

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

The Conservation Fund Working Forest Fund and Related Properties

SCS-FM/COC-00102N
410 Market St. Suite 360
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514
Trevor Cutsinger

14951 "A" Caspar Rd, Box 50
Caspar, California 95420
UNITED STATES
Holly Newberger
<http://www.conservationfund.org/>

CERTIFIED	EXPIRATION
21 December 2012	20 December 2017

DATE OF FIELD AUDIT
28-29 September & 1-2 October 2015
DATE OF LAST UPDATE
28 October 2015

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



Foreword

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

Cycle in annual surveillance audits			
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 st annual audit	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 nd annual audit	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 rd annual audit	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 th annual audit
Name of Forest Management Enterprise (FME) and abbreviation used in this report:			
The Conservation Fund (TCF)			

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

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

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

Organization of the Report

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

Table of Contents

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY	4
1. GENERAL INFORMATION	4
1.1 Annual Audit Team.....	4
1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation	5
1.3 Standards Employed	5
2 ANNUAL AUDIT DATES AND ACTIVITIES	5
2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities.....	5
2.2 Evaluation of Management Systems	9
3. CHANGES IN MANAGEMENT PRACTICES.....	9
4. RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION.....	10
4.1 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations	10
4.2 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations	13
5. STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS	15
5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted	15
5.2 Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Responses from the Team, Where Applicable	15
6. CERTIFICATION DECISION	16
7. CHANGES IN CERTIFICATION SCOPE	16
8. ANNUAL DATA UPDATE	20
8.1 Social Information.....	20
8.2 Annual Summary of Pesticide and Other Chemical Use	21
SECTION B – APPENDICES (CONFIDENTIAL).....	22
Appendix 1 – List of FMUs Selected For Evaluation.....	22
Appendix 2 – List of Stakeholders Consulted.....	22
Appendix 3 – Additional Audit Techniques Employed.....	23
Appendix 4 – Pesticide Derogations	23
Appendix 5 – Detailed Observations.....	23
Appendix 6 – Chain of Custody Indicators for FMEs.....	40

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY

1. General Information

1.1 Annual Audit Team

Auditor Name:	Dr. Walter R. Mark	Auditor role:	FSC Lead Auditor and SFI Auditor
Qualifications:	<p>Dr. Walter R. 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. He has a B.S. in Forest Management from Utah State University, an M.S. in Forest Science from Colorado State University, and a Ph.D. in Botany and Plant Pathology from Colorado State University. 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) and a Fellow and certified forester with the Society of American Foresters 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 in Canada and the US for certification, recertification, scoping, and annual audits since 2003.</p>		
Auditor Name:	Dr. David E. Capan	Auditor role:	FSC Auditor and SFI Auditor
Qualifications:	<p>Dr. David E. Capan is a Professor Emeritus in the Rubenstein School of Environment and Natural Resources at the University of Vermont. He has a B.S.F. degree in Forestry from the University of Tennessee, an M.S. degree in Wildlife Management from the University of Maine, and a Ph.D. in Wildlife Science from Utah State University. He has been a faculty member at the University of Vermont since 1976, maintaining a part-time research appointment from 2002-2010. Dr. Capen is a Certified Wildlife Biologist and previously a Certified Forester. He has conducted FSC assessments for 15 years in Massachusetts, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Indiana, Wisconsin, Connecticut, and Pennsylvania.</p>		
Auditor Name:	Mike Ferrucci	Auditor role:	SFI Lead Auditor and FSC Auditor
Qualifications:	<p>Mike Ferrucci is the SFI Program Manager for NSF – International Strategic Registrations and is responsible for all aspects of the firm's SFI Certification programs. He is qualified as a RAB-QSA Lead Auditor (ISO 14001 Environmental Management Systems), as an SFI Lead Auditor for Forest Management, Procurement, and Chain of Custody, as an FSC Lead Auditor Forest Management and Chain of Custody, as a Tree Farm Group Certification Lead Auditor, and as a GHG Lead Auditor. Mike has led Sustainable Forest Initiative (SFI) certification and precertification reviews throughout the United States. He has also led or participated in joint SFI and Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) certification projects in nearly one dozen states and a joint scoping or precertification gap-analysis project on tribal lands throughout the United States. He also co-led the pioneering pilot dual evaluation of the Lakeview Stewardship Unit on the Fremont-Winema National Forest.</p>		

