

FSC Controlled Wood Due Diligence System Public Summary

Note: Guidance on how to use this document is in grey italic font and should be deleted from the final version

1. General information

Organisation name:	Superior Hardwoods of Ohio, Inc.
FSC certificate code:	RA-CW-004824
Organisation's DDS contact person:	Bryan Feicht
DDS prepared/assisted by:	Bryan Feicht/Doug Schwemlein
Date last reviewed/updated (by the organisation):	10/2/2026

2. Suppliers

Participating site	Non-certified material type sourced	Exact number of suppliers	Supplier type(s)	Average no. of tiers in the supply chains	Approximate or exact number of sub-suppliers
McArthur	Logs	47	Loggers	1	0
Wellston	Logs	27	Loggers	1	0
Cambridge	Logs	53	Loggers	1	0
Parkersburg	Logs	47	Loggers	1	0
Barlow	Logs	25	Loggers	1	0

3. Supply areas

SH has implemented the US National Risk Assessment, FSC-NRA-USA V1-0, that was approved on April 1st, 2019, to determine the risk related to sourcing material from each controlled wood category.

4.a Risk mitigation for the origin of the material

Copy the table for each supply area. Add information about control measures for each indicator that is designated **specified or unspecified risk** in the relevant risk assessment (**deleting rows for indicators that are low risk or aren't found in the applicable risk assessment**) and complete the table.

If you only source from low risk areas, delete the table and state **"N/A, all supply areas are low risk"**.

Supply area: Ohio, Northern West Virginia, South-eastern Pennsylvania, Northern Kentucky		
Indicator	Control Measures	Findings from field verification if undertaken as a control measure
Number of the indicators designated specified or unspecified risk in the applicable risk assessment. Note that the number of applicable indicators will change depending on the type of risk assessment used, and not all will be applicable to company risk assessments and 'old' national risk assessments.	Describe the control measures implemented to mitigate the risk and describe their desired outcome. Describe the activities conducted to verify the effectiveness of the control measures. Include information on the cycle (how often you conduct verification), number of audits, justification of sampling intensity, and the key results of the audits. If you found non-conformities, state steps taken to address them.	Summarise findings, if field verification was conducted. Describe steps taken to address any non-conformities found, unless confidential. If information is deemed confidential and not published, provide a justification for this.
Controlled wood category 1. Illegally harvested wood N/A, all supply areas are low risk		
Controlled wood category 2. Wood harvested in violation of traditional and human rights N/A, all supply areas are low risk		
Controlled wood category 3. Wood from forests in which high conservation values are threatened by management activities	CONTROL MEASURE - SPATIAL SCREENING, FIELD VERIFICATION, AND EXCLUSION OF NON-CONFORMING MATERIAL Superior Hardwoods of Ohio (SH) uses avoidance and exclusion as the control measure for specified risk associated with Mesophytic Cove Sites (MCS). The desired outcome is to prevent material from sites where MCS are threatened by incompatible forest management activities from entering SH's Controlled Wood volume. Method and responsibility: • The FSC Certification Manager maintains the current MCS specified-risk map and county list for SH's sourcing area and makes the list available to log buyers at all participating sites. • Log buyers identify the county of origin for each source tract. Any tract originating in a county identified as potentially containing MCS is flagged for mandatory field verification. • A trained SH forester conducts the field inspection and records the tract location/GPS coordinates and whether MCS are present. • When MCS are present, the SH forester evaluates the harvest against the management recommendations in the University of Kentucky publication, 'Identification and Timber Management of Mesophytic Cove Sites for FSC Controlled Wood' (including removal of no more than 25% of dominant overstory trees, with at least 80% of harvested trees being yellow-poplar or cucumbertree). • Material from a harvest that meets the applicable recommendations may be included in Controlled Wood sourcing. Material from a harvest that does not meet the applicable recommendations is excluded from SH's	Field verification is used as part of the control measure for all tracts flagged by the MCS spatial screening. Inspection results are recorded on the SH audit/inspection form and retained for at least five years. Material from any inspected harvest that does not meet the applicable MCS management recommendations is excluded from Controlled Wood volume. The FSC Certification Manager reviews inspection records at least annually to verify implementation and effectiveness of the control measure and to identify any needed corrective action.

