

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

---

## VERMILION FOREST MANAGEMENT COMPANY LTD.

### SCS-FM/COC-00094N

311 Harrison Drive  
Sudbury, Ontario P3E 5E1  
**Peter Street; General Manager**  
[pstreet@nipissingforest.com](mailto:pstreet@nipissingforest.com)

Website: <http://sudburyforest.com>

CERTIFIED	EXPIRATION
Sept 05, 2011	Sept 04, 2016

DATE OF FIELD AUDIT
04-06/Sept/2013
DATE OF LAST UPDATE
25/Nov/2013

SCS Contact:  
**Brendan Grady** | Director  
Forest Management Certification  
+1.510.452.8000  
[bgrady@scsglobalservices.com](mailto:bgrady@scsglobalservices.com)

**SCS**global  
SERVICES  
*Setting the standard for sustainability™*

2000 Powell Street, Ste. 600, Emeryville, CA 94608 USA  
+1.510.452.8000 main | +1.510.452.8001 fax  
[www.SCSglobalServices.com](http://www.SCSglobalServices.com)

## Foreword

Cycle in annual surveillance audits			
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <sup>st</sup> annual audit	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <sup>nd</sup> annual audit	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 <sup>rd</sup> annual audit	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 <sup>th</sup> annual audit
Name of Forest Management Enterprise (FME) and abbreviation used in this report:			
VERMILION FOREST MANAGEMENT COMPANY LTD. (VFM)			

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

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

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

### Organization of the Report

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

## Table of Contents

---

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY .....	4
1. GENERAL INFORMATION .....	4
1.1 Annual Audit Team.....	4
1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation .....	4
1.3 Standards Employed .....	4
2 ANNUAL AUDIT DATES AND ACTIVITIES .....	5
2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities .....	5
2.2 Evaluation of Management Systems .....	11
3. CHANGES IN MANAGEMENT PRACTICES .....	11
4. RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION .....	11
4.1 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations .....	11
5. STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS .....	11
5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted .....	22
5.2 Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Responses from the Team, Where Applicable .....	22
6. CERTIFICATION DECISION .....	22
7. CHANGES IN CERTIFICATION SCOPE .....	22
8. ANNUAL DATA UPDATE .....	26
8.1 Social Information .....	26
8.2 Annual Summary of Pesticide and Other Chemical Use .....	27
SECTION B – APPENDICES (CONFIDENTIAL) .....	28
Appendix 1 – List of FMUs Selected For Evaluation.....	28
Appendix 2 – List of Stakeholders Consulted.....	28
Appendix 3 – Additional Audit Techniques Employed.....	29
Appendix 4 – Pesticide Derogations .....	29
Appendix 5 – Detailed Observations.....	29
Appendix 6 – Chain of Custody Indicators for FMEs.....	50

## SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY

### 1. General Information

#### 1.1 Annual Audit Team

<b>Auditor Name:</b>	Walter R. Mark	<b>Auditor role:</b>	Lead Auditor
<b>Qualifications:</b>	Dr. Mark is a professor emeritus of forestry at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo and former Director of Swanton Pacific Ranch, the University’s FSC Certified school forest. Dr. Mark specializes in forest health and silviculture. Dr. Mark is a consultant for SCS and is responsible for the audit. Dr. Mark is a registered professional forester in California (RPF No. 1250) with over 40 years of forestry experience in public and private forestry and higher education sectors. He has served as audit team member and leader for several certification, recertification, scoping, and annual audits over the past several years. Dr. Mark was a member of the SCS team that performed the original FSC certification audit on VFM in 2005.		
<b>Auditor Name:</b>	Peter Higgelke	<b>Auditor role:</b>	Auditor
<b>Qualifications:</b>	Peter is a Consulting Forester, Managing Partner of KBM Forestry Consultants Inc. (Ontario). As a principal in KBM, Mr. Higgelke specializes in forest auditing, forest management planning, forest inventory, wildlife habitat supply analysis modelling, business plan preparation, timber harvesting, and forest renewal prescriptions. Peter is a registered professional forester in the province of Ontario. He participates regularly in Independent Forest Audits in Ontario and has advised First Nations on forest management, forestry negotiations and economic development. In the past he lectured at Lakehead University on integrated forest resources management and GIS applications in forestry. Peter was a member of the SCS team that performed the original FSC certification audit on VFM in 2005.		

#### 1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation

A. Number of days spent on-site assessing the applicant:	2.5
B. Number of auditors participating in on-site evaluation:	2.0
C. Additional days spent on preparation, stakeholder consultation, and post-site follow-up:	2.0
<b>D. Total number of person days used in evaluation:</b>	<b>7.0</b>

#### 1.3 Standards Employed

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

Title	Version	Date of Finalization
SCS Interim Standard for GLSL	V 2-0	–March 2012
All standards employed are available on the websites of FSC International ( <a href="http://www.fsc.org">www.fsc.org</a> ), the FSC-US ( <a href="http://www.fscus.org">www.fscus.org</a> ) or the SCS Standards page ( <a href="http://www.scsglobalservices.com/certification-standards-and-program-">www.scsglobalservices.com/certification-standards-and-program-</a>		

[documents](#)). Standards are also available, upon request, from SCS Global Services ([www.SCSglobalServices.com](http://www.SCSglobalServices.com)).

## 2 Annual Audit Dates and Activities

### 2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities

<b>Date:</b> September 4, 2013	
<b>FMU / Location / sites visited</b>	<b>Activities / notes</b>
Vermillion Forest Management --Sudbury Holiday Inn	<p>Opening Meeting: Received an update on the company and activities since the last annual audit from Peter Street. This update included a personnel update and the changes in the road tending to the use of herbicides instead of manual tending. Following this the open CARs and OBS were reviewed and documents related to these were reviewed.</p> <p>The next action was to review the agenda and finalize the field audit stops.</p> <p>Those in attendance included: Peter Street, Walter Mark, and Peter Higgelke.</p>
Vermillion Forest Management --Sudbury Holiday Inn Parking Lot and travel to first field site	<p>Field Audit Group met and introductions were made prior for departure to first field audit stop. Those participating included Peter Street, Mark Lockhart, Ron Luopa, Doug Maki, Eric Gelinias, and Pat Bazinet from VFM; Jenny Gerow from MITIG; Mike Bulova from the MNR; Jim Gomm, Bob Boyuk and Vicki Mather from the LLC; and, Walter Mark and Peter Higgelke from the audit team.</p> <p>Changes in attendance at various stops will be recorded for each stop.</p> <p>Discussion on the new FRI on the way to the first stop included updating the HCV's and the gap analysis. RSA's on the forest will renew with the new FMP. The AOC's are the functional equivalent of RSA's in FSC terminology. The list of those and the prescriptions for them are included in the FMP. The MNR is pushing for more winter operations in the future as many AOC prescriptions have timing restrictions which limit operations in the summer months.</p>
Vermillion Forest Management – Stop 13-01	<p>This stop was at a fall-winter clearcut in Gervais Block SC-01. The harvest was done in 2010 and the area was planted in the spring of 2013. Disk trenching was used for site preparation in 2012. There were survival issues with the planting stock. Fifty specimens were removed from each block and were tested for quality. Testing showed that the smaller seedlings were most likely to die and an agreement was reached on culling prior to planting. After planting survival was in excess of 97%. Plan to spray with herbicide for release in 2014.</p> <p>Planting was found to have been well done with substantial ingress to augment stocking. Site preparation had removed much of the balsam fir remnants on the site post harvest.</p>

	<p>Don Trudeau from Gervais joined the group here at the end of this stop.</p>
<p>Vermillion Forest Management – Stop 1 and 2</p>	<p>The first location at this stop was at the 70 foot bridge over the Sturgeon River on the Gervais Road. The bridge replaced an historical ford at the site. Federal permitting was required due to the navigable nature of the river. The bridge is gated to prevent unauthorized use. Following completion of forest operations in the block, the bridge will be removed.</p> <p>Next the group moved into the cut block in Gervais Block 2010-006 to look at the planting and to examine a temporary bridge placed on the Paul Lake Branch Road in the unit. This was a fall-winter clearcut harvest in 2010 with planting in 2013 following TTS site preparation. The plant was well done with species matched to the site by planting spruce in the wetter areas and pine in the drier areas. Harvest operations are limited seasonally to prevent interference with park use as outlined in the Temagami Land Use Plan. Cutting started in 2012 and will continue with 1/3 cut in each of three years.</p> <p>Some drainage concerns were apparent and plans to correct were in place – a number of new drainage pipes were already on hand. Slash had been piled in the majority of the block with plans to continue once operations restart.</p> <p>The temporary crossing on the Paul Lake Branch Road had some issues with water flow off the road coming down the road and diverted near the crossing. The crossing had a down slope approach on both sides and no water bars to divert water flow on the road surface until near the crossing. Sediment barriers were installed and no sediment had reached the stream at the time of the audit.</p> <p>Don Trudeau left the group at this point.</p>
<p>Vermillion Forest Management – Stop 4</p>	<p>The next stop was at EACOM block 2010-002 harvested by Gervais. The harvest was started in 2012. There was a small area (3ha) of unallocated wood cut in error. The MNR traded this off for about 7 ha of moose late wintering habitat with mature jack pine.</p> <p>On the drive to this block, the group travelled on a newly constructed road. The road was located and constructed within forest that was not allocated for harvest. According to the FMP, road right of way widths were limited to 30m. There were numerous examples where the right of way width had been exceeded. It was observed that this practice was largely limited to sites in which road building material was found and used by the excavator operator who had developed the road. See <b>CAR 2013.3</b></p> <p>A temporary bridge crossing was examined. This crossing was well installed with little to no disruption of the channel. The road and crossing were in an AOC identified as potential as First Nation cultural</p>

	<p>site. The protections were discussed and observed. The use of log mats and geotextile fabric should allow the bridge to be removed with little risk of disturbance of sedimentation.</p> <p>Material was noted on the bridge surface and the bridge surface did have gaps which could allow debris to pass through the bridge surface into the stream. Don Trudeau indicated he came out periodically and cleaned the bridge surfaces off to prevent deposition into the stream.</p> <p>The contractor was operating at the time of the audit stop. Discussions with the mechanic present on site and inspection for safety equipment showed the presence of two spill kits on site. The individual interviewed indicated he had attended the annual training and had training on environmental issues, turtle issues and use of spill kits. All operators on site were certified for their equipment operation.</p> <p>During travel to the next stop discussions centered on the transformation taking place in the MNR. They are going through a three-year downsizing. They are planning to regionalize some functions by reducing functions and staff in some district offices. Layoff notices have been sent out and vacancy announcements are out.</p> <p>Slash burning was also discussed during this travel. The burning period is October 15 through November 15. Public notices will be out 30 days in advance of burning operations with maps and smoke visibility announcements. Notifications are also sent to local police departments, airports, fire departments, municipalities, and mines within 5 km of the burning. Eric Gelinis will be heading this effort.</p>
<p>Vermillion Forest Management – Stop 23</p>	<p>This stop was at a red pine thinning in Block 2010-039 by Future Wood. The stand was originally planted at 1200 seedlings/ha by the MNR 45 to 50 years ago. The target after thinning is 800 stems/ha with basal area equal to or greater than 24m<sup>2</sup>/ha. The operation is done with a processor and a forwarder. There were some issues during start-up in the spring with damage to residual trees and cutting below the 800 stems/ha level. This was corrected and operations were much better in the later work areas. Potential loss of productivity due to processor and forwarder corridors was discussed. The prescription was discussed and later documentation was provided and reviewed. The limit on removal levels during thinning was the limiting factor on the prescription.</p> <p>An old gravel pit was re-opened and utilized in the operations. There were trees too close to the edge, but it was active at the time and plans were to cut the trees too close to the edge of the pit.</p> <p>An oil leak was detected on the truck used to haul gravel. The truck had leaked oil on the ground. There also appeared to be a spill from servicing the truck in the area that had not been cleaned up at the time of the audit visit. Please see <b>CAR 2013.1 and OBS 2013.5</b></p>

