification of these products as certified by the Forest Stewardship Council.</p>
<p>2.2 The FME shall maintain records of quantities/volumes of FSC-certified product(s).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Sale contracts include the quantity of FSC-certified products. Other data base records also include these volumes.</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>Timber sale contracts were presented and reviewed for sites visited in 2017. All components of this indicator a) through h) were met.</p>

<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. 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>NA</p>	<p>This FME sells certified materials as a lump sum, pre-paid agreement. The trees are paid for before the trees are harvested. The contractor is responsible for shipping documents.</p>
<p>2.5 When the FME has demonstrated it is not able to include the required FSC claim as specified above in 2.3 and 2.4 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>This FME sells certified materials as a lump sum, pre-paid agreement. The trees are paid for before the trees are harvested. The contractor is responsible for shipping documents.</p>
<p>3. Labeling and Promotion</p>		<p>N/A, FME does not use/ intend to use trademarks</p>
		<p>N/A, CW/FM certificates are not allowed to use FSC trademarks (<i>Note: it is a Major nonconformity to 3.1 if CW/FM certificates are found to be using trademarks</i>)</p>
<p>3.1 The FME shall adhere to relevant trademark use requirements of FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2 described in the <i>SCS Trademark Annex for FMEs</i>.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Contracts are based on a state-wide template and found to lack the appropriate trademark symbol. See Minor CAR 2017.5 under FSC-STD-50-001, 1.15.</p>
<p>4. Outsourcing</p>	<p>X</p>	<p>N/A, FME does not outsource any COC-related activities.</p>
		<p>N/A, FME outsources low-risk activities such as transport and harvesting.</p>
<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>The Chain of Custody Administrator located at the State Office in Albany is responsible for providing and revising templates that result in conformance with section 5.2 9 and is reasonably knowledgeable of the COC control system and standard.</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 training plan and records of training were available upon request.</p>
---	----------	---

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

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

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

<p>Description of how the organization currently uses, or intends to use, FSC trademarks and/or labels, including but not limited to printed materials, Internet applications, on-product labeling, and other public-facing media:</p>	<p>Organization currently uses FSC trademark on website and sale documents.</p>
---	---

<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 1.9 Products intended to be labeled or promoted as FSC certified are included in the organization’s certified product group list.</p>	<table border="1"> <tr><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td><td>C</td></tr> <tr><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>NC</td></tr> <tr><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>C w/Obs</td></tr> </table>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	C	<input type="checkbox"/>	NC	<input type="checkbox"/>	C w/Obs
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	C						
<input type="checkbox"/>	NC						
<input type="checkbox"/>	C w/Obs						

Evidence: FME does label on-product. Products are identified by species as raw logs of species identified and confirmed during the 2017 audit.

<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 1.4, 1.6 – 1.8, 1.13 – 1.14 The organization does <u>not</u> use the FSC trademarks in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ in connection with the sale or promotion of FSC Controlled Wood (§1.4) ▪ in any way that could cause confusion, misinterpretation or loss of credibility to the FSC certification scheme (§1.6) ▪ to imply any FSC endorsement or responsibility of the organization’s activities outside of the certificate scope (§1.7) ▪ to imply any FSC responsibility for the production of products, documents or promotional materials (§1.8) ▪ in product brand names, company names or website domain names (§1.13) ▪ translated to another language with no English included (§1.14) 	<table border="1"> <tr><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td><td>C</td></tr> <tr><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>NC</td></tr> <tr><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>C w/Obs</td></tr> </table>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	C	<input type="checkbox"/>	NC	<input type="checkbox"/>	C w/Obs
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	C						
<input type="checkbox"/>	NC						
<input type="checkbox"/>	C w/Obs						

<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 7.2 The FSC trademarks are not used together with the marks of other forest certification schemes in a way which implies equivalence or in a way which is disadvantageous to the FSC trademarks in terms of size or placement.</p>	<table border="1"> <tr><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td><td>C</td></tr> <tr><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>NC</td></tr> <tr><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>C w/Obs</td></tr> </table>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	C	<input type="checkbox"/>	NC	<input type="checkbox"/>	C w/Obs
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	C						
<input type="checkbox"/>	NC						
<input type="checkbox"/>	C w/Obs						

Sections 1.4, 1.6 – 1.8, 1.13, 1.14, and 7.2 Evidence: Reviews of routine documents associated with FSC claims.