	Controlled Wood volume. Frequency and records: • County-of-origin screening is performed for each source tract. Field verification is required for 100% of tracts flagged by the MCS risk-area screening before the material is approved for inclusion in Controlled Wood volume. • Each field verification is documented on an SH audit/inspection form with GPS coordinates, inspection findings, eligibility determination, and any exclusion or corrective action. Records are retained for a minimum of five years. • The FSC Certification Manager reviews the specified-risk map/county list and the effectiveness of this control measure at least annually and whenever the applicable FSC risk assessment or sourcing area changes. Other Category 3 specified-risk areas: Late Successional Bottomland Hardwoods and the Central Appalachians Critical Biodiversity Area (CBA) occur in portions of Kentucky. The FSC Certification Manager reviews SH sourcing records at least annually to determine whether material was sourced from counties containing these specified-risk areas. If sourcing occurs from an applicable specified-risk area, the material must be evaluated under an applicable control measure before it may be included in Controlled Wood volume. SH's review of Fiber Tract records previously identified sourcing from Greenup, Mason, Lawrence, and Carter Counties, Kentucky; none of those counties were identified as specified risk for Late Successional Bottomland Hardwoods or the Central Appalachians CBA.	
Controlled wood category 4. Wood from forests being converted to plantations or non-forest use3.2 N/A, all supply areas are low risk		
Controlled wood category 5. Wood from forests in which genetically modified trees are planted3.41.11 N/A, all supply areas are low risk		

4.b Risk assessment and mitigation for mixing in the supply chain

Participating site	Supply chain type	No. of tiers	Risk of mixing	Control measures	Findings from field verification if undertaken as a control measure
<i>This table shall be filled for each applicable participating site (listed in the table in Section 2)</i>	Describe the supply chain e.g. • Wood delivered and purchased directly from concession holder to Organisation's log yard • Wood delivered and purchased directly from concession holder to Organisation's log yard, but purchased through a round wood trader. • Wood delivered from forest to railway terminal and transported by train to organisation. and state the relevant supply area, or state that the material previously had an FSC claim but was sourced from a non-FSC certified (chain of custody) supply chain.	<i>'Tiers' indicates the legal entities taking ownership of the wood from harvesting to the organisation purchasing it. If there is only 1 tier, it means that wood is purchased directly from the concession holder.</i>	Summarise the risk assessment of mixing in this supply chain. Justify conclusions. NOTE: As per requirement 3.5 of FSC-STD-40-005 V3-1, material can only be used as controlled wood when there is low risk for origin and NO RISK of mixing with non-eligible inputs in the supply chains. Therefore, conclusions shall be either "no risk" or that risk is present. Control measures are required for instances where risk is present.	If risk is identified, state what actions are being taken to mitigate that risk. Describe the activities that have been conducted by the organisation to verify the effectiveness of the control measures. Include information on the cycle (how often verification is conducted), number of audits, justification of sampling intensity, and the key results of the audits. If non-conformities were found, state steps taken to address them.	Summarise findings, if field verification was conducted. Describe steps taken to address any non-conformities found, unless confidential. If information is deemed confidential and not published, provide a justification for this.
McArthur	Logs are delivered directly from the forest.	1-2	Logs are delivered direct from forest. No risk of mixing.	CM Audits are conducted annually to verify district of origin compliance.	N/A

Wellston	Logs are delivered directly from the forest.	1-2	Logs are delivered direct from forest. No risk of mixing.	CM Audits are conducted annually to verify district of origin compliance.	N/A
Cambridge	Logs are delivered directly from the forest.	1-2	Logs are delivered direct from forest. No risk of mixing.	CM Audits are conducted annually to verify district of origin compliance.	N/A
Parkersburg	Logs are delivered directly from the forest.	1-2	Logs are delivered direct from forest. No risk of mixing.	CM Audits are conducted annually to verify district of origin compliance.	N/A
Barlow	Logs are delivered directly from the forest.	1-2	Logs are delivered direct from forest. No risk of mixing.	CM Audits are conducted annually to verify district of origin compliance.	N/A

5. Technical experts used in the development of control measures

List all technical experts used for developing control measures.