Vermillion Forest Management – Unscheduled Stop	Drove by EACOM Block 33 where gravel exploration was left in disturbed state and observed during the 2012 annual audit, resulting in CAR 2012.6. The area was repaired.
Vermillion Forest Management – Stop 21	This is a Goulard Lumber operation in Block 2010-036. The block is to be clearcut and the early operations have been to cut the road right of ways. Operations including a new gravel pit looked good.
Vermillion Forest Management – Stop 31	<p>Cleland Road construction with several water crossings under Domtar’s license with the work completed by Piquette. Road construction in this part of the Sudbury Forest is challenging with little coarse material available for road construction, leaving the operators with no alternative but to use fine textured silty soils for road construction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bridge - construction well done with grubbing kept within the 30m road right-of-way.</li> <li>• Two HDPE pipes – construction well done,</li> <li>• Temporary bridge (WX079) – construction well done; however road approaches require repairs. Present situation does not prevent water from flowing down hill on the road surface to the top of the crossing where it then runs into the stream.</li> <li>• WX080 - construction well done.</li> <li>• WX081 – approaches need improvement – see WX079 above.</li> </ul> <p><b>Please see CAR 2013.2</b></p>
Vermillion Forest Management – Stop 32	<p>Domtar Blocks 2010-045 and 2010-104 operated by Piquette. The stop included a site where early fall rutting had occurred and had been investigated jointly by the MNR, VFM and Piquette.</p> <p>The harvest was found to have been well done. Utilization was good. Snag numbers were good and were well distributed.</p> <p>The area had been site prepared via trenching. Spacing was good and down pressure was applied well.</p>
<b>Date:</b> September 5, 2013	
Vermillion Forest Management – Sudbury Holiday Inn Parking	The audit group today consisted of Peter Street, Ron Luopa, Doug Maki, Eric Gelinas, and Pat Bazinet from VFM; Tim Lehman from the MNR; and, Walter Mark and Peter Higgelke from the audit team.
Vermillion Forest Management. – Stop 22	<p>This stop was clearcut in Piquette Block 2010-102. The cut areas were in two separate locations. The smaller of the two had no issues. The larger of the two had limited access and as a result extensive site damage occurred in the main skid approaches to the only landing for the unit. A major part of the issue was the timing of implementation of the harvest. This needs to be addressed to prevent this type of damage to the site in the future. Please see <b>CAR 2013.2</b></p>
Vermillion Forest Management – Stop 34	<p>This is a Chartrand Lumber operation in Block 2010-072. This block had been harvested using the shelterwood method. There was extensive discussion CAR 2012.2 regarding leaving of insular and peninsular patches in shelterwood units. The discussion led to Tim Lehman agreeing to research the background information on the stand and site guides to see if this was addressed. The MNR would take the position that if insular and peninsular patches were left, that would not</p>



	<p>constitute compliance with the FMP in the application of the shelterwood method. This will be addressed in the decision made by the audit team on CAR 2012.2.</p> <p>The application in the unit looked good with little to no residual stand damage and areas of habitat included in the unit as moose late winter habitat.</p> <p>Further down the road several sites were found with oil spills, one of which exceeded 20m<sup>2</sup>. Please see <b>CAR 2013.5</b></p>
<p>Vermillion Forest Management – Stop 12-7</p>	<p>This stop was to look at the results of an herbicide trial to test the efficacy of mixes and separate applications of Garlon XRT and VisionMax. The tests were conducted to determine if the amounts and costs of herbicide application for release could be lowered.</p> <p>The results were mixed in terms of control of competing vegetation and the impact of the herbicide on white pines. The assessment included percent kill of target species and percent kill of crop trees. Did receive some mortality in areas of white pine, particularly in the Garlon XRT plots.</p>
<p>Vermillion Forest Management – Stop 30</p>	<p>This is a Lahaie Lumber operation in Block 2010-087. The block is to be clearcut with seed trees. There were timing restrictions due to species at risk, namely coldwater fisheries and Blanding turtle presence in the area. Harry Struik met the group at the unit and explained the restrictions and the current status of the operations. The timing periods for the two species at risk put real time constraints on the operation. A crossing was needed and it could not be put in after September 1. The turtle restrictions included an inner zone from May1 to Sept 30 and the larger zone from June 1 through Aug 30. The restriction zones were painted on trees at the unit. Road had been shaped for access by falling equipment, but no vehicular traffic was allowed. Had to shuttle fuel in by ATV.</p>
<p>Vermillion Forest Management – Stop 26</p>	<p>This is an N'Skwakamok operation in Block 2010-053. The block was a pine shelterwood and pine seed tree harvest operation with winter operations. The audit group was joined by John Manitowabi, general manager of N'Skwakamok since 2009. Discussions with John on the way to the units included allocations sales to cover some of the debt owed and the contracts for manual tending and FRI work. Advance pine regeneration had been well protected during operations. There were some areas of rutting, although they did not exceed the standards. Some different skid trail locations might have reduced the impact of skidding. Utilization seemed to be good and residual stand damage was minimal. There were some logs left at the landings which were planned for pick-up later.</p>
<p>Vermillion Forest Management – Stop 27</p>	<p>This is an N'Skwakamok operation in Block 2010-053 that was completed by Jay Wilson Logging. At the start of this section of the block, there had been concerns with damage to residual stems and</p>

	<p>existing regeneration. These were addressed as operations proceeded as was evident in our walkabout.</p> <p>A skid trail was found running down slope and across a drainage. Soil had been pulled down the hill and into the drainage impeding water flow.</p> <p>Both concerns at this site could have been avoided with adequate supervision on site. Please see <b>CAR 2013.1</b></p>
Vermillion Forest Management – Stop 12-13	<p>This stop was a Garlon herbicide treatment block. Garlon was applied at a rate of 2.6 L/ha in a 50 L/ha mix. The pine seedlings had no observable damage and a good kill was achieved on the target maple.</p>
Vermillion Forest Management – Stop 13-12	<p>This was an herbicide application block with air blast ground spray for site preparation prior to spring 2014 plant. This was VFM's first ground spray performed by an operator other than Harry Struik.</p> <p>Some skips in the application were observed, but overall it was a very good job. SAR reduced the level of application done due to timing window and slower production with ground sprayers. To overcome this problem ground sprays will be reduced in favor of more aerial application. VFM staff met with the MNR biologist to prioritize entire herbicide application plan for 2013 to reduce likelihood of problems with restrictions based on species at risk concerns.</p>
<b>Date:</b> September 6, 2013	
Vermillion Forest Management – Sudbury Holiday Inn Parking	<p>The audit group today consisted of Peter Street and Ron Luopa from VFM; Sean Sutherland from G.W. Sutherland Contracting Company Ltd.; Mike Bulova from the MNR; and, Walter Mark and Peter Higgelke from the audit team.</p>
Vermillion Forest Management – Stop 18	<p>This stop was a winter pine shelterwood and pine seed tree harvest in Sutherland Block 2010-023. This operation had an AOC related to cottaging. Timing was to be from Labor day until the first snow accumulation. In addition to the timing issues, there was a 30m visual buffer along roads and trucks were escorted both ways to prevent encounters with other traffic. A bypass was built to eliminate some hazardous road. Old road route was decommissioned. Other AOC's in the block included moose aquatic feeding habitat, wetlands, warm water fisheries, and a self-sustaining lake trout lake.</p>
Vermillion Forest Management – Stop 20	<p>This was a Sutherland clearcut in birch in Block 2010-028. It was a winter operation so access was somewhat limited and the haul road went through a long stretch of adjacent landowner property. The road was gated and locked. Insular and peninsular patches looked good. Quite a bit of blow down in the residual trees scattered throughout the block. Slash will be piled later for burning. Winter operations roads had some washout issues on the way in to the unit and within the unit. Plan is to deal with this at the time the slash is piled, since equipment will be present to provide for drainage in needed areas.</p>
Vermillion Forest Management – Closing Meeting	<p>The closing meeting was held at lunch with those in attendance including Peter Street and Ron Luopa of VFM; Sean Sutherland; and, Walter Mark and Peter Higgelke of the audit team.</p>

## 2.2 Evaluation of Management Systems

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

## 3. Changes in Management Practices

There have been no significant changes in management practices since the last audit.

## 4. Results of the Evaluation

### 4.1 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations

There were six CARs and OBS from the 2012 annual surveillance audit which were open at the time of the 2013 annual surveillance audit.

<b>Finding Number: 2012.1</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <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):	
<b>Deadline</b>	<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):
<b>FSC Indicator(s):</b>	<b>SCS GLSL Interim Standard, Indicator 1.5.1</b>
<b>Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):</b> Indicator 1.5.1 requires that the manager demonstrates that measures are in place to protect the management unit from illegal/unauthorized activities. The Means of Verification includes controlling access. Although VFM is notifying MNR of breached access controls, the MNR has had difficulties re-establishing and/or enforcing access control points. VFM reported in several FOIP reports that access controls could be improved and that follow-up enforcement was required.	
<b>Corrective Action Request (or Observation):</b> VFM should begin working more closely with MNR to improve maintenance and enforcement of access controls and/or implement other approaches to control unauthorized activity on the FMU.	

<b>FME response</b> <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	VFM continued to conduct Compliance Inspections on established access controls. These inspections were reported in FOIP to MNR and reviewed and discussed with the local LCC. Copies of the FOIP reports can be found in the folder for 1.5.1. Also contained in this folder is MNR’s strategy for monitoring access controls – which VFM participated in developing and has committed to assisting the District in implementing. This CAR was discussed at VFM’s Spring Compliance Meeting (power point presentation in the General Information folder). VFM has also encouraged Licensees to fix any damaged gates.
<b>SCS review</b>	The response of VFM shows increased monitoring and reporting by VFM of access violations. Increased participation in maintenance and monitoring of access restriction by the licensees. The MNR has established a policy of working directly with the LCC to have the members of the LCC monitor and report access restriction violations directly to them. This will greatly increase the monitoring and reporting of access restrictions and violations. This should result in reduced access restriction violations.
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

<b>Finding Number: 2012.2</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):</b>	
<b>Deadline</b>	<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):
<b>FSC Indicator(s):</b>	<b>SCS GLSL Interim Standard, 6.3.11</b>
<p><b>Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):</b>                  VFM procedures do not ensure that conformance with Indicator 6.3.11 that states “In clear-cuts and other final removal cuts in natural forests, harvesting maintains residual structures in sufficient quantities and distribution so as to fulfill their ecological functions.” Specifically the elements of 6.3.11 requiring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. Residual retention includes all standing residual structure in a defined and mapped harvest area, including insular patches, peninsular patches, partial harvest areas and reserves established for other purposes.</li> <li>d. All residual retention is long term, meaning it will not be harvested until at least the subsequent rotation.</li> </ul> <p>VFM does not maintain uncut insular and peninsular patches in shelterwood treatments of white pine or hardwoods. FMP and Stand and Site Guide does allow for harvesting in reserve patches when adjacent stand is 3m, thus jeopardizing the “long-term” requirement of the reserve patches.                  The audit did not uncover any harvests that did not conform with requirements of 6.3.11, rather this CAR is being issued on the fact that VFM procedures do not conform to 6.3.911</p>	
<p><b>Corrective Action Request (or Observation):</b>                  VFM must implement measures to ensure conformance with 6.3.11.</p>	

<p><b>FME response</b> <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• VFM will defer from cutting any insular &amp; peninsular patches until the GLSL Standard has been finalized or new Canadian standards are developed.</li> <li>• At a meeting with FSC Canada held on April 3<sup>rd</sup> &amp; 4<sup>th</sup>, 2013 (which VFM/NFRM hosted) - the question of following the FSC standards or Provincial standards was discussed. All in attendance agreed that Provincial requirements come first and the Certificate holder should just identify the conflict with government regulations – please refer to the Minutes of the meeting in the General Information Section – Part 3 on page 5.</li> </ul>
<p><b>SCS review</b></p>	<p>At this time it is clear that the FSC Standard 6.3.11 and the policies, regulations and guidelines of the MNR are in direct conflict with regard to insular and peninsular residual patches within shelterwood cuts made on the Sudbury Forest. The MNR has approved a 10-year FMP for the Sudbury Forest which does not provide for the establishment of insular and peninsular residual patches in Shelterwood units. The MNR staff interviewed by the audit team indicated that the SFL must abide by the conditions and prescriptions approved in the FMP and that a deviation from that FMP would not be permitted.</p> <p>A follow-up letter providing rationale for the lack of insular and peninsular patches in final removal cuts in shelterwood harvests was provided by Tim Lehman of the MNR and states as follows: “With regards to the insular and peninsular issue I have been reading the stand and site guide background and rationale for direction (section 3.2.2.2 page 12, 13). Selection harvest areas are excluded because a mature overstory is maintained, shelterwood areas are excluded because 1) shelterwood can result in young development stages for short periods but rarely results in pre-sapling conditions associated with clearcuts, 2) nature of broader forest where shelterwood is practiced is very heterogeneous resulting in a mixture of shelterwood, clearcut and selection in intimate relation to each other and the intimate nature of this mosaic combined with specific guidelines for clearcuts will normally result in a reasonable pattern that likely approaches the natural disturbance pattern for the area.” This then puts the lack of insular and peninsular patches in the final removal cuts of shelterwood harvests in compliance with 6.9.9, which states that “The amount of residual structure retained in harvest operations will approximate the levels of expected post-disturbance residual identified in 6.1.3</p> <p>This satisfies the audit team with regard to the lack of insular and peninsular patches in the final removal cut of shelterwood harvests</p> <p>VFM should continue to seek resolution of this seeming conflict between the FSC Standards, the stand and site guide, and the provincial laws and regulations as indicated under FSC 1.4.1.</p>
<p><b>Status of CAR:</b></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed  <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major  <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i></p>

**Finding Number: 2012.3**

<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):	
<b>Deadline</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <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):
<b>FSC Indicator(s):</b>	<b>SCS GLSL Interim Standard, Indicator 8.1.1</b>
<b>Non-Conformity</b> (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): VFM is in non-conformance with Indicator 8.1.1 that requires the management plan's implementation to be subject to regular monitoring that documents: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The degree in which goals, objectives and targets were met</li> <li>Conformance to the management plan</li> <li>Unexpected effects of management activities; and Social and environmental effects of management activities</li> </ol> Specifically, monitoring of crossings/culverts across the FMU has not occurred per the FMP requirement of monitoring all water crossing every three years.	
<b>Corrective Action Request</b> (or Observation): VFM must ensure water crossings are monitored per the requirements of the FMP.	
<b>FME response</b> (including any evidence submitted)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Water crossing survey requirements have been identified and mapped and Ron &amp; Pat are in the process of completing the required inspections.</li> <li>Please refer to Ron's email and survey results for Hawley Township in the General Information Section</li> </ul>
<b>SCS review</b>	The FME has submitted a plan for survey of all water crossings in the FMU every three years.
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

<b>Finding Number: 2012.4</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):	
<b>Deadline</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <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):
<b>FSC Indicator(s):</b>	<b>SCS GLSL Interim Standard, Indicator 8.2.5</b>
<b>Non-Conformity</b> (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): VFM is not sufficiently monitoring the environmental impacts of forest management activities assessed in accordance with Criterion 6.1. Assessments in 6.1 shall consider impacts including site specific impacts. Furthermore, 6.1 specifically requires assessment of potential impacts to moist soils and soils subject to compaction (e.g., structured clay).	