<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 1.11 Any information about FSC that is in addition to FSC trademarks and labels included in any material has been given prior approval by SCS.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs <input type="checkbox"/> N/A, no additional FSC information
<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 1.15 The use of the FSC “checkmark-and-tree” logo is directly accompanied by the appropriate trademark symbols ® or ™ (in superscript font). The appropriate symbol also accompanies the first use of “FSC” and “Forest Stewardship Council” in any text.</p> <p>NOTES:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The use of trademark registration symbol is not required for FSC claims in sales and delivery documents, or for the disclaimer/ statement specified in requirement 7.5 of FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2. The registration symbol is required for any other use of initials “FSC” on documents; however, the omission of the use of trademark registration symbol in promotional texts related to FSC on invoice templates, delivery notes and similar documents is possible if the software used to produce these documents does not support trademark registration symbols. This exception only applies to the use of the trademark registration symbol for the initials “FSC” and the name “Forest Stewardship Council”. In January 2014, in Hong Kong, FSC changed the trademark symbol from ® back to ™. Companies affected by this change which have approved artwork with the ® registered trademark symbol for distribution in Hong Kong may continue to produce, distribute and sell into the market product using the registered trademark symbol on the FSC trademarks until 1 September 2015, with an additional liquidation period of six months, which expires 1 March 2016. All new artwork must use the ™ trademark symbol. Where the FSC initials are used vertically in the traditional way of writing for Asian nations, the registration status symbol may be used in superscript font in either the top right corner (alongside F), or the bottom right corner (alongside C) as preferred. In this instance, mark “C”. 	<input type="checkbox"/> C <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NC, Minor 2017.5 <input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs <input type="checkbox"/> N/A, one or more of the noted exceptions apply
<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 1.16 All FSC trademark uses have been submitted to SCS for approval.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs
<p>Sections 1.11, 1.15 and 1.16 Evidence: Approvals on record.</p>	
<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 1.10 All (previously approved) FSC labels only use the FSC label artwork provided on the label generator or otherwise issued or approved by SCS or FSC.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A, no approved FSC labels
<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, Sections 10, 11 and 12 All (previously approved) FSC labels and logos conform to the standard requirements for color and font (§10.1-10.3, 11.5, 11.7, 11.9), format and size (§10.4 - 10.7, 11.2, 11.3, 11.8), trademark symbol (§10.8, 11.4), FSC trademark license code (§10.9), label text (§10.10 - 10.15) and/or mini label requirements (§10.16 - 10.18). The label or logo is not being misused in any manner described in section 12.2.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A, no approved FSC labels
<p>Sections 1.10, 10, 11 and 12.2 Evidence: Interviews and nature of selling raw logs there is no use of label artwork.</p>	
<p>Promotional use of the FSC trademarks</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> N/A, does not use/intend to use FSC trademarks for promotional purposes (Skip Promotional section)</p>	

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

<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 1.12, 4.4</p> <p>The FSC trademarks are not used to promote product quality aspects not covered by FSC certification (§ 1.12). Any claims regarding qualities outside the control of FSC, such as other environmental attributes of the product, are separated from text about FSC (§ 4.4).</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs <input type="checkbox"/> N/A, no additional quality claims
<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 6.1</p> <p>Catalogues, brochures, and websites meet the following requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The promotional panel, or at least the FSC trademark license code, is in a prominent place. b) When the products are not all on the same page, a link or text such as “Look for FSC certified products” is included next to the panel / code. c) FSC certified products are indicated by using the logo or with “FSC certified” in the product description. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs <input type="checkbox"/> N/A, do not use trademarks in these items
<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 4.1</p> <p>For labeled stationery and brochures printed on FSC-certified paper, the label is not in such a prominent position as to make it appear that any organization (or its products) represented in the publication is endorsed by FSC. (E.g. the FSC label is not placed on the front cover of the brochure or next to images of forest-based products which are not FSC certified.)</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A, no such labeled items
<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 6.2</p> <p>FSC certified products are not promoted using only the SCS Kingfisher and/or SCS Global Services logo.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs
<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 7.3</p> <p>FSC trademarks are not used at the top of document templates such as letterheads, sales documents and emails.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs
<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 7.4</p> <p>The FSC trademarks are not used on business cards to promote the organization’s certification. NOTE: If authorization was duly received under the previous trademark standard, the organization may use the existing supply until it is depleted. In this case, the approval must be available and must have been granted prior to July 1, 2011.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs <input type="checkbox"/> N/A, approval granted prior to July 1, 2011
<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 4.2</p> <p>If a business card is printed on FSC-certified paper, the mini label with product type is used at minimum size. The use of the mini label does not imply that the organization is affiliated with FSC.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs <input type="checkbox"/> N/A, no labeled business cards