	<p>Mike Ferrucci has 33 years of forest management experience. His expertise is in sustainable forest management planning; in certification of forests as sustainably managed; in the application of easements for large-scale working forests, and in the ecology, silviculture, and management of mixed species forests, with an emphasis on regeneration and management of native hardwood species. Mike has conducted or participated in assessments of forest management operations throughout the United States, with field experience in 4 countries and 33 states. Mike has been a member of the Society of American Foresters for over thirty-five years. He is Past Chair of the SFI Auditor’s Forum. Mike is also a Lecturer at the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, where he has taught graduate courses and workshops in forest management, harvesting operations, professional forest ethics, private forestry, and financial analysis.</p>
--	---

1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation

A. Number of days spent on-site assessing the applicant:	4
B. Number of auditors participating in on-site evaluation:	3 (1 for one day 2 for 3 days)
C. Additional days spent on preparation, stakeholder consultation, and post-site follow-up:	4.5
D. Total number of person days used in evaluation:	11.5

1.3 Standards Employed

1.3.1. Applicable FSC-Accredited Standards

Title	Version	Date of Finalization
FSC US Forest Management Standard	1.0	July 2010
All standards employed are available on the websites of FSC International (www.fsc.org), the FSC-US (www.fscus.org) or the SCS Standards page (www.scsglobalservices.com/certification-standards-and-program-documents). Standards are also available, upon request, from SCS Global Services (www.SCSglobalServices.com).		

2 Annual Audit Dates and Activities

2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities

Date: 29 September 2015	
FMU / Location / sites visited	Activities / notes
The Conservation Fund/Success Pond, NH, and McConnell Pond, NY	Opening meeting: In attendance: David Capen, Mike Ferrucci (Auditors) Trevor Cutsinger, Jazmin Varela, Nancy Bell (TCF), David DeGrutolla (LandVest Timberlands)
	Success Pond Site No. 1. Marie Grand road

	<p>Approximately 1 mile of year-round road, an extension of a privately owned road that is gated, but accessible from other roads on the property that are not gated. The road is in need of maintenance. Erosion is minor, but ditches have been filled and the crown is no longer present. Along this road, we stopped to inspect marking of property boundary and signage. Boundary is blazed and is scheduled for re-blazing and painting within the year.</p> <p>Site No. 2. Leavitt Stream Sale (partial) A 9-acre mix of patch clearcuts created in March 2015. Very dense stand of spruce and fir with virtually no regeneration in the understory. A mix of small openings of different sizes and the logging trails already show evidence of seedlings of spruce, fir, and white pine. Large white pines were left as possible nest sites for ospreys. Logging was done by a local operator, with feller-bunches and grapple skidder, and was done with a contract logging agreement. Marketing was by Timbervest Logging Co.</p> <p>Site No. 3. Winter roads 03-0300 and 03-0301 Access is blocked most of the time with large rocks, but currently open and in good shape. Numerous small waterbars were installed to drain the road but still allow access by truck.</p> <p>Site No. 4. Leavitt Stream Sale (main sale) Improvement thinning and group selection in HS and H types. Auditors did an extensive inspection of this harvest area, which involved a large, steep slope, a stream crossing, and various harvest methods. A NH wetland permit was required for a winter pole crossing of a small stream. Observed a 75-foot riparian buffer along the stream and good brushing of logging trails, most of which ran up slope. Operation was completed in March, when ground was thawing, but rutting was minor and trails were left with ample brush and waterbars. One auditor climber to top of ridge and witnessed a 40-inch legacy white birch tree.</p> <p>McConnell Pond</p> <p>Site No. 5. Silvio Conti National Wildlife Refuge Office The Nulhegan Basin Unit of the Conti Refuge is an adjacent property to TCF's McConnell Pond property. One of the main winter accesses to refuge lands is across the TCF property. The two landowners work together on a study of Canada Lynx and cooperate on landscape-level forest management. The audit team interviewed the Refuge Manager and Refuge Biologist.</p> <p>Site No. 6. McConnell Pond Road This road provides non-winter access to the forests of the property and also to 9 camp leases around McConnell Pond. The road serves as part of the VAST snowmobile network in winter. Road is well drained and maintained.</p> <p>Site No. 7. Along the road Windshield observations of small wildlife clearing, gravel pit, and roadside mowing.</p> <p>Site No. 8. Stand No. 89</p>
--	--