<p>During the 2012 audit, Block 46 Piquette was heavily rutted and early results showed poor poplar regeneration due to compaction/root damage and possible reduced growth of next rotation. Although this site did not exceed MNR's standard for excessive rutting, there were signs that logging was causing productivity impacts to the site.</p>	
<p><b>Corrective Action Request (or Observation):</b> Per 8.2.5, VFM must monitor the environmental impact of rutting and compaction on susceptible sites.</p>	
<p><b>FME response</b> <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i></p>	<p>Regeneration plots have been established in 4 areas previously reported as having site damage. The regeneration plots have been established in the rutted areas and adjacent to these areas. Initial regeneration survey results can be found in section 6.0 Criterion.</p>
<p><b>SCS review</b></p>	<p>The FME has established some monitoring plots to monitor the impact of rutting and compaction. In addition the FME has provided a specific plan for continued monitoring and analysis of these impacts.</p>
<p><b>Status of CAR:</b></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed  <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major  <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)</p>

<p><b>Finding Number: 2012.5</b></p>	
<p><b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation</p>	
<p><b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):</b></p>	
<p><b>Deadline</b></p>	<p><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):</p>
<p><b>FSC Indicator(s):</b></p>	<p><b>SCS GLSL Interim Standard, Indicator 7.3.1</b></p>
<p><b>Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):</b> Indicator 7.3.1 requires that Forest workers receive adequate training and supervision to ensure proper implementation of the management plan. Given the current variability in skill and experience of operators as well as variability in operators care/precaution there is room to improve the level of supervision by VFM foresters. Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Residual stand and advanced regeneration damage in Block 10-28 could have been stopped if identified when the operations were starting out; rather it was identified after the harvest had been completed. The area of damaged red oak could only have been stopped if VFM staff were on site during the day it was skidded. In the areas previously inspected in the block, care was being taken around residual stems. This damage occurred when the contractor (not the Licensee's regular skidder operator) took it upon himself to skid the trees.</li> <li>- Lack of cooperation by a shareholder in having proper supervision of his operations. .</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Corrective Action Request (or Observation):</b> VFM should implement approaches to ensure there is adequate supervision of forest workers that results in proper implementation of the management plan.</p>	

<b>FME response</b> <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	The incident leading up to this CAR and the requirement of having on site supervision (in accordance with the Occupational Health & Safety Act) was discussed at VFM's Spring Compliance Meeting (power point presentation in the General Information section).
<b>SCS review</b>	The FME response does not adequately address the OBS and field observations in the 2013 field audit found a continuation of the problem of start-up supervision. This OBS has been raised to <b>CAR 2013.1</b> .
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i>

<b>Finding Number: 2012.6</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):	
<b>Deadline</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <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):
<b>FSC Indicator(s):</b>	<b>SCS GLSL Interim Standard, Indicator 6.3.7</b>
<b>Non-Conformity</b> (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): Relevant "best management practices" pertaining to the protection of soils, water quality and sensitive sites were not being implemented. In ECOM Block 33, the operator bulldozed part of hillside to search for gravel, which did not represent best management for protection of soils. The operation had finished and the exposed hillside had yet to be repaired.	
<b>Corrective Action Request</b> (or Observation): VFM must ensure that reparation to the damage in block ECOM 33 made and ensure BMPs for gravel exploration are followed across the FMU.	
<b>FME response</b> <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	The damaged area has been repaired – please refer to the photos in the file called "Aggregate exploration rehab" in the General Information folder. Please also refer to VFM's Spring Compliance Meeting's power point presentation in the General Information section
<b>SCS review</b>	The damaged area was observed during the 2013 field audit and the photo evidence has been reviewed. The damaged area has been repaired.
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i>

## 4.2 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations

<b>Finding Number: 2013.1</b>
-------------------------------



<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):	
<b>Deadline</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <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):
<b>FSC Indicator(s):</b>	<b>SCS GLSL Interim Standard, Indicator 7.3.1</b>
<b>Non-Conformity</b> (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): Indicator 7.3.1 requires that Forest workers receive adequate training and supervision to ensure proper implementation of the management plan. Given the current variability in skill and experience of operators as well as variability in operators care/precaution there is room to improve the level of supervision by VFM foresters. Evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Residual stand and advanced regeneration damage in Block 10-28 could have been stopped if identified when the operations were starting out; rather it was identified after the harvest had been completed. The area of damaged red oak could only have been stopped if VFM staff were on site during the day it was skidded. In the areas previously inspected in the block, care was being taken around residual stems. This damage occurred when the contractor (not the Licensee's regular skidder operator) took it upon himself to skid the trees.</li> </ul> Lack of cooperation by a shareholder in having proper supervision of his operations.	
<b>Corrective Action Request</b> (or Observation): VFM must implement approaches to ensure there is adequate supervision of forest workers that results in proper implementation of the management plan.	
<b>FME response</b> (including any evidence submitted)	
<b>SCS review</b>	
<b>Status of CAR:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

<b>Finding Number: 2013.2</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):	
<b>Deadline</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <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):
<b>FSC Indicator(s):</b>	<b>SCS GLSL Interim Standard, Indicator 6.3.14</b>

<b>Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):</b> Several stops on the field audit this year provided evidence that there is a problem with the scheduling of operations on damage prone sites at a time of year when such operations lead to extensive site damage. An example of a stop with this type of issue was the clearcut in Piquette Block 2010-102. VFM staff and staff from the MNR looked at this site during operations and determined operations could continue. Indicator 6.3.14 requires that operations on these types of sites be scheduled during periods of the year when risks are minimized.	
<b>Corrective Action Request (or Observation):</b> VFM must schedule operations on damage prone sites to times of the year when risks are minimized.	
<b>FME response (including any evidence submitted)</b>	
<b>SCS review</b>	
<b>Status of CAR:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

<b>Finding Number: 2013.3</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):</b>	
<b>Deadline</b>	<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):
<b>FSC Indicator(s):</b>	<b>SCS GLSL Interim Standard, Indicator 6.3.6</b>
<b>Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):</b> Several examples of road right of ways that exceeded 30 m were observed during the field audit. This exceeds the allowable ROW in the FMP. Excessive grubbing along the ROW's was also observed during the audit. This often increases the ROW width and reduces forest productivity. The excessive grubbing also disrupts natural hydrologic function in many areas.  The indicator states that the manager has a strategic access plan to minimize and mitigate the negative impacts of roads.	
<b>Corrective Action Request (or Observation):</b> VFM must ensure that the roads planned in the FME are implemented as stated in the FMP and are constructed to minimise the negative impacts of roads and road construction.	
<b>FME response (including any evidence submitted)</b>	
<b>SCS review</b>	

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

<b>Finding Number: 2013.4</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):</b>	
<b>Deadline</b>	<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):
<b>FSC Indicator(s):</b>	<b>SCS GLSL Interim Standard, Indicator 6.3.8</b>
<b>Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):</b>	
During the course of the field audit, several water crossing sites were visited where the approaches to the crossing sloped toward the crossing and adequate protection to prevent the delivery of sediment into the stream was not implemented or was implemented poorly and did not provide adequate protection for the resource. In addition many of the bridges observed had holes in the decking and were covered with debris, which could fall through the bridge and into the stream.	
<b>Corrective Action Request (or Observation):</b>	
VFM must implement relevant BMP's pertaining to the protection of soils, water quality and sensitive sites, with particular attention to those related to those which ensure the protection of aquatic habitat during construction and use.	
<b>FME response (including any evidence submitted)</b>	
<b>SCS review</b>	
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i>

<b>Finding Number: 2013.5</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):</b>	
<b>Deadline</b>	<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):
<b>FSC Indicator(s):</b>	<b>SCS GLSL Interim Standard, Indicator 6.7.4</b>

<b>Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):</b>	
During the field audit pieces of equipment with obvious oil leaks were observed parked in areas of operations. This equipment was still in use by the operators or was waiting for transport from the operating site, even though oil deposition was evident under the equipment. In addition there were several areas where oil deposition was not removed and therefore not taken to a designated disposal site. VFM has standard operating procedures and guidelines for dealing with oil leaks. These need to be implemented on the FMU	
<b>Corrective Action Request (or Observation):</b>	
VFM must ensure that leaking equipment is promptly repaired or removed from the forest. If leaks are discovered, the contaminated material must be removed from the forest and taken to a designated disposal site.	
<b>FME response (including any evidence submitted)</b>	
<b>SCS review</b>	
<b>Status of CAR:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

<b>Finding Number: 2013.6</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):</b>	
<b>Deadline</b>	<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):
<b>FSC Indicator(s):</b>	<b>SCS GLSL Interim Standard, Indicator 6.7.2</b>
<b>Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):</b>	
Several operation locations were observed during the field audit that had left extensive amounts of trash and containers in the forest during operations and after operations were completed.	
<b>Corrective Action Request (or Observation):</b>	
VFM should implement written standards and practices on waste management. Field inspections of waste control measures must be implemented. Forest workers must be educated on the importance and the standards for waste management.	
<b>FME response (including any evidence submitted)</b>	
<b>SCS review</b>	
<b>Status of CAR:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

<b>Finding Number: 2013.7</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Major CAR</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Minor CAR</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Observation</b>	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):	
<b>Deadline</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <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):
<b>FSC Indicator(s):</b>	<b>SCS GLSL Interim Standard, Indicator 6.3.12</b>
<b>Non-Conformity</b> (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): During the field audit thinning operations utilizing equipment for harvesting and skidding were observed to be generating excessive skid road areas in the thinning operations. This was particularly evident at a red pine thinning in Block 2010-039. In many cases the area in skid trails approached the area left for growth. The problem was improved after VFM staff inspected the operations following initial start-up in the unit. VFM staff required the operator to reduce the width of the equipment access trails. Operations on the rest of the unit were much improved in terms of skid road areas. Discussion occurred regarding the amount of area that was lost to production and various alternatives that might be considered.	
<b>Corrective Action Request</b> (or Observation): VFM must ensure that forest roads, skid trails, and landings are well planned and designed to minimize soil erosion and loss of productive area.	
<b>FME response</b> (including any evidence submitted)	
<b>SCS review</b>	
<b>Status of CAR:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

## 5. Stakeholder Comments

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

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

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

### 5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted

Employees of Vermillion Forest Management	Employees of the Ministry of Natural Resources
Employee of MITIG	Local Citizens Committee
Employees of Gervais Lumber Company	Employee of Lahaie Lumber
Employee of N'Skwakamok	Employee of Sutherland Lumber

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

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FME has not received any stakeholder comments from interested parties as a result of stakeholder outreach activities during this annual audit.
--

## 6. Certification Decision

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

## 7. Changes in Certification Scope

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

### Name and Contact Information

<b>Organization name</b>	Vermillion Forest Management
<b>Organization name</b>	Vermillion Forest Management Company Ltd
<b>Contact person</b>	Peter Street, General Manager

<b>Address</b>	311 Harrison Drive Sudbury, Ontario P3E 5E1	<b>Telephone</b>	Office:705-752-5430 ext 26
		<b>Fax</b>	705-752-5736
		<b>e-mail</b>	pstreet@nipissingforest.com
		<b>Website</b>	<a href="http://www.sudburyforest.com">http://www.sudburyforest.com</a>

**FSC Sales Information**

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

**Scope of Certificate**

<b>Certificate Type</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Single FMU	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple FMU
	<input type="checkbox"/> Group	
<b>SLIMF (if applicable)</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Small SLIMF certificate	<input type="checkbox"/> Low intensity SLIMF certificate
	<input type="checkbox"/> Group SLIMF certificate	
	# Group Members (if applicable) NA	
<b>Number of FMUs in scope of certificate</b>		
<b>Geographic location of non-SLIMF FMU(s)</b>	Latitude: Longitude:	
<b>Forest zone</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Boreal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Temperate
	<input type="checkbox"/> Subtropical	<input type="checkbox"/> Tropical
<b>Total forest area in scope of certificate which is:</b> Units: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac		
privately managed	1.1 million ha	
state managed	0	
community managed	0	
<b>Number of FMUs in scope that are:</b>		
less than 100 ha in area	100 - 1000 ha in area	
1000 - 10 000 ha in area	more than 10 000 ha in area	One
<b>Total forest area in scope of certificate which is included in FMUs that:</b> Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" 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	
<b>Division of FMUs into manageable units:</b>		

A forest unit is an aggregation of forest stands for management purposes which has similar species composition, develops in a similar manner (both naturally and in response to silvicultural treatments) and is managed under the same silvicultural system. Forest units are among the fundamental building blocks of a forest management plan. They are used to describe current, and project future, forest conditions in the FMP.