<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 8.1, 8.2 All promotional items (e.g., mugs, pens, T-shirts, caps, banners, vehicles, etc.) display, at minimum, the FSC logo and FSC trademark license code (§8.1). Any promotional items made wholly or partly of wood (e.g., pencils, memory sticks, etc.) meet the applicable labeling requirements specified by FSC-STD-40-004 (§8.2).</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs <input type="checkbox"/> N/A, no FSC labels on promotional items
<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 8.3 For FSC trademarks used for promotion at trade fairs the organization has clearly marked which products are FSC certified and the products carry an FSC label; or if no products are displayed, a visible disclaimer stating, “Ask for our FSC certified products,” or, “We can provide FSC certified products upon request,” is present. NOTE: Use of text to describe the FSC certification of the organization does not require a disclaimer.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs <input type="checkbox"/> N/A, no FSC trademarks used for promotion at trade fairs
<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 9.1, 9.2 The organization takes full responsibility for the use of FSC trademarks by investment companies and others making financial claims based on their FSC certified operations (§9.1). Any such claims are accompanied by the disclaimer, “FSC is not responsible for and does not endorse any financial claims on returns on investments” (§9.2).</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs <input type="checkbox"/> N/A, no investment claims about FSC operations
<p>Promotional Trademarks Section Evidence: Most of these materials are not being used for any FSC trademarks or claims. Such use is limited to raw log sales at the stump. These uses were examined in all associated documents.</p>	
<p>Number and variety of promotional trademarks and associated approval records reviewed: Range, including timber sale contracts, websites, and management plans.</p>	
<p>Using the FSC labels on products</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A, does not use/intend to use FSC on-product/packaging labels (Skip section 11)</p>	
<p>NOTE: This section is applicable for all organizations that use or <i>intend</i> to use FSC trademarks for on-product purposes. For evaluation audits, it is acceptable to mark C if the client demonstrates an adequate awareness of the requirements through interviews and other applicable evidence. A requirement should be marked NC and a corresponding CAR should be issued for any nonconformance identified, such as use of FSC trademarks prior to granting of certification.</p>	

Appendix 7 – FME staff consulted

Company Name NYDEC
 Location Albany and Multi field offices in the regions (Region 8) Bath
 Type of Audit SFI 2015-2019 re-assessment audit
 Opening Meeting Date October 10, 2017 Closing Meeting Date October 16, 2017

NAME (Printed)	TITLE/POSITION	OPENING MEETING (Initials)	CLOSING MEETING (Initials)
Keri Yankus <i>Keri Yankus</i>	NSF SFI Lead Auditor	<i>KY</i>	
Stefan Bergmann	SCS auditor (FSC)	<i>SAB</i>	
JOEL FISKE	NYDEC	<i>JRF</i>	
John Gibbs	Natural Resources Supervisor DEC	<i>JG</i>	
Beth Jacquarain	SCS	<i>BQ</i>	
Mark Gooding	Regional Forester	<i>MG</i>	
Gretchen Cicora	Forester	<i>GC</i>	
JOSH BORST	FORESTER 2	<i>JB</i>	
Cody Lafter	Forest Tech. 1	<i>CL</i>	
Nicholas Szatkowski	Forest Tech 1	<i>NS</i>	
Tad Norton	Forester 1	<i>TN</i>	
Eric Egger	Forest Technician II	<i>EE</i>	
ROB MESSENGER	BUREAU CHIEF	<i>RW</i>	