	<p>Inspection of 63-acre harvest done during summer 2014. Auditors spent more than an hour on this site, walking numerous harvest trails. The harvest was an improvement harvest in a two-aged stand of northern hardwoods. The last harvest was in 1988. All wood came out to a single landing, and the main skid road was well brushed and underlain with pulp-sized logs. Logging was done with feller-buncher and skidder, by a local logger. Sawlogs and pulp were sold to local processors. Many instances of trees marked “no cut” to be left for wildlife.</p>
<p>Date: 1 October 2015</p>	
<p>FMU / Location / sites visited</p>	<p>Activities / notes</p>
<p>The Conservation Fund/Caspar Office/</p>	<p>Opening Meeting: In attendance: Walter Mark, Mike Ferrucci (Audit Team); Trevor Cutsinger, Holly Newberger, Scott Kelly, and Lauren Fety (TCF) Discussion and review included: Introductions, Review of audit plan, existing CARs and OBS, North Coast Policy Digest, Harvest Volume History 2007-2015, Option A on file with Cal Fire, Olson Gulch THP Documentation, Inventory, FSC international generic standards, final site selection</p>
<p>The Conservation Fund/Caspar/Garcia River FMU</p>	<p><u>Garcia River FMU</u> Stop No. 1 Graphite THP Scott Kelly of TCF conducted a safety meeting for field visits on TCF lands. The Graphite THP was harvested in 2014 and 2015 with closeout spring 2015. The yarding was done with tractors and standing skyline. The silviculture was single tree selection and group selection. Group selection sites were based on pre-harvest stand conditions. Little residual tree damage was observed. Planting on groups is forester’s choice, based on stocking after harvest. Planting stock is from local seed sources on the Jackson State Forest and is either 1-1 or 2-0 bare-root or container grown in a nursery in Oregon. Water bars for erosion control was installed on skid trails and secondary roads with rolling dips on the main haul roads. Stop No. 2 Olson Gulch THP Northern spotted owl (NSO) sites were mapped near site and were excluded from the mark. The harvest included portions of the Ecological Reserve, where the silviculture is thin from below to develop late stage successional forest stands. Marking leaves defective and wildlife trees, and smaller lower canopy trees. The mark is based on variable density thinning. Stands had been entered several times previously. LTO was on site and was interviewed by the audit team. Stop No. 3 North Fork Garcia River Habitat Improvement Project This project was an in-stream habitat improvement project to place large woody debris in the stream channel to improve fish habitat. The project was done in 2011 and the impacts were very evident. Project was a partnership project with The Nature</p>