Name	License/Registration #	Qualification	Scope of service	Source of information
			<i>State the relevant supply area(s) and indicator(s) for which expertise was used in the development of control measures</i>	<i>For publicly available expertise, provide the citation for the specific source(s) of information used</i>
FSC US			Appalachian region	FSC US Controlled Wood Regional Meeting Report, Appalachian Region: Asheville, NC July 19, 2018
Ohio Div. of Forestry		State Government Authority	<i>State of Ohio, BMPs</i>	http://forestry.ohiodnr.gov/portals/forestry/pdfs/industry/bmplogging.pdf
Ohio Div. of Forestry		State Government Authority	<i>State of Ohio, Invasive Species</i>	http://ohiodnr.gov/invasivespecies
UK Center for Forest and Wood Certification		University	<i>Forests of HCV and Mesophytic Cove Sites</i>	https://cfwc.ca.uky.edu/controlled-wood

6. Stakeholder consultation processes

Summarise all stakeholder consultation processes that you have conducted, including information on:

N/A, stakeholder consultation not required"

Supply area	Relevant controlled wood category	List of stakeholder groups invited to participate	Summary of comments received from stakeholders	Description of how stakeholder comments were taken into account	Justification for concluding that the material sourced from the area was low risk
-------------	-----------------------------------	---	--	---	---

		<i>List all types of stakeholders contacted. E.g. Forest owners/managers, Forest contractors, Representatives of forest workers and forest industries, FSC certificate holders, Local/regional/national/international social NGOs, Forest workers, trade unions, local communities, indigenous and traditional peoples, local/regional/national/international environmental NGOs, FSC-accredited certification bodies, National and state forest agencies, Experts with expertise in controlled wood categories, Research institutions and universities, FSC regional offices/network partners/working groups</i>			

7. Complaints

Complaints must be received in writing and must include the name and contact information of the complainant, a description of the issue and supporting evidence. Complaints will be submitted to the Superior Hardwoods FSC Certification Manager: Bryan Feicht, PO Box 320, McArthur, OH 45651, bryan.feicht@superiorhardwoods.com, 740-596-2561.

- Complaints Procedure:
 - a) Acknowledge receipt of complaint.
 - b) Inform stakeholders of the complaint procedure and provide an initial response within two weeks.
 - c) Forward complaints related to risk designation to the certifying body.
 - d) Conduct an initial determination of whether or not the complaint is “substantial” by assessing the evidence provided against the risk of using material from unacceptable sources.
 - e) Have discussion with complainant that aims to resolve complaints initially designated as substantial before proceeding to further actions.
 - f) Forward substantial complaints to the certifying body and relevant FSC National Office for the supply area within two weeks of receiving the complaint. This must include information on what steps will be taken to resolve the issue and the precautionary approach that will be used.
 - g) Implement a precautionary approach towards the continued sourcing of relevant material while the complaint is pending. (Pending complaints are those complaints assessed as substantial and where no corrective actions have yet been taken).
 - h) Implement a verification process for a complaint determined to be substantial, within two months of receipt (e.g. field verification, desk verification).
 - i) Determine corrective actions to be taken by suppliers and the means to enforce their implementation for complaints assessed and verified as substantial. If corrective actions cannot be determined and/or enforced, the relevant material and/or suppliers will be excluded by Superior Hardwoods.
 - j) Verify that corrective actions have been taken by suppliers and whether or not they are effective.
 - k) If no corrective actions have been taken, the relevant material and/or suppliers will be excluded by Superior Hardwoods.
 - l) Inform the complainant, the certification body, and the relevant FSC National Office of the results of the complaint and any actions that were taken.

m) Keep records of all complaints received, actions taken, and all associated correspondence and retain records for a minimum of 5 years.

Annex

US National Risk Assessment.