There are 16 forest units on the Sudbury Forest. There are five uniform shelterwood forest units comprising about 130,234 ha or 23% of the forest. The ten clearcut forest units add to about 421,360 ha or 74% of the forest; and there is one selection forest unit for the tolerant hardwoods comprising 15,926 ha or 3% of the forest.

**Non-SLIMF Group Members**

Name	Contact information	Latitude / longitude of Non-SLIMF FMUs
NA		

**Production Forests**

Timber Forest Products	Units: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac
Total area of production forest (i.e. forest from which timber may be harvested)	476,429
Area of production forest classified as 'plantation'	0
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by replanting or by a combination of replanting and coppicing of the planted stems	310,081
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by natural regeneration, or by a combination of natural regeneration and coppicing of the naturally regenerated stems	166,348
Silvicultural system(s)	Area under type of management
Even-aged management	
Clearcut (clearcut size range 6 to 40 acres)	421,360
Shelterwood	130,234
Other:	0
Uneven-aged management	
Individual tree selection	15,926
Group selection	0
Other:	0
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (e.g. nursery, recreation area, windbreak, bamboo, silvo-pastoral system, agro-forestry system, etc.)	0
The sustainable rate of harvest (usually Annual Allowable Harvest or AAH where available) of commercial timber (m3 of round wood)	35,828 MBF/yr
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 ha exclusively for NTFP 91,092 ha in parks & protected areas
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
<b>Explanation of the assumptions and reference to the data source upon which AAH and NTFP harvest rates estimates are based:</b>	
Vermillion Forest Management Plan 2010 using SFMM for modelling	
<b>Species in scope of joint FM/COC certificate: (Scientific / Latin Name and Common / Trade Name)</b>	

**FSC Product Classification**

Timber products		
Product Level 1	Product Level 2	Species
031 Logs/ Wood in the rough	0311 Logs of coniferous wood	JP, EWP, RP,BF, BS, WS
031 Logs/ Wood in the rough	0312 Logs of non-coniferous wood	RO, RM, WB, C
031 Logs/ Wood in the rough	0313 Fuel wood, in logs/other non proc forms	
3451 Wood charcoal	34510 Wood charcoal	
311 Wood, sawn or chipped lengthwise, sliced or peeled, of a thickness exceeding 6 mm; railway or tramway sleepers (cross-ties) of wood, not impregnated	3110 Wood, sawn or chipped lengthwise, sliced or peeled, of a thickness exceeding 6 mm; railway or tramway sleepers (cross-ties) of wood, not impregnated	
312 Wood continuously shaped along any of its edges or faces; wood wool; wood flour; wood in chips or particles	3123 Wood in chips or particles	

**Conservation Areas**

<b>Total area</b> of forest and non-forest land protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for conservation objectives:		111,527 ha		
<b>High Conservation Value Forest / Areas</b>				
<b>High Conservation Values present and respective areas:</b>		Units: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac		
	Code	HCV Type	Description & Location	Area
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV1	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g. endemism, endangered species, refugia).	Deer wintering areas, moose aquatic feeding areas, self-sustaining lake trout lake reserves, rarer tree species north of Highway 17, Wolf Lake Red Pine Old Growth, Capreol-Hammer Delta, Provincially Significant Wetlands	139,193.4
<input type="checkbox"/>	HCV2	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant large		0

		landscape level forests, contained within, or containing the management unit, where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance.		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV3	Forests or areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems.	Old growth hemlock stands in and adjacent to Killarney Provincial Park	1,217.1
<input type="checkbox"/>	HCV4	Forests or areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g. watershed protection, erosion control).		0
<input type="checkbox"/>	HCV5	Forests or areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g. subsistence, health).		0
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV6	Forests or areas critical to local communities' traditional cultural identity (areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in cooperation with such local communities).	French River Park, Vermilion River Park & shoreline reserve, Wahnapiatae River (south of Highway 17) shoreline reserve, Sturgeon River Park, Native Trails	14,691.4
<b>Total Area of forest classified as 'High Conservation Value Forest / Area'</b>				<b>155,101.9</b>

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

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

**8. Annual Data Update**

**8.1 Social Information**

<b>Number of forest workers (including contractors) working in forest within scope of certificate (differentiated by gender):</b>
---

# of male workers = 4 full-time, 2 part-time	# of female workers = 1 seasonal	
<b>Number of accidents in forest work since last audit:</b>	<b>Serious: # 1</b>	<b>Fatal: # 0</b>

## 8.2 Annual Summary of Pesticide and Other Chemical Use

<input type="checkbox"/> FME does not use pesticides.				
Commercial name of pesticide / herbicide	Active ingredient	Quantity applied annually (kg or lbs)	Size of area treated during previous year	Reason for use
VisionMax	Glyphosate	37.9 kg ai	23.4 ha	Site Prep - Aerial
VisionMax	Glyphosate	102.8 kg ai	82.7 ha	Tending - Aerial
Vision	Glyphosate	544.4 kg ai	382.3 ha	Tending - Aerial
Garlon XRT	Triclopyr	1317.8 kg ai	714.7 ha	Tending - Aerial

\*Note: 41.1 ha received a mix of VisionMax and Garlon XRT, so total treated area is 1,162.0 ha, 41.1 ha less than the sum of 1,203.1 ha in the 'area treated' column. The 2,002.9 kg ai sum is accurate.

SECTION B – APPENDICES (CONFIDENTIAL)

**Appendix 1 – List of FMUs Selected For Evaluation**

FME consists of a single FMU

FME consists of multiple FMUs or is a Group

**Appendix 2 – List of Stakeholders Consulted**

**List of FME Staff Consulted**

Name	Title	Contact Information	Consultation method
Peter Street	General Manager		In person interview
Ron Luopa	Operations Forester		In person interview
Doug Macki	Silviculture Forester		In person interview
Pat Basinet	Forest Technician		In person interview
Eric Gelinis	Forest Intern		In person interview
Mark Lockhart	Planning Forester		In person interview

**List of other Stakeholders Consulted**

Name	Organization	Contact Information	Consultation method	Requests Cert. Notf.
Mike Bulova Forest Compliance	Ministry of Natural Resources		Field site interview	
Jim Gomm	LLC Member cottager Rep		Field site interview	
Bob Boyuck	LLC Member Trapper Rep		Field site interview	
Vicki Mather	LLC Member		Field site interview	
Jenny Gerow GIS Specialist	MITIG		Field site Interview	
Don Trudeau Forester	Gervais Lumber		Field site interview	
Michelle Mechanic	Gervais Lumber		Field site interview	
Tim Lehman Management Forester	Ministry of Natural Resources		Field site interview, email	
Harry Struik Contract Marker	Lahaie Lumber		Field site interview	
John Manitowabi General Manager	N'Skwakamok		Field site interview	

Sean Sutherland	Sutherland Contracting		Field site interview	
-----------------	------------------------	--	----------------------	--

### Appendix 3 – Additional Audit Techniques Employed

None

### Appendix 4 – Pesticide Derogations

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

### Appendix 5 – Detailed Observations

Evaluation Year	FSC P&C Reviewed
2011	Unknown cannot be determined
2012	<b>1.5, 2.3, 3.2, 4.2, 4.4, 5.6, 6.2, 6.3, 6.9, 8.2, 9.4, P2, P3, 5.1-5.4</b>
2013	<b>1.5, 2.3, 3.2, 4.2, 4.4, 5.6, 8.2, P6, P9</b>
2014	1.5, 2.3, 3.2, 4.2, 4.4, 5.6, 6.2, 6.3, 6.9, 8.2, 9.4, & TBD
2015	All - Recertification

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

REQUIREMENT	C/NC	COMMENT/CAR
<b>P1 Forest management shall respect all applicable laws of the country in which they occur, and international treaties and agreements to which the country is a signatory, and comply with all FSC Principles and Criteria.</b>		
<b>C1.5. Forest management areas should be protected from illegal harvesting, settlement and other unauthorized activities.</b>	C	
1.5.1 The manager demonstrates that measures are in place to protect the management unit from illegal/unauthorized activities.  <i>Means of verification:</i>	C	VFM presented various FOIP reports prepared since the 2012 audit as part of the evidence that the FMU is protected from illegal and unauthorized activities. There is a new access restriction policy in place by the MNR. The LLC is cooperating with the MNR to report any unauthorized access. VFM prepares an annual Compliance Plan and

Measures to prevent unauthorized activities (e.g. boundary notices, access controls) Procedures for reporting illegal activities. Records of illegal activities (if any).		has policies 2 and 3 in place, which cover illegal activities on Crown lands.
<b>P2 Long-term tenure and use rights to the land and forest resources shall be clearly defined, documented and legally established.</b>		
<b>C2.3. Appropriate mechanisms shall be employed to resolve disputes over tenure claims and use rights. The circumstances and status of any outstanding disputes will be explicitly considered in the certification evaluation. Disputes of substantial magnitude involving a significant number of interests will normally disqualify an operation from being certified.</b>	C	
2.3.1 Where there is a dispute over tenure claim and use rights, the applicant is implementing a dispute resolution process that has been mutually agreed to.	C	VFM has a dispute resolution process in the Shareholder’s Agreement and in all the Overlapping License Agreements with all Licensees. VFM is not currently involved in any disputes over tenure.
2.3.2 The manager is not involved in outstanding disputes of substantial magnitude involving a significant number of interests in relation to tenure claims and use rights on the management unit. The magnitude and extent depend on various factors including the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whether the dispute involves local rights holders;</li> <li>• Whether the dispute involves legal or customary rights;</li> <li>• The range of issues and/or interests involved;</li> <li>• Whether the potential impacts on the disputant(s) are irreversible or cannot be mitigated; and/or</li> <li>• Whether the dispute involves issues related to meeting the FSC GLSL Regional Standard.</li> </ul>	C	VFM provided numerous examples of disputes with various entities regarding a myriad of different types of concerns. This documentation included a clear view of the process of dispute resolution and the history of the cooperativeness of VFM to come to a settlement that protected the forest resource productivity and provided mitigation to lessen the impacts of management activities where possible.
<b>P3 The legal and customary rights of indigenous peoples to own, use and manage their lands, territories, and resources shall be recognized and respected.</b>		
<b>Terminology</b> The term “Indigenous Peoples” in this standard means “Aboriginal Peoples” as defined in the Canadian Constitution Act, 1982 to include “Indians, Inuit and Métis”.  The Supreme Court in Canada has recognized and clarified the application of Aboriginal and Treaty rights in a number of recent landmark decisions (e.g. Sparrow 1990, Delgam’uukw 1997, Powley 2003 and Haida 2004, to name a few). The legal framework related to Aboriginal Peoples in Canada is constantly evolving.  Aboriginal rights are collectively held rights, therefore most of the language referring to Indigenous or Aboriginal rights in this standard refers to “Aboriginal Peoples” or communities as a whole, rather than to individuals. “Aboriginal community” refers to any First Nations or Métis community (status or non-status) with a demonstrated traditional connection to the area in question.		
<b>C3.2. Forest management shall not threaten or diminish, either directly or indirectly, the resources or tenure rights of indigenous peoples.</b>  On Private and Community forests, the dispute resolution requirements described in 3.1.5b is the mechanism to address 3.2.	C	
3.2.1 On Public forests, the manager makes use of an assessment of Aboriginal resources and tenure rights, undertaken by or jointly with the affected Aboriginal communities.	C	Social and Economic Profiles are in place for all affected Aboriginal Communities. Two of these, the Temagami and Dokis First Nations were provided as evidence by VFM. The others are on file in the MNR Offices. Each of the Aboriginal Communities has identified and