	<p>Conservancy and the California Department of Fish and Game (Wildlife).</p> <p>Stop No. 4 Upper North Fork THP This was a hack and squirt herbicide project to control tanoak and plant with redwood seedlings. The project was done in 2013 and the efficacy was very good. Wildlife trees were retained as were large tanoak specimens. The general hack and squirt has been replaced by more selective tree poisoning where each tree treated must benefit a future crop tree directly.</p> <p>Stop No. 5 Upper North Fork THP This stop was to look at a group selection unit with planted redwood.</p>
<p>Date: 2 October 2015</p>	
<p>FMU / Location / sites visited</p>	<p>Activities / notes</p>
<p>TCF/Caspar/Salmon Creek and Big River FMU's</p>	<p>Additional TCF employees present on field day included Mary Mayeda and Madison Thomson.</p> <p>Salmon Creek FMU</p> <p>Stop No. 1 Upper Hazel THP Upper Hazel THP is planned for harvest in 2016. Much effort with Friends of the Albion to appease public opinion about logging in local area. Held two proactive tours with the local groups. The public hearing on the THP with Cal Fire received no public comments. Looked at the sample mark that was prepared for the PHI to apply single tree selection. WLPZ on FMU was expanded by National Marine Fisheries during previous ownership. New anadromous fish rules have taken care of the problems. There is an upper diameter limit of 48 inches on the FMU. Plan to thin to 130-150 sq ft of basal area and leave trees with structural attributes such as flat tops, wolfie fir, conky trees, and the two largest trees per acre. Option A includes a threshold of retention of 4 trees per acre over 48 dbh. Cut planned will remove 6-7 Mbf/A.</p> <p>Stop No. 2 Upper Hazel THP Haul Road Evidence of maintenance even though no active THP using the road.</p> <p>Stop No. 3 North Navarro Ridge THP Checked boundary marking in area where the THP boundary was adjacent to ranch property of another owner. The entire boundary of the Salmon Creek FMU is blazed and additionally is flagged during a THP. Other FMU boundaries are not all blazed, discussions indicated that a line is flagged prior to the THP and agreement is reached with adjacent landowner. If cannot agree, then the line is resurveyed.</p> <p>Driving Discussion RTE surveys are conducted by biologists. Wildlife by Mendocino County RCD wildlife biologist, mostly for NSO, marbled murrelet and red-legged frogs; Plant surveys by either a county botanist or UC Extension botanist.</p>

	<p>Archeology surveys are conducted by Madison Thomson, a forester for TCF, who is certified through the Cal Fire Archeology program. Controversy has grown about the hack and squirt program due to the additional dead fuels during the extreme drought. TCF is conducting a study to look at options with four treatments; H&S all >20", H&S <20" selectively, Remove all <20", and no treatment.</p> <p>Big River FMU</p> <p>Stop No. 4 Changeling THP</p> <p>Looked at a culvert upgrade where the existing culvert had rusted out. New culvert sized for 100 year storm with rockered inlet and outlet. TCF received a grant from the Bechtel Foundation for \$100,000 to reduce sediment from existing roads. TCF matches that as needed.</p> <p>Stop No. 5 Changeling THP</p> <p>Looked at a road realignment, reconstruction and abandonment project where existing road was failing due to slide activity. New road was full bench construction and old road was trash packed with slash to prevent surface erosion. Jubata grass control as an invasive plant was observed along the road on the way out of the Salmon Creek FMU.</p>
TCF/Caspar/Big River FMU	<p>Closing meeting was held on the haul road out of the Big River FMU. Preliminary findings were presented to TCF staff by the audit team. What to expect next from the audit and the tentative schedule of events was discussed. Meeting ended at 3:45.</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

No significant changes have occurred since the recertification in 2012.