Company Name NYDEC
 Location Albany and Multi field offices in the regions (1+7) Regional Herkimer + Sherburne
 Type of Audit SFI 2015-2019 re-assessment audit
 Opening Meeting Date October 10, 2017 Closing Meeting Date October 16, 2017

NAME (Printed)	TITLE/POSITION	OPENING MEETING (Initials)	CLOSING MEETING (Initials)
Keri Yankus	NSF SFI Lead Auditor		
Jake Murphy	Forest technician 1 (continued)	JM	
Nick Wilcox	Forest technician 1	NW	
AUDY GOELLER	SUPERVISING FORESTER	AG	
Andy Blum	Forester 1	AB	
Erin Stoddard	Forest technician	EES	
Tom Williams	Forest Technician 2 (continued)	TW	
Travis Pettit	Forest Technician (continued)	TP	
Stefan Bergmann	SCS FM Auditor	SB	
DAVID SINCLAIR	REGIONAL FORESTER	DS	
Chris Sprague	Forester 1	CS	
Robert Off	Forester 1	RO	
Rob Messenger	REGIONAL CHIEF	RM	
Josh Borst	FORESTER 2	JB	
Beth Jacamanis	SCS Certification Forester	BJ	
Jason Scherling	Forester 1	JS	
GREG WENIS	S.R. FORESTER	GW	
Mary Kay Allen	Senior Forester	MKA	
Jessica Mosher	Forest tech	JLM	
Dave Smith	Regional Forester	DS	
Scott Healy	Supervising Forester	SAH	
Tony Sparacino	Forester	TZS	
Andrea Mercurio	Forester	A	

AESOP 48561 ISSUE 10, STATUS-PUBLISHED, EFFECTIVE 30 FEB 2017
 This document is the property of NSF International.

Ed Sykes
 Cora Redner

Forester

Forest Tech

DLR

Company Name NYDEC
 Location Albany and Multi field offices in the regions - Albany Central office
 Type of Audit SFI 2015-2019 re-assessment audit
 Opening Meeting Date October 10, 2017 Closing Meeting Date October 16, 2017

NAME (Printed)	TITLE/POSITION	OPENING MEETING (Initials)	CLOSING MEETING (Initials)
Keri Yankus	NSF SFI Lead Auditor	KY	KY
Josh Borst	FORESTER 2	JB	JB
Rob Messenger	BUREAU CHIEF	RM	RM
Nathan Fink	Forester 1 Region 4	via phone	
Peter Innes	Assistant Director Lands + Forests	PI	
Patricia Maher	Dep Comm Nat Res	KM	
Robert Davies	Director, Lands + Forests	RKD	
Dave Paradowski	Reg Forester - 9	via phone	
Joel Fiske	Sup. Forester - 8	↓	
Mark Gooding	Reg Forester - 8		
Dave Smith	Reg. Forester - 6		
Scott Healy	Sup. Forester - 6		

Company Name NYDEC
 Location Albany and Multi field offices in the regions
 Type of Audit SFI 2015-2019 re-assessment audit
 Opening Meeting Date October 10, 2017 Closing Meeting Date October 16, 2017

NAME (Printed)	TITLE/POSITION	OPENING MEETING (Initials)	CLOSING MEETING (Initials)
Keri Yankus	NSF SFI Lead Auditor	KY	
Stefan Bergmann	SCS FM Auditor	SB	
Michael Catlan	Supervising Forester	MJC	
Bill Schwaner	Regional Forester	BS	
Josh Berst	FORESTER 2	JB	
Joe Sweeney	Forest Tech 1	JS	
Vicki Cross	FORESTER 1	VC	
Scott Maxham	Forester 1	SM	
Robert Cross	Forester 1	RC	
Mike Mulligan	Forester 1	MM	
ROB MESSENGER	Bureau Chief	RM	
Beth Jackman	SCS	BJ	