<p><i>Means of verification:</i> Baseline data on numbers of traditional land users, resources used, areas frequented and revenues generated from traditional land-use.</p>		<p>mapped their Native Values. This information is handled on a confidential basis and is provided only on a need to know basis. This information is carefully protected, due to the high degree of sensitivity of the information and the values. Special training has been provided to those who need to access this information for planning and resource protection. AOC's are established for all the mapped Native Values. These included agreed upon protection measures.</p>
<p>3.2.2 On Public forests, the manager ensures that management activities outlined in the management plan do not threaten or diminish Aboriginal resources are based on the results of the assessment described in 3.2.1.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>See the description under 3.2.1. A Stage 2 Archeological Assessment Field Report was produced for Jennings Township.</p>
<p><b>P4 Forest management operations shall maintain or enhance the long-term social and economic well-being of forest workers and local communities.</b></p>		
<p><b>Employees and Forest Workers Definitions</b></p> <p>Employee: Anyone who is on the payroll of the manager, in a full-time, part-time or seasonal capacity, for whom the manager withholds and remits taxes in accordance with federal and provincial laws.</p> <p>Forest worker: All employees as defined above, as well as self-employed contractors, the employees of contractors or the employees other companies whose activities (e.g. planning, road-building, thinning, harvesting, hauling, etc) contribute directly to the delivery of wood to the manager that will be included in the scope of the FSC certificate.</p>		
<p><b>C4.2. Forest management should meet or exceed all applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of employees and their families.</b></p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>4.2.1 The manager ensures that all forest workers comply with all relevant provincial occupational health and safety requirements,</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i> Safety policy. Equipment safety inspection records. Worker interviews. Written contracts or understandings with contractors or other employers of forest workers</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>VFM has identified a Health and Safety Representative and complies with the SWO safety policies. Samples of internal and external safety audits were reviewed along with samples of safety inspections and safety meetings.</p> <p>Various examples of school bus safety and haul truck safety procedures were reviewed during the audit.</p>
<p>4.2.2 The manager has a process in place for fairly resolving disputes with employees pertaining to occupational health and safety.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>This is covered in the SWO Safety Policies and in discussion in 4.2.1.</p>
<p><b>C4.4. Management planning and operations shall incorporate the results of evaluations of social impact. Consultations shall be maintained with people and groups directly affected by management operations.</b></p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>4.4.1 Local communities, community and non-government organizations, forest workers, and the interested public affected by forest management are provided with meaningful opportunities to participate in forest management planning. The manager demonstrates that all input was considered and responded to.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>A desired Forest Benefits meeting was held on April 30, 2008. This is a major part of the FMP consultation process as outlined by the MNR for Crown Forests. The 2010 FMP identifies numerous opportunities for public and other stakeholder participation in the planning process. The LCC for the Sudbury Forest was also actively involved and represents a wide variety of interested public members. The 2010 FMP includes a social and economic impact analysis and the results of this analysis were included in the objectives for the FMP.</p>

<p>4.4.2 Adjacent landowners and local resource users that may be directly affected by forest operations are provided with notice, and their concerns considered prior to commencement of harvesting and operations.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The MNR identifies the adjacent landowners for any planned operation in the AWS for the year. Local newspaper notifications are published for activities on the forest, and example would be for herbicide use along road right of ways.</p>
<p>4.4.3 Concerns raised by adjacent landowners and local resource users after notice of harvest and operations are duly considered prior to commencement of activity.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Following the notifications to adjacent landowners, those individuals may contact the MNR or VFM with concerns. If thoses cannot be worked out by discussion, there is a formal process that is followed to provide opportunity for input and resolution of impacts.</p>
<p>4.4.4 On public lands, a public participation process is used to supplement the requirements of 4.4.1. The manager openly seeks representation from a broad and balanced range of interested parties and invites them to participate.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>See discussion under 4.4.3</p>
<p>4.4.5 The public participation process on public lands uses clearly defined ground rules that contain provisions on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Goals;</li> <li>• Timelines;</li> <li>• Internal and external communications;</li> <li>• Resources (human, physical, financial, informational or technological) according to needs;</li> <li>• Roles, responsibilities and obligations of participants, including their organizations;</li> <li>• Decision-making methods;</li> <li>• Authority for decisions;</li> <li>• Mechanism to adjust the process as needed;</li> <li>• Access to information;</li> <li>• Participation of experts, other interests and government; and</li> <li>• A dispute resolution mechanism.</li> </ul> <p>The participants have been involved in the development of, and agreed to, the ground rules.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>See discussion under 4.4.3</p>
<p><b>P5 Forest management operations shall encourage the efficient use of the forest’s multiple products and services to ensure economic viability and a wide range of environmental and social benefits.</b></p>		
<p><b>C5.6. The rate of harvest of forest products shall not exceed levels that can be permanently sustained.</b></p> <p>This Criterion addresses the actual harvest of forest products. The related but different topic of setting sustainable harvest levels is addressed in 7.1.1 (Annex D)</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>5.6.1 The manager demonstrates that the average of the present and projected annual timber harvests over the next decade, and averages of projected timber harvests over all subsequent decades, do not exceed the projected long term harvest rate, while meeting the GLSL Standards over the long term.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The 2010 FMP includes long term objectives and strategies to attain these objectives. The timber harvest productivity levels were determined through modeling, using the Strategic Forest Management Model V-3.0. The harvest levels on the FMU have consistently been below the levels identified as sustainable in the SFMM outputs. The data utilized in the preparation of the 2010 FMP showed utilization levels below those planned in the</p> <p>Some of the objectives developed in the FMP cannot be obtained at reduced levels of harvest in the timeframe that is identified in the</p>



		FMP. Required revision of the FMP every 10 years with adjustments on an annual and 5 year basis reflect this.
<b>P6 Forest management shall conserve biological diversity and its associated values, water resources, soils, and unique and fragile ecosystems and landscapes, and, by so doing, maintain the ecological functions and the integrity of the forest.</b>		
<b>C6.1. Assessments of environmental impacts shall be completed -- appropriate to the scale, intensity of forest management and the uniqueness of the affected resources -- and adequately integrated into management systems. Assessments shall include landscape level considerations as well as the impacts of on-site processing facilities. Environmental impacts shall be assessed prior to commencement of site-disturbing operations.</b>	C	
<p>The term “assessment of environmental impacts” as it is used here is not intended to refer to a formal “Environmental Impact Assessment” as is conducted under federal and provincial laws and regulations. As it is used here, it is intended to mean technical assessments of the manner and extent to which proposed or undertaken management activities affect the environment directly and indirectly. The assessment methodologies used must be scientifically sound. The scope of an assessment is typically outlined at the start of the project so that the project has some well-defined boundaries.</p> <p>These may include physical, temporal, political, cultural and financial limits within the project mandate. Aspects of the environment typically included in assessments are site impacts (on soil and site attributes), community impacts (on local wildlife and ecological communities), and landscape impacts (on the broader forest ecosystem).</p> <p>Where an Environmental Impact Assessment has been carried out – including a Class Environmental Assessment such as the Class Timber EA carried out by the Province of Ontario – the information and guidelines that result from that Assessment can be used towards meeting the requirements of 6.1, provided that the manager can clearly document how it has assessed the local site conditions on its management unit in advance of carrying out operations, and in enough detail to determine where and how such guidelines might apply. Assessments at the stand or site level are carried out prior to implementing field operations and periodically thereafter.</p>		
6.1.1 A method for assessing environmental impact is implemented by the manager. This method shall consider impacts including but not necessarily limited to: the quality and quantity of forest resources; site specific impacts; and	C	The MNR and VFM maintain an inventory of values on the FMU. These values are identified in maps and ground truthed in the planned area of operation prior to the commencement of any operations.

<p>impacts on other resources</p>		<p>The Forest Management Planning Manual (FMPM) for Ontario’s Crown Forest (OMNR 2004) requires that an assessment be prepared to identify the potential social and economic impacts of implementing the PMS.</p> <p>A start-up checklist is utilized by VFM Staff to go over the identified resources and the AOC Prescriptions for those prior to the start of operations in the forest.</p>
<p>6.1.2 The manager has gathered relevant data including environmental and ecological data that will serve as regional and landscape-level context for the environmental impact assessment.</p> <p>The information shall include, but need not be limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Maps of ecosystems, fragile ecosites, soil type, forest cover and natural disturbance for the forest;</li> <li>b. An inventory of site specific environmental/ecological characteristics sensitive to impacts by forest operations such as steep slopes, shallow soils, moist soils and soil subject to compaction (e.g. structured clay);</li> <li>c. Maps of HCVFs and their attributes;</li> <li>d. Classification of water bodies and identification of spawning grounds.</li> <li>e. Information regarding management regimes in surrounding forests, in particular for the areas or sites abutting the forest;</li> <li>f. Details on sites and areas of particular ecological importance for First Nations (as per Criterion 3.3).</li> </ul>		<p>Data on forest values is obtained by the MNR and updates are provided periodically by the MNR to the FMU. These maps were all updated for the 2010 FMP. The next update is scheduled for 2014-2015. Work is progressing on this effort and an outside contractor is currently collecting the field data for the update. Some of the information mapped includes forest types, topography, wet areas, stream and lake habitat classification, and ownership. First Nations resources of ecological importance are noted on the maps as well as HCVF’s. Many of these are treated as confidential in the database.</p> <p>These are mapped in a GIS database system and are utilized as a preliminary assessment of resources that might be impacted by any planned operations prior to commencement of any planned forest operations.</p> <p>Many examples of the application of the AOC prescriptions were observed during the field audit.</p>
<p>6.1.3 The natural variability and historic local pattern of the forest in the region has been characterized, and includes:</p> <p>A description of major disturbance factors, including disturbance intervals;</p> <p>Estimated mean distribution and/or composition of tree species, forest cover types and/or forest unit as appropriate;</p> <p>Estimated typical age class distribution.</p> <p>The assessment is reviewed by qualified specialists and available for public review.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The natural benchmark was used to determine appropriate desired levels and targets for objectives designed to represent natural features of the Forest. Comparisons were made between modeling scenarios implementing harvest and silviculture and the scenario of allowing the forest to evolve via natural dynamics. The desire was to follow the trend of the natural benchmark and attempt to achieve maximum levels of non-timber objectives (as examined from a natural condition) within a management scenario. The modeling efforts included movement of forest types and species through time. This included age class distribution. All this effort was critically reviewed by the MNR and other resource professionals and through the public participation process.</p>
<p>6.1.4 In the case of SLIMF,, the information collected in 6.1.2 and 6.1.3 shall be incorporated into the management plan and used to inform operations as to limit environmental impacts. A separate environmental impact assessment is not required</p>	<p>NA</p>	
<p>6.1.5 The data collected in 6.1.2 and 6.1.3 is verified on-site where appropriate, assessed and interpreted in consideration of the potential impacts (positive or negative) described in 6.1.1.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>All identified values are discovered by VFM Staff, Licensees, or tree makers. If need be the values information is updated. Protection for identified resources is outlined in the AOC prescription and this is applied on the ground prior to operations.</p>

<p>6.1.6 Where indicator 6.1.5 is applied to SLIMF, the manager shall make uses of generally accepted and locally relevant resources to complete the requirements of 6.1.2 and 6.1.3.</p>	<p>NA</p>	
<p>6.1.7 Benchmarks of current forest condition at the stand and landscape levels are in place to serve as references during impact assessment.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The Long Term Management Direction Summary includes benchmarks of current and desired future conditions in the FMU.</p>
<p>6.1.8 When indicator 6.1.7 is applied to SLIMF, relevant local benchmarks from the surrounding landscape are used.</p>	<p>NA</p>	
<p>6.1.9 The results of environmental assessments are incorporated into management planning and implementation such that where an assessment has indicated that environmental impacts of proposed management activities pose significant risk, then:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Management activities do not occur; or</li> <li>b. The manager reduces the risk to an acceptable level by employing an alternative management approach or mitigative measures; or</li> <li>c. The manager provides a rationale that includes evidence that the chosen option is acceptable based on the conservation of biodiversity and/or other environmental values. This rationale is to be compared with the risk of taking no actions.</li> </ol>	<p>C</p>	<p>Starting from the natural benchmark as discussed in 6.1.3 the forest is modeled with various management strategies to determine the potential impact of operation on resources. The desire of the effort is to follow the natural condition to achieve a maximum level of non-timber objectives. AOC prescriptions are developed for all resources of concern identified and these are implemented on the ground to protect those values. These include mitigations such as timing restrictions; set aside buffers, restricted access, and reserve of some areas to protect resources. The AOC prescriptions have all been developed and reviewed by a wide group of resource professionals. Monitoring of the values assures that the prescriptions are achieving the desired protection levels.</p>
<p>6.1.10 The manager implements conditions necessary to achieve the intent of the silvicultural and harvest prescriptions including but not necessarily limited to :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Residual stocking, structure, species composition and quality (ref. 6.2.4, 6.2.5, 6.3.1)</li> <li>b. Specific habitat requirements (ref. 6.2.2, 6.2.3, 6.2.4, 6.3.1, 6.3.2)</li> <li>c. Protection of sensitive sites (ref. 6.3.6, 6.3.9, 6.3.16)</li> </ol> <p>Where forest workers have not received specific training in meeting this requirement, trained tree markers shall be used.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The planned operations are implemented in the field and FOIP inspections demonstrate this. FOIP reports were provided for most stops visited on the field audit. Certified tree markers are utilized for all implementations.</p> <p>AOC prescriptions are developed to protect resources and these are implemented. This was checked at several of the field stops. A tree marker laying out the buffers for turtles was interviewed at one stop and the mark was reviewed.</p>
<p><b>C 6.2. Safeguards shall exist which protect rare, threatened and endangered species and their habitats (e.g., nesting and feeding areas). Conservation zones and protection areas shall be established, appropriate to the scale and intensity of forest management and the uniqueness of the affected resources. Inappropriate hunting, fishing, trapping, and collecting shall be controlled.</b></p>	<p>C</p>	