4. Results of the Evaluation

4.1 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations

Finding Number: 2014.1	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	SCS CoC Indicators for Forest Management Enterprises 3.2 (see also FSC-STD-50-001 (V1-2), indicator 1.15 and Annex 1).
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): Examples of the use of Forest Stewardship Council trademarks were observed without the required registered trademark symbol.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): The appropriate symbol shall be added to “FSC” or “Forest Stewardship Council” for the first use in any text. The registration status of the FSC trademarks for the respective country is listed in Annex 1 of FSC-STD-50-001 (V1-2).	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	<p>TCF has revised the North Coast Annual Report to appropriately use FSC and Forest Stewardship Council. This was done in coordination with SCS and FSC to assure correct usage. The change was approved by Jillian Van Luchen on 4/14/2015. A pdf of the revised North Coast Annual Report was reviewed during the course of the audit. The revised document has not been reprinted at this time to include the revisions. The Conservation Fund will continue to utilize the existing copies. When the current supply is exhausted the revised brochure will be printed and distributed, using the newly approved version.</p> <p>During the course of the audit the TCF website was reviewed and under the working forest projects for the individual forests additional cases of the misuse of the also includes use of Forest Stewardship Council trademarks without the required registered trademark symbol.</p>
SCS review	The lack of revision of all of the text using the Forest Stewardship Council trademarks does not meet the intent of this minor CAR. As a result this CAR is upgraded to Major CAR 2015.1.
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2014.2	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US Forest Management Standard v1.0, 8.2.d.3
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): Methods of monitoring relevant socio-economic issues vary considerably from FMU to FMU. The California properties calculate an annual estimate of economic impact. For East Grand Lake, an annual community benefits summary is produced as a loan requirement. However, for the Eastern Shore Forests there was a recent study conducted that included economic impact data that could serve as a baseline, but there does not appear to be a regular protocol for socio-economic monitoring.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): TCF should improve its processes for monitoring socio-economic issues to ensure that this consistently takes places across the entire scope of the forests in the certificate.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	TCF has adopted a standardized guideline for monitoring on all the FMUs included in the certificate, including socio-economic monitoring. The monitoring guideline is posted on the TCF website: http://www.conservationfund.org/images/The_Conservation_Fund_Public_Monitoring_Summary_for_Website_2015.pdf
SCS review	The new monitoring guideline fulfils the OBS and as a result, it is closed.
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2014.3	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US Forest Management Standard v1.0, 8.5.a
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): A public summary of monitoring results is not available for all FMUs in the scope of the certificate. An annual summary of monitoring efforts and results for the California properties is published as part of an annual report, but no corresponding summary exists for other the other properties.	

Corrective Action Request (or Observation): While protecting landowner confidentiality, either full monitoring results or an up-to-date summary of the most recent monitoring information is maintained, covering the Indicators listed in Criterion 8.2, and is available to the public, free or at a nominal price, upon request.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	As part of the monitoring guideline adopted for all FMUs a summary of all monitoring activities is available upon request.
SCS review	The announcement of the availability of the monitoring summary fulfils the requirement in CAR 2014.3, and the CAR is closed as a result. The method of requesting this summary is not clear on the website as posted on the link under OBS 2014.2. See OBS 2015.2.
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2014.4	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US Forest Management Standard v1.0, 9.1.a and 9.1.b
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): An HCVF checklist was completed for the Eastern Shore Forests as an appendix to the management plan. The checklist indicated that no HCVF was present, but did not provide any justification for this determination. It was also unclear whether this determination underwent consultation with outside experts or stakeholders in order to confirm its accuracy.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): In developing their HCVF assessment, TCF must consult with qualified specialists, independent experts, and local community members who may have knowledge of areas that meet the definition of HCVs.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	The justification for the determination of the HCVF was provided by the consultant utilized to identify the HCVF. This included the GAP analysis completed and the stakeholder and expert consultation utilized to confirm the accuracy of the determination.
SCS review	As a result of the clarification and justification provided by TCF, CAR 2014.4 is closed.
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

4.2 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations

Finding Number: 2015.1	
Select one: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	SCS CoC Indicators for Forest Management Enterprises 3.2 (see also FSC-STD-50-001 (V1-2), indicator 1.15 and Annex 1).
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): Examples of the use of Forest Stewardship Council trademarks in various documents were observed during the 2014 annual surveillance audit and again during the 2015 annual surveillance audit on the TCF website without the required registered trademark symbol. Since this was Minor CAR 2014.1, this CAR has been upgraded to Major CAR 2015.1	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): The appropriate symbol shall be added to “FSC” or “Forest Stewardship Council” for the first use in any text and approval for trademark uses sought from SCS. The registration status of the FSC trademarks for the respective country is listed in Annex 1 of FSC-STD-50-001 (V1-2).	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	<i>On October 7, 2015 TCF submitted language to SCScertified.com for approval to use the registered trademark on the TCF website. Approval was received from SCS on October 7, 2015. The change was made to the TCF website on October 16, 2015, and can be seen here: http://www.conservationfund.org/projects/north-coast-forest-conservation-initiative</i>
SCS review	FME received approval for trademark use from SCS per the records demonstrated. Website was also reviewed for the trademark use, which conforms to FSC requirements.
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2015.2	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify): none
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US Forest Management Standard v1.0, 8.5.a

Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): A public summary of monitoring results is now available for all FMUs in the scope of the certificate. This is available upon request according to the monitoring guidelines document. An annual summary of monitoring efforts and results for the California properties is published as part of an annual report, but no corresponding summary exists for other the other properties. The methodology for requesting the public summary of the monitoring results is not clear in the monitoring guidelines document posted under the WFF portion of the TCF website.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): The methodology for requesting a public summary of the monitoring guidelines should be clarified to make the process as easy and transparent as possible.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2015.3	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify): none
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US Forest Management Standard v1.0, 7.1
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): The Buckeye FMU was acquired in 2013 and a 2 ND draft of the management plan has been prepared by TCF and has undergone a first round of review and modification. The draft management plan is in the final review process with the Advisory Committee and Sonoma County. The timeline for the completion of the review is beyond the control of TCF, therefore this item is issued as an observation. While review and final adoption is underway, TCF adopted a policy of no action on the Buckeye FMU. This provides protection to any resources present on the FMU. The resources on the Buckeye FMU are also protected under the general management guidelines in place for all of the TCF WFF FMUs.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): TCF should expedite the process of adoption of the management plan for the Buckeye FMU.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

5. Stakeholder Comments

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

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

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

5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted

TCF Employees	
Logging Contractor	

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.	
Stakeholder comments	SCS Response
Economic concerns	
Social concerns	
Environmental concerns	

6. Certification Decision

The certificate holder has demonstrated continued overall conformance to the applicable Forest Stewardship Council standards. The SCS annual audit team recommends that the certificate be sustained, subject to subsequent annual audits and the FME's response to any open CARs.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments: TCF continues to manage the forests in the WFF to a standard that is extremely high and the management activities are proactive. The communication with the local community is exemplary.	

7. Changes in Certification Scope

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

Name and Contact Information

Organization name	The Conservation Fund		
Contact person	Trevor Cutsinger and Holly Newberger		
Address	Trevor Cutsinger	Telephone	
	410 Market St Suite 360	Fax	
	Chapel Hill NC 27516; 919-951-0107	e-mail	tcutsinger@conservationfund.org hnewberger@conservationfund.org
	Holly Newberger 14951 "A" Caspar Road, Box 50 Caspar, CA 95420 United States	Website	http://www.conservationfund.org

FSC Sales Information

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

Scope of Certificate

Certificate Type	<input type="checkbox"/> Single FMU	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple FMU
	<input type="checkbox"/> Group	
SLIMF (if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/> Small SLIMF certificate	<input type="checkbox"/> Low intensity SLIMF certificate
	<input type="checkbox"/> Group SLIMF certificate	
# Group Members (if applicable)		

Number of FMUs in scope of certificate	10		
Geographic location of non-SLIMF FMU(s)	<i>Latitude & Longitude:</i>		
Forest zone	<input type="checkbox"/> Boreal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Temperate	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Subtropical	<input type="checkbox"/> Tropical	
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is:	Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac		
privately managed	109,075		
state managed			
community managed			
Number of FMUs in scope that are:			
less than 100 ha in area	0	100 - 1000 ha in area	0
1000 - 10 000 ha in area	10	more than 10 000 ha in area	0
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is included in FMUs that:	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		
Division of FMUs into manageable units:			
Divided among 10 properties in various states			
<u>California:</u>			
Garcia River Forest – 24,000 acres;			
Gualala Forest – 14,000 acres;			
Big River and Salmon Creek – 16,000 acres;			
Buckeye Forest – 18,120 acres;			
<u>Texas:</u>			
Bobcat Ridge – 7,051 acres;			
<u>Vermont:</u>			
McConnell Pond – 4,500 acres;			
<u>Maine:</u>			
East Grand Lake – 5,947 acres;			
<u>Pennsylvania:</u>			
Penfield Forest – 2,041 acres;			
<u>Virginia:</u>			
Chesapeake Forest – 8,600 acres;			
<u>New Hampshire:</u>			
Success Pond – 8,900 acres			