<p>Note: All species that are listed as “at risk” (i.e. those which have some special designation related to concerns for their population or habitat status) by federal or provincial government agencies and that are present or believed to be present on the management unit must be included in the considerations related to species at risk in Criterion 6.2 and elsewhere in the standard where the term “species at risk” is used. Managers should also consider other vulnerable species as “at risk” (and therefore apply the measures identified by the relevant indicators of this standard), including species that are under consideration for listing as well as species that have been identified by non-government agencies or groups if the designation or concern is the result of efforts by a diversity of agencies or groups, considering a diversity of vulnerability factors; and which include consideration of the impact of forest management activities on relevant vulnerability factors for the species. In 6.2.1 the manager maintains a list of all “at risk” species meeting the above criteria. Indicators 6.2.2 and 6.2.3 apply only to formally listed Species at Risk, while 6.2.4 applies to other uncommon species and 6.2.5 applies only to uncommon tree species. Also note that Principle 9 allows for the possibility of addressing concerns related to concentrations of endangered species and/or endangered ecosystems.</p>		
<p>6.2.1 The management plan – or related documents – has an updated list of species at risk (i.e. flora and fauna) that are presently or potentially found in the forest (i.e. the forest is located in their distribution area), as indicated in federal, provincial or regional government listings, as well as other species that have been identified as needing special protection.</p>	C	<p>The FMP has a complete list of all species at risk and many other species as well. AOC’s have been established and prescriptions for protection of critical resources for SAR’s are included in the FMP. The FMP projects the impacts of management activities on many species as part of the modeling effort. Habitat indicators for old growth species all exceeded the minimums for the species. SAR training has been a part of the last three Spring Compliance Meetings. SAR training was included in the PowerPoint presentations used at these meetings.</p>
<p>6.2.2 Where plans exist, or are under development by government to protect the habitat and populations of species at risk in the forest, the manager implements all measures relevant to their activities and cooperates with efforts to control inappropriate hunting, fishing, trapping and collecting.</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i> Protection plans for species and habitat or a development schedule for plans. Records of activities undertaken under the plans.</p>	C	<p>The AOC prescriptions for all SAR and other species requiring special mitigation for protection are implemented on the FMU. During the course of the audit the field audit stops included several stops where spray and harvest operations were impacted by the blanding and wood turtle prescriptions. The prescriptions were implemented to protect the habitat and populations of the two turtle species.</p> <p>Records of the inclusion in the management planning and implementation are included in the records of inspections.</p>
<p>6.2.3 Where plans identified through Indicator 6.2.2 do not exist or are incomplete or inadequate, a precautionary approach is used in management of the habitats of the relevant species at risk.</p>	C	<p>Plans for mitigation measures and AOC prescriptions to protect habitat and species are part of the stand and site guide and include the latest scientific knowledge. These have been developed in close consultation with Eric Cobb, the MNR District Species at Risk Biologist.</p>

<p><i>Means of verification:</i>                  Review of precautionary measures.                  Comparison of approaches and levels of activity in neighbouring, similar forests.                  Results of habitat modelling for relevant species, where it has been undertaken.</p>		
<p>6.2.4 Special prescriptions are applied to protect rare and uncommon species:                  For rare and uncommon plant and wildlife species, appropriate buffer zones or harvest modifications are applied in order to ensure their protection.</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i>                  Species and habitat protection plans, or timetable for preparing such plans.                  Records of activities undertaken in accordance with these plans</p>	C	See discussion in 6.2.3.
<p>6.2.5 The manager has established a desired target for the future distribution and abundance of rare tree species listed in 6.1.1 consistent with site conditions, historical abundance and the scale of the forest being managed. The target, management plan and operational plans should be designed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase its relative abundance;</li> <li>• Conserve genetic diversity;</li> <li>• Ensure successful regeneration ;</li> <li>• Maintain a balance of age classes in the management unit;</li> <li>• Harvest isolated stands only if adequate natural regeneration is present within the stand or if seed from the appropriate seed zone is used to successfully regenerate (free to grow) an equivalent site within the seed zone;</li> <li>• Harvest isolated individuals that have seed bearing potential only where they are showing signs of severe decline and are hazardous</li> </ul>	C	<p>The SFMM process resulted in modeled desired future conditions for tree species. The Stand and Site Guide includes the scientific basis for the natural disturbances and the historical abundance. These are addressed in the Long Term management Direction for the FMU. Indicators for determining the success of the management to move in the direction of the desired future condition are included in the LTMD with monitoring planned in the future.</p> <p>Some stand types and tree species are included in the HCVF's for the FMU.</p>
<p><b>C6.3. Ecological functions and values shall be maintained intact, enhanced, or restored, including: a) Forest regeneration and succession. b) Genetic, species, and ecosystem diversity. c) Natural cycles that affect the productivity of the forest ecosystem.</b></p> <p>Note: Several Indicators in 6.3 (6.3.1, 6.3.2, 6.3.5, 6.3.10, 6.3.11 and 6.3.16) use the qualifier "in natural forests." This means that these Indicators do not apply on plantations within the management unit.</p>	C	
<p>6.3.1 In consideration of the assessment results in 6.1, the manager has determined a long-term desired future forest condition that maintains, enhances or restores natural conditions in natural forests relating to:</p>	C	These items are addressed in the Long Term Management Direction and the desired future conditions modeled in the FMP.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• diversity of forest types</li> <li>• diversity of successional stages</li> <li>• distribution of age classes, including old growth</li> <li>• diversity of forest structures (e.g. horizontal, vertical and pattern)</li> <li>• connectivity</li> <li>• levels of disturbances at the landscape level (e.g. watershed)</li> </ul>		
<p>6.3.2 Quantitative short to mid-term (e.g. 2-5 years) objectives have been set, using expert input, to maintain, enhance or restore natural conditions in natural forests. Plans have been developed and are being implemented to achieve the objectives.</p>	C	<p>The objectives for each 10 year period are included in the FMP through the complete term of the modeling effort. Timing for the assessments is identified in Table 6 of the FMP.</p>
<p>6.3.3 Plans have been developed and are being implemented to achieve the objectives established in 6.3.2.</p>	C	<p>See discussion in 6.3.2.</p>
<p>6.3.4 Quantitative habitat objectives should be set, using expert input, for species whose habitat requirements have not been addressed in 6.3.1. Plans have been developed and are being implemented in natural forests to achieve the objectives.</p>	C	<p>The entire modeling effort is largely based on the Stand and Site Guide and the NDPEG. These both include natural disturbance pattern information, historical evidence and are based on the latest scientific knowledge with expert input. The 2010 FMP includes a significant effort to include wildlife objectives, strategies and targets.</p>
<p>6.3.5 Plans have been developed and are being implemented in natural forests to achieve the objectives established in 6.3.4.</p> <p>Note: This indicator is intended to supplement the “coarse filter” approach outlined in 6.3.1, by encouraging managers to implement measures aimed at improving habitat for significant species with specific habitat needs.</p>	C	<p>See discussion in 6.3.4</p>
<p>6.3.6 The manager has a strategic access management plan to minimize and mitigate the negative impacts of roads. This may include but is not necessarily limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reducing road density;</li> <li>• reducing and/or limiting access to High Conservation Value Forest areas;</li> <li>• decommissioning roads;</li> <li>• avoiding road building in or around protected areas; and-or</li> <li>• maintaining remoteness of areas with sensitive cultural or ecological values or where required for tourism</li> <li>• Maintain or restore connectivity</li> </ul> <p>Means of Verification: The manager collaborates with the government and other relevant authorities in implementing the plan.</p>	NC	<p>The FMP addresses the access issues for the FMU and has future access plans included in the FMP. All proposed and existing primary, branch and operational roads have road use strategies consistent with Land Use Direction. Several examples of decommissioning, avoidance of road building near protected areas, protection of remoteness and special resources were observed during the course of the field audit.</p> <p>Examples of ROW width exceeding guidelines and excessive grubbing adjacent to road construction were observed during the field audit.</p> <p><b>CAR2013.3</b></p>
<p>6.3.7 The manager complies at a minimum with all provincial regulations, policies and licence conditions pertaining to riparian and wetland protection during harvesting and road construction.</p>	C	<p>Operations on the FMU are required to follow the Provincial Roads and Water Crossing Guidelines and the Stand and Site Guide. AOC prescriptions are implemented for cold and warm water fisheries, self-sustaining lake trout lakes, and provincially significant wetlands.</p>

<p>6.3.8. Disturbance to seasonal watercourses (including intermittent and ephemeral streams, seeps, ponds, vernal pools) is avoided wherever possible.</p> <p>Means of Verification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Temporary crossings are restored so as to avoid damage to seasonal watercourses.</li> </ul>	<p>NC</p>	<p>The Provincial Roads and Water Crossing Guidelines apply to intermittent and unmapped streams and provide for management practices to avoid disturbance and provide for restoration following use of temporary crossings. Examples of temporary crossings and the management practices implemented to reduce or avoid damage were reviewed. The implementations viewed in the field were generally well done, see <b>CAR 2013.4</b>.</p>
<p>6.3.9 The manager is implementing relevant best management practices pertaining to the protection of soils, water quality and sensitive sites.</p> <p>(Examples of relevant “best management practices” include but are not limited to: Silvicultural Guide to Managing Southern Ontario Forests Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, Forest Management Guide for Conserving Biodiversity at the Stand and Site Scales Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, and in Quebec ‘Saines pratiques : voirie forestière et installation de ponceaux, MRNQ – Direction régionale de la Gaspésie–Iles-de-la-Madeleine’)</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Several crossings were observed during the course of the audit where the approaches to the crossing sloped toward the crossing. Several of these had potential to deliver sediment to the stream channel due to water flow on the road surface. Water diversion off the road surface was not adequate to prevent the deposition and sediment barrier implementation was not adequate. See the discussion under CAR 2013.4.</p>
<p>6.3.10 In partial cuts in natural forests, harvesting (whether during normal operations or salvage following a natural disturbance) and other stand management activities leave residual structures in sufficient quantity and distribution for them to serve their ecological functions. Precise objectives for different structural components are determined and documented, and include the following considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• diversity of vertical and horizontal structure and tree pattern relevant to the site;</li> <li>• wildlife habitat; and</li> <li>• woody debris</li> </ul>	<p>C</p>	<p>The Stand and Site Guide provides the scientific basis for the prescriptions developed to manage stands in partial cut situations. These guides prescribe the residual structure. The NDPEG also apply to some of these situations. The requirements are summarized in the Tree Marking Guide.</p>
<p>6.3.11 In clearcuts and other final removal cuts in natural forests, harvesting maintains residual structures in sufficient quantities and distribution so as to fulfill their ecological functions. Specific ranges for the various structural components are described in the forest management plan, consistent with the requirements below, and are implemented.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Post harvest residual includes patches or clumps of trees and individual trees and/or patches.</li> <li>Residual retention includes all standing residual structure in a defined and mapped harvest area, including insular patches, peninsular patches, partial harvest areas and reserves established for other purposes.</li> <li>Residual structure consists of a mix of dispersed trees and/or a range of patch sizes adapted to the size of</li> </ol>	<p>C</p>	<p>NDPEG is implemented in clearcuts to provide for residual structure and includes individual trees and insular and peninsular patches.</p> <p>Final removal cuts in shelterwood harvests do not include insular and peninsular patches for residual structure. This is addressed in the Stand and Site Guide where it is stated that “shelterwood areas are excluded because 1) shelterwood can result in young development stages for short periods but rarely results in pre-sapling conditions associated with clearcuts, 2) nature of broader forest where shelterwood is practiced is very heterogeneous resulting in a mixture of shelterwood, clearcut and selection in intimate relation to each other and the intimate nature of this mosaic combined with specific guidelines for clearcuts will normally result in a reasonable pattern that likely approaches the natural disturbance pattern for the area.” This then puts the lack of insular and peninsular patches in the final removal cuts of shelterwood harvests in compliance with 6.9.9, which states that “The amount of residual structure retained in harvest operations will approximate the levels of expected post-disturbance residual identified in 6.1.3.</p>

<p>the cutblock. Residuals are well distributed at all scales throughout the harvest area. Where the harvest area is an aggregation of smaller cutblocks, residual trees and patches shall be well distributed within the small cutblocks as well as between or among them.</p> <p>d. All residual retention is long term, meaning it will not be harvested until at least the subsequent rotation.</p> <p>e. The amount of residual structure retained in harvest operations will approximate levels of expected natural post-disturbance residual identified in 6.1.3.</p> <p>f. In small harvest blocks (i.e. 5-20ha) where there is abundant residual forest in the form of harvest block separators, peninsulas, riparian or other types of reserves, or stands harvested under one of the partial cut systems in the surrounding area, residual structure of 25 to 30 individual trees per hectare should be retained within the clearcut harvest area, based on the managers' goals related to wildlife habitat and ecological characteristics.</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maps and aerial photographs of harvested areas.</li> <li>• Relevant training material used in courses or by harvest and site preparation</li> <li>• Field reconnaissance.</li> </ul>		<p>All depletions are mapped and insular and peninsular patches are mapped. VFM has agreed to cease harvesting of insular and peninsular patches until the issue of length of retention is clarified.</p>
<p>6.3.12 Forest roads, skid trails and landings are well planned and designed to minimise soil erosion and loss of productive area. Forest roads, landings and skid trails are designed to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. reduce soil and road embankment erosion, soil compaction and rutting,</li> <li>b. minimise water crossings and loss of productive area;</li> <li>c. minimize loss of site productivity; and</li> <li>d. ensure the protection of aquatic habitat quality during construction and use.</li> </ol> <p><i>Means of verification:</i></p>	<p>NC</p>	<p>In general this indicator is in compliance, however, during the field audit several examples of roads where there was potential for delivery of soil from water flow on road surfaces or from debris on bridge surfaces which had gaps in the surface which would allow debris on the bridge surface to drop directly into the stream channel were observed. Implementation of sediment barriers to capture any sediment that was moving toward the stream channel was not done well enough to prevent sediment deposition.</p> <p><b>CAR 2013.7</b></p>



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proof of implementation of standards/practices, assessed in the field</li> <li>• Use of waterbars on steep slopes and/or switchbacks</li> <li>• Knowledge by the field workers of the standards/practices, assessed through interviews</li> <li>• Rate and severity of non-compliances</li> </ul>		
<p>6.3.13 Rutting related site damage and damage to residual trees (crown, trunks and roots) does not exceed provincial acceptable levels.</p>	C	See discussion in 6.3.12 and CAR 2013.2
<p>6.3.14 Harvest plans schedule operations on damage prone sites to periods of the year when risks are minimized.</p>	NC	<p>Several examples of site damage during operations were observed during the field audit, where scheduling the operations for drier times or times when the ground was frozen would have greatly reduced site damage. In addition operator choices in some of those situations made the damage more prevalent than may have been necessary. Skid road location in particular is sometimes an issue on wetter sites.</p> <p><b>CAR 2013.2</b></p>
<p>6.3.15 Where mechanical site preparation is adopted it keeps to a minimum soil compaction, erosion and organic nutrient displacement. The top organic layer and the underlying mineral soil are mixed rather than the organic layer removed (may vary depending on the targeted regeneration, expected competition and availability of herbicides as a treatment option).</p>	C	<p>Several examples of mechanical site preparation were observed during the field audit. All of these are part of the effort of VFM to reduce the dependency on herbicides for site preparation. All the mechanical site preparation appeared to result in minimal compaction, erosion or nutrient displacement. The impacts were small, yet helped provide a planting bed where success was possible without chemical site preparation.</p>
<p>6.3.16 In natural forests regeneration efforts should emulate natural processes such as natural regeneration, direct seeding, and use local seed sources.</p>	C	<p>Seed zones are tracked to match planting stock to the appropriate site and to maintain genetic diversity. NDPEG is utilized in planning the harvest and subsequent regeneration method.</p>
<p>6.3.17 Regeneration occurs in a timely fashion, and consistent with successional objectives as outlined in 6.3.1.</p>	C	<p>Regeneration generally occurs shortly after completion of harvest to take advantage of the widow of opportunity provided by the harvesting disturbance, most often the season following harvest. Regeneration surveys are conducted in harvested blocks to assure that either natural regeneration is present in adequate numbers or that planting efforts succeeded by attaining a high rate of survival.</p>
<p><b>C6.4. Representative samples of existing ecosystems within the landscape shall be protected in their natural state and recorded on maps, appropriate to the scale and intensity of operations and the uniqueness of the affected resources.</b></p>	C	
<p><b>Protected Areas</b> Protected Areas are defined in this standard as areas protected by legislation, regulation, or land-use policy to control human occupancy or activity. Protected areas therefore can only be created by government and their establishment includes consideration of factors that are outside the scope of FSC certification. However, it is the intent of this Criterion to ensure that forest managers act within their sphere of influence to support the efforts by government to complete a network of representative protected areas; at the very least by taking steps to avoid diminishing future options for</p>		

<p>establishing protected areas. In this standard we use the term “candidate protected area” to identify areas that are identified by the manager and validated by external review as having the potential to contribute towards the completion of a network of representative protected areas.</p>		
<p>6.4.1 The manager shall identify potential gaps in the representative completeness of protected areas in the appropriate ecological unit(s) (ecoregions, ecodistricts, natural regions) contained on the management unit, using the best available tools and information, such as but not necessarily limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. land cover gap analysis; and</li> <li>b. enduring features gap analysis.</li> </ul> <p>Note : There are a number of tools currently available that can be used to carry out a gap analysis, including the WWF-Canada Assessment of Representation (AoR) Gap Analysis Tool and the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources Gap Tool. The analysis should extend to the full area of all ecological units contained on the management unit, so that protected areas in the ecological unit but outside of the management unit should be considered.</p>	C	<p>The MNR has conducted a GAP Analysis to identify potential gaps in the completeness of protection. The gap analysis results are mapped and available at the MNR or VFM Office.</p>
<p>6.4.2 Where there are identified gaps, the manager shall use the gap analysis and consideration of elements such as representativeness, connectivity, integrity, forest age, rare ecosystems, the results of the HCVF analysis in 9.1 and other available analyses to determine and map the location and size of candidate protected areas.</p>	C	<p>The most recent results showed a need for the expansion of the Wolf Lake Forest Reserve. VFM supports this expansion of the reserve to protect the resource. The HCVF analysis identified areas to be protected as HCVF.</p>
<p>6.4.3 The manager shall engage and cooperate with interested parties (e.g. ENGOs, Aboriginal communities) and qualified experts in carrying out the gap analysis and identifying candidate protected areas.</p>	C	<p>The initial GAP Analysis work was started with the World Wildlife Fund and the Wildlands League. The Aboriginal Communities have provided information on the cultural resources important to their communities.</p>
<p>6.4.4 General consensus is sought amongst interested parties of the conclusions of the gap analysis regarding the identification and contribution of candidate protected areas.</p>	C	<p>VFM has consistently supported the conclusions of the GAP Analysis process. The latest example is their support of the expansion of the Wolf Lake Forest Reserve.</p>
<p>6.4.5 The manager actively supports initiatives open to all interested parties, which may include government, industrial and private landowners, and nongovernment agencies to establish systems of protected areas in the region of the landholding.</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the landowner/manager can demonstrate support of multi-stakeholder initiatives to establish a protected areas system in the region</li> </ul>	C	<p>HCVF’s and AOC’s are prevalent on the Sudbury Forest. Whenever candidate protection areas are identified, VFM Staff locates the resource and confirms it on the ground. Once done new areas of protection are mapped and established.</p>

<p>6.4.6 The manager shall not undertake forest management activities, including harvesting, silviculture and road in protected and candidate protected areas.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Field stops provide evidence of the implementation of the protection measures and the observance of the limitations and mitigation measures during operations.</p>
<p><b>6.4.7</b> The manager demonstrates voluntary deferral of forest management activities, including harvesting, silviculture and road construction in identified candidate protected areas. Forest management activities may occur in candidate protected areas where agreed to through the general consensus of interested parties.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>All AOC's and HCVF's are clearly mapped on planning documents. Any candidate areas are treated as though they are approved as AOC's until final decisions are made. This protects the resources.</p>
<p><b>6.4.8</b> In the case of SLIMF for large low-intensity forests, and small groups (cumulative area less than 10,000 ha) of small forests, the Indicators under Criterion 6.4 apply in a manner appropriate to the scale and intensity of the operations. In small individual forests, Criterion 6.4 is met through compliance with Principle 9.</p>	<p>NA</p>	
<p><b>C6.5. Written guidelines shall be prepared and implemented to control erosion; minimize forest damage during harvesting, road construction, and all other mechanical disturbances; and to protect water resources.</b></p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>6.5.1 The manager has and is implementing Standard Operating Procedures that cover at a minimum the harvesting and silvicultural requirements in 6.3 that relate to erosion control and minimizing forest damage.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The FMP contains discussion of the Silvicultural Grounds for implementing silviculture on the FMU. The Tree Marking Guide also provides instructions for implementing various silvicultural methods in operations. Monitoring of rutted areas with heavy soils for impacts and monitoring of water crossings are part of the standard operating procedures.</p>
<p><b>C6.6. Management systems shall promote the development and adoption of environmentally friendly non-chemical methods of pest management and strive to avoid the use of chemical pesticides. World Health Organization Type 1A and 1B and chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides; pesticides that are persistent, toxic or whose derivatives remain biologically active and accumulate in the food chain beyond their intended use; as well as any pesticides banned by international agreement, shall be prohibited. If chemicals are used, proper equipment and training shall be provided to minimize health and environmental risks.</b></p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>6.6.1 Chemical Pesticides identified by FSC as highly hazardous pesticides (see Annex x) or where prohibited by law are not used.</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Company policy identifying prohibited chemicals/pesticides.</li> <li>• Records of pesticide application.</li> </ul>	<p>C</p>	<p>Records of pesticide use show no usage of chemical pesticides identified by FSC as highly hazardous pesticides. VFM has a policy against use of such pesticides. No derogations for usage have been obtained from FSC.</p>

<p>6.6.2 The manager participates in the development and implementation of an integrated pest management programme, an aspect of which aims at avoiding the use of chemical pesticides.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Provincial programs are sometimes implemented for control of certain pests. VFM is utilizing alternative methods of site preparation to help reduce the dependency on chemical pesticides.</p>
<p>6.6.3 The manager shall use chemical pesticides only when non-chemical products are not available, ineffective to attain the silvicultural objectives, cost-prohibitive or inadequate in light of risks and environmental and social benefits. Furthermore, chemical pesticides shall only be used when their use is essential to attain the following silvicultural objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The regeneration or restoration of non-forest lands; or</li> <li>b. The regeneration of challenging species (e.g. Oak or White Pine);</li> <li>c. The control of invasive exotic species; or</li> <li>d. To control major insect outbreaks.</li> </ul> <p>The rationale for each chemical pesticide use is documented and publicly available.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>VFM does utilize manual tending and mechanized site preparation where it is appropriate and can be successful. Most of the pesticide use is for site preparation or release on sites where more regeneration of more challenging species is desired. The FMP includes an objective on the use of herbicides.</p> <p>The use of pesticides is documented and use reports are filed with the MOE and MNR. A summary is included in the annual report.</p>
<p><b>C6.7. Chemicals, containers, liquid and solid non-organic wastes including fuel and oil shall be disposed of in an environmentally appropriate manner at off-site locations.</b></p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>6.7.1 Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) are in place and implemented regarding safe handling and disposal of chemicals, liquid and solid non-organic wastes including fuel and oil. These SOP's reflect best management practices and at at minimum ensure compliance with all regulatory guidelines.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>VFM has policies in place for pesticide use and on reducing waste, recycling and proper waste disposal.</p>
<p>6.7.2 A recycling program is in place for used oil and plastic containers.</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Written standards/practices on waste management</li> <li>• Field inspections of waste control measures</li> <li>• Knowledge by the field workers of the standards/practices, assessed through interviews</li> </ul>	<p>C</p>	<p>VFM has a policy in place on proper waste disposal. Compliance inspections looked for and report on garbage left by operation and also any oil spills are documented and reported in the FOIP reports.</p> <p>In spite of these actions there were numerous examples of trash and debris left after operations had finished in areas note during the field audit.</p> <p><b>OBS 2013.6</b></p>
<p>6.7.3 In the event of a hazardous product spill, the manager shall immediately contain the product, notify the appropriate authorities, and begin cleanup and product elimination with the assistance of qualified personnel.</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Written standards/practices on hazardous waste management</li> <li>• Field inspections of hazardous waste control measures</li> </ul>	<p>C</p>	<p>This is one of the items included in the Compliance Inspections conducted only a regular basis as part of the monitoring program. A small spill was observed during the field audit and is covered under CAR 2013..5 in 6.7.4</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Knowledge by the field workers of the standards/practices, assessed through interviews</li> </ul>		
<p>6.7.4 Leaking equipment is repaired or taken out of the forest. Recovered material is taken to a designated disposal site.</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Written standards/practices on waste management</li> <li>Field inspections of waste control measures</li> <li>Knowledge by the field workers of the standards/practices, assessed through interviews</li> </ul>	NC	<p>Leaking equipment was observed in two stops during the field audit. Both of these leaks had resulted in small depositions of oil in the soil. Leaking equipment is included in the Compliance Inspections.</p> <p><b>CAR 2013.5</b></p>
<p><b>C6.8. Use of biological control agents shall be documented, minimized, monitored, and strictly controlled in accordance with national laws and internationally accepted scientific protocols. Use of genetically modified organisms shall be prohibited.</b></p>	C	
<p>6.8.1 Biological control agents (e.g. Bt) are used only where other non-chemical pest control methods are, or can reasonably be expected to be ineffective. The rationale for the use of biological control agents is documented and based on scientific evidence.</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>records of application of biological control agents.</li> <li>forest protection plans.</li> <li>documented rationale for the use of biological control agents.</li> </ul>	C	<p>No biological control agents are utilized by VFM or contractors.</p>
<p>6.8.2 Genetically modified organisms are not used.</p>	C	<p>No GMO organisms have been used by VFM or on the forest.</p>
<p><b>C6.9. The use of exotic species shall be carefully controlled and actively monitored to avoid adverse ecological impacts.</b></p>	C	
<p>6.9.1 The use of exotic species, in plantations or otherwise, shall be justified and monitored for adverse environmental impacts. Only species known to be non-invasive are to be used.</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Description and records of areas where exotic species are planted</li> <li>Inspection of exotic species plantations</li> <li>Results of monitoring measures</li> </ul>	C	<p>No exotic species have been utilized.</p>
<p><b>Hybrids</b> Hybrids derived from at least one exotic species are considered exotic species. Hybrids are typically sterile, and hence non-invasive. Hybridization does not constitute genetic modification of the sort referred to in FSC's definition of Genetically Modified Organisms.</p>		

<p><b>C6.10. Forest conversion to plantations or non-forest land uses shall not occur, except in circumstances where conversion:</b>  <b>a) Entails a very limited portion of the forest management unit; and b) Does not occur on High Conservation Value Forest areas; and c) Will enable clear, substantial, additional, secure, long-term conservation benefits across the forest management unit.</b></p>		
<p>6.10.1 Forest conversion to plantations from the time of initial FSC certification shall not exceed 5% of the productive forest area.</p>	C	There have been no conversions to plantation since FSC Certification.
<p>6.10.2 Forest conversion to plantations or non-forest land uses (except roads required for access) do not occur on High Conservation Value Forest (HCVF) areas.</p>	NA	See discussion under 6.10.1
<p>6.10.3 Where forest conversion to plantations or non-forest uses takes place the manager demonstrates the conservation benefits across the landscape.</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i>  Evaluation of the conservation and social impacts and benefits of conversion  Comparison with any candidate protected areas identified as per 6.4</p>	NA	See discussion under 6.10.1
<p>6.10.4 Management actions are undertaken to convert all non-forest areas (landings, road, gravel pits, etc.) back to forest once the non-forest use has ceased.</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documented plans related to re-establishment of forest cover in non-forest areas.</li> <li>• Field inspection of re-establishment efforts.</li> </ul>	C	Aggregate pits are planted to trees once the pits have been rehabilitated and are no longer in use for aggregate extraction. Roads and landings decommissioned or not part of the permanent road infrastructure are replanted. Slash piles are burned to return those areas to production.
<p><b>P7 A management plan -- appropriate to the scale and intensity of the operations -- shall be written, implemented, and kept up to date. The long-term objectives of management, and the means of achieving them, shall be clearly stated.</b></p>		
<p><b>P8 Monitoring shall be conducted -- appropriate to the scale and intensity of forest management -- to assess the condition of the forest, yields of forest products, chain of custody, management activities and their social and environmental impacts.</b></p>		
<p><b>8.2. Forest management should include the research and data collection needed to monitor, at a minimum, the following indicators: a) yield of all forest products harvested, b) growth rates, regeneration, and condition of the forest, c) composition and observed changes in the flora and fauna, d) environmental and social impacts of harvesting and other operations, and e) cost, productivity, and efficiency of forest management.</b></p>	C	
<p><b>Yield of all forest products harvested</b></p> <p>8.2.1 The manager monitors timber harvest volumes by species and product.</p>	C	Depletions are recorded as part of the operations in the forest and the timber harvest volumes are included in the annual report.
<p>8.2.2 The manager has assembled readily available information about the harvest of timber by parties other than themselves on the managed forest unit.</p>	C	This information is all included in the annual report

<p><i>Means of verification:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information (i.e. volume harvested by species, location of harvest) related to the timber harvests of overlapping licensees, third parties, independent operators, and any others who conduct harvest operations in the forest.</li> </ul>		
<p><b><u>Growth rates, regeneration, and condition of the forest</u></b></p> <p>8.2.3 The manager monitors growth rates, regeneration and condition of the forest, including but not necessarily limited to forest health, disturbance, and age class structure.</p>	C	The yield curves developed by the research partnership were used for the 2010 FMP. Regeneration surveys and free to grow surveys are conducted on a regular basis.
<p><b><u>Composition and observed changes in the flora and fauna</u></b></p> <p>8.2.4 The manager conducts regular monitoring of the forest in order to highlight changes to important habitat characteristics.</p>	C	Monitoring during field operations often result in new records of habitat. These results are included in Values Updates as routine procedure. MNR conducts wildlife surveys and updates the information in NRVIS on a regular basis.
<p><b><u>Environmental Impact</u></b></p> <p>8.2.5 The manager monitors environmental impacts of forest management activities assessed in accordance with Criterion 6.1.</p>	C	Compliance inspection reports are an important part of the monitoring for the impacts of forest management activities. VFM has also implemented monitoring of previously rutted areas, particularly in compaction prone soils to determine the impact on regeneration and growth. VFM also monitors all water crossing once every three years to protect water resources.
<p>8.2.6 The manager sets up and implements, or participates in, a program to monitor the status of the applicable High Conservation Values as identified in 9.1 following the manager’s activities in or adjacent to those High Conservation Value Forests, including the effectiveness of the measures employed for their maintenance or restoration.</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documented HCV monitoring program.</li> </ul>	C	<p>HCV’s are monitored when forest operations occur near the site of the values. All HCV’s are not monitored on an annual basis, since if there are no operations in close proximity there is no risk of change of status due to operations. Monitoring schedules and responsibilities are included in the HCV Report.</p> <p>The effectiveness of protection or restoration is monitored as part of the Compliance Inspection.</p>
<p>8.2.7 When monitoring results indicate increasing risk to a specific conservation attribute, the manager re-evaluates the measures taken to maintain or enhance that attribute, and adjusts the management measures to reverse the trend.</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Results of monitoring program.</li> </ul>	C	The AOC prescriptions were examined and where required improved. For example there is a new trout lake AOC.
<p><b><u>Impacts on Cultural Values and Resources</u></b></p> <p>8.2.8 The manager monitors the impacts of forest management activities on cultural values, resources and uses.</p>	C	FOIP reports include this information and Compliance Inspections cover this.
<p><b><u>Economics</u></b></p> <p>8.2.9 The manager monitors the costs, productivity and efficiency of forest management activities, consistent with Criterion 5.1.</p>	C	Silvicultural expenditures are reported annually. These are included in the annual report.

<p><b>P9 Management activities in high conservation value forests shall maintain or enhance the attributes which define such forests. Decisions regarding high conservation value forests shall always be considered in the context of a precautionary approach.</b></p>		
<p><b>C9.1. 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.</b></p>	C	
<p>9.1.1 The manager undertakes efforts to, or makes use of existing efforts to, identify and map the presence of HCVFs by means of a process that meets the characteristics and intent of the assessment process in Appendix x.</p> <p><i>Means of verification :</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documented procedures used to identify and map HCVFs and related values</li> <li>• Results of assessment processes – documents, maps, etc.</li> <li>• Interviews with those involved in identification process.</li> </ul>	C	<p>The report, “High Conservation Values in the Sudbury Forest, Version 3.0,” was produced in August 2010. This report was revised twice since the preparation of the original HCV report in 2007. The report was prepared in accordance with the process outlined in Annex D of the FSC Forest Stewardship Standard: Great Lakes ST. Lawrence Region Draft 3.0 (December 2010).</p>
<p>9.1.2 The manager ensures that a credible external review is undertaken of the HCVF assessment.</p>	C	<p>External review of the HCVs identified and the prescriptions and assessment programs has been reviewed by the MNR as part of the preparation of the Sudbury Forest 2010-2020 FMP.</p> <p>The consultation process for the HCVs includes a four-phased process composed of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Broad review based on the FMP process, to determine forest values generally in the Sudbury Forest which will include as a minimum individual stakeholder representatives including the Local Citizen’s Committee, communities</li> <li>• Consultation with technical experts about species, ecosystems or values that are HCVF</li> <li>• Focused review by regional, provincial and national stakeholders of the values and the management approach</li> </ul> <p>Open door policy – VFM maintains an open door policy for its HCVF program where new HCVs and new management approaches will be considered any time.</p>
<p>9.1.3 The HCVF assessment shall be made publicly available, including associated maps (subject to confidentiality considerations) as well as a summary of how concerns raised during the consultation and review process have been addressed.</p> <p>Note: Factors that may limit the public availability of information include the ownership of that information by other parties as well as the need in some circumstances to withhold site-specific information in order to protect the value.</p>	C	<p>High Conservation Values in the Sudbury Forest, Version 3.0 is available on the web at VFM’s webpage under <a href="http://www.sudburyforest.com/SupDocs/Sudbury_HCVF_Report_100923.pdf">http://www.sudburyforest.com/SupDocs/Sudbury_HCVF_Report_100923.pdf</a></p>
<p><b>C9.2. The consultative portion of the certification process must place emphasis on the identified conservation attributes, and options for the maintenance thereof.</b></p>	C	
<p>9.2.1 The manager shall consult with directly affected persons, qualified specialists and Aboriginals on the</p>	C	<p>Preparation of the HCVF report included the four required consultation components. Additionally, extensive consultation</p>



<p>identification of the High Conservation Values and the management options thereof.</p>		<p>occurred with all stakeholders as part of the public consultation process for the Sudbury Forest 2010-2020 FMP.</p>
<p>9.2.2 On public forests the manager should take steps to encourage ongoing and constructive engagement with interested parties in the identification of High Conservation Values and the management options thereof, where the interest, commitment and capacity for such constructive engagement exists.</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Record of draft information shared with interested parties (NGOs, Aboriginal communities, etc)</li> <li>• Record of agreements or understandings reached with interested parties in which there is a shared responsibility for constructive engagement.</li> </ul>	<p>C</p>	<p>The HCVs identified in the report and assessments have been included in the FMP for the Sudbury Forest 2010 to 2020. Objectives have been developed to consider all high conservation values and they are included in section 3.6 of the FMP. The FMP process which was completed this year includes extensive consultation with all stakeholder groups. Special FMP values sessions were conducted with First Nations representatives.</p> <p>The public meetings are well documented and all comments made during the FMP review process are recorded and provided in the supplemental documents accompanying the FMP and serve as part of the HCVF documentation process.</p> <p>VFM encourages further engagement through its website and a transparent engagement process with various relevant stakeholders.</p>
<p><b>C9.3. The management plan shall include and implement specific measures that ensure the maintenance and/or enhancement of the applicable conservation attributes consistent with the precautionary approach. These measures shall be specifically included in the publicly available management plan summary.</b></p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>9.3.1 Areas designated as HCVF are managed over the long term in a way to ensure the quality of their attributes and their size are not diminished.</p> <p><i>Means of verification :</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Management plan and strategies related to HCVFs.</li> </ul>	<p>C</p>	<p>Specific actions and approaches are implemented by VFM.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 2010-2020 FMP provides the direction for HCV management: the prescriptions are integrated into the plan</li> <li>• Detailed prescriptions are written for the values during the planning process</li> <li>• Managers aim at ensuring that the value is sustained, based on the concept of no net loss</li> <li>• A precautionary approach is adopted which requires that no impact is occurring.</li> </ul> <p>Objectives have been developed to consider all high conservation values and they are included in section 3.6 of the FMP.</p>
<p>9.3.2 When a High Conservation Value extends beyond property or forest management unit boundaries under the manager’s responsibilities, or when the maintenance of a conservation value depends on the proximity or connectivity with other HCVFs, the manager coordinates its conservation efforts with those of the neighbouring HCVF landowners/managers.</p> <p><i>Means of verification</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Correspondence with managers of adjacent lands.</li> <li>• Portions of management plan dealing with management of adjacent lands.</li> </ul>	<p>C</p>	<p>Compliance with this standard is evident in the operations and proposals by VFM. VFM worked with the Nipissing Forest and with Ontario Parks to assure that the HCV values in areas of the forest boundary are protected. These areas are clearly identified on the map sets available and HCV areas are identified on maps included in the AWS. This provides for awareness of the value in the planning of the operations and for the proper establishment of protection during operations. VFM participated in a regional HCV process to assure that values that have overlapping management authority are protected. This was done in cooperation with WWF and the Nature Conservancy.</p>
<p>9.3.3 The manager demonstrates that the management strategies and measures selected to maintain or restore High Conservation Values are</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The management strategies and protection measures employed are those that are included in the HCV report and they consistently meet or exceed the provincial standards for the values protected. These have been reviewed as part of the HCV report consultation and were</p>

<p>consistent with a precautionary approach, and with respect to each conservation attribute:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Will create conditions with a very high probability of securing the long-term maintenance or the restoration of the applicable conservation attribute;</li> <li>b. Are being implemented; and</li> <li>c. Are proving effective (or are adapted as required) based on the results of monitoring.</li> </ul> <p><i>Means of verification :</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of management strategies and those portions addressing the above points.</li> </ul>		<p>reviewed additionally during the FMP process. The HCVs identified and the prescriptions for those are modified as new standards are included in provincial guidelines, the protection measures are modified to meet or exceed the level of protection required in the province.</p>
<p><b>C9.4. Annual monitoring shall be conducted to assess the effectiveness of the measures employed to maintain or enhance the applicable conservation attributes.</b></p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The resources that are protected during the operations are monitored to ascertain that they have been protected during the operations as part of the compliance inspection process. The responsibilities for inventory and monitoring are identified in the HCV report and this is a shared responsibility of the MNR and VFM. VFM is responsible for the prescription development and implementation. Examples of the HCV protection measures were viewed during the field audit, including Blanding turtle habitat protection during herbicide applications.</p>

### Appendix 6 – Chain of Custody Indicators for FMEs

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