Production Forests

Timber Forest Products	Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac
Total area of production forest (i.e. forest from which timber may be harvested)	92,032
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	5,047

Area of production forest regenerated primarily by natural regeneration, or by a combination of natural regeneration and coppicing of the naturally regenerated stems	86,095
Silvicultural system(s)	Area under type of management
Even-aged management	12,059
Clearcut (clearcut size range)	
Shelterwood	
Other:	
Uneven-aged management	79,523
Individual tree selection	
Group selection	
Other:	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (e.g. nursery, recreation area, windbreak, bamboo, silvo-pastoral system, agro-forestry system, etc.)	
The sustainable rate of harvest (usually Annual Allowable Harvest or AAH where available) of commercial timber (m3 of round wood)	See attached table for each property AAH
Non-timber Forest Products (NTFPs)	
Area of forest protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for the production of NTFPs or services	
Other areas managed for NTFPs or services	
Approximate annual commercial production of non-timber forest products included in the scope of the certificate, by product type	
Explanation of the assumptions and reference to the data source upon which AAH and NTFP harvest rates estimates are based:	
Management plans include discussion or documentation with model outputs or other rationale explaining assumptions for Annual Allowable Harvest rates.	
Species in scope of joint FM/COC certificate: (Scientific / Latin Name and Common / Trade Name)	
<i>Abies balsamea, Abies concolor, Acer rubrum, Acer saccharum, Alnus rubra, Betula alleghaniensis, Betula nigra, Betula papyrifera, Carya spp., Fagus grandifolia, Fraxinus americana, Fraxinus nigra, Larix laricina, Liquidambar styraciflua, Liriodendron tulipifera, Notholithocarpus densiflorus, Picea glauca, Pinus lambertiana, Picea mariana, Picea rubens, Pinus strobus, Pinus taeda, Populus balsamifera, Populus grandidentata, Populus tremuloides, Prunus serotina, Pseudotsuga menziesii, Quercus alba, Quercus rubra, Quercus spp., Sequoia sempervirens, Thuja occidentalis, Tilia americana, Tsuga canadensis</i>	

FSC Product Classification

Timber products		
Product Level 1	Product Level 2	Species
W1	W1.1 (Roundwood logs)	All
W3	W3.1 (Woodchips)	<i>Abies balsamea, Acer rubrum, Acer saccharum, Betula alleghaniensis, Betula nigra, Betula papyrifera, Carya spp., Fagus grandifolia, Fraxinus americana, Fraxinus nigra, Larix laricina, Picea glauca, Picea</i>

		<i>mariana, Picea rubens, Pinus strobus, Populus balsamifera, Populus grandidentata, Populus tremuloides, Prunus serotina, Quercus alba, Quercus rubra, Quercus spp., Thuja occidentalis, Tilia americana, Tsuga canadensis</i>
Non-Timber Forest Products		
Product Level 1	Product Level 2	Product Level 3 and Species

Conservation Areas

Total area of forest and non-forest land protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for conservation objectives:		4,699 ac		
High Conservation Value Forest / Areas				
High Conservation Values present and respective areas:		Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac		
<input type="checkbox"/>	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).	North Coast, CA; Northern Spotted Owl habitat	2,737
<input type="checkbox"/>	HCV2	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant large landscape level forests, contained within, or containing the management unit, where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance.		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV3	Forests or areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems.	North Coast, CA; Oak woodlands and grasslands.	1,195
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV4	Forests or areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g. watershed protection, erosion control).	Class I Streams North Coast, CA Bottomland Hardwoods, TX Forested wetlands, NH Forested wetlands, ME	4,162
<input type="checkbox"/>	HCV5	Forests or areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g. subsistence, health).		

<input type="checkbox"/>	HCV6	Forests or areas critical to local communities' traditional cultural identity (areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in cooperation with such local communities).		
Total Area of forest classified as 'High Conservation Value Forest / Area'				8,094

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

<input type="checkbox"/> N/A – All forestland owned or managed by the applicant is included in the scope.		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Applicant owns and/or manages other FMUs not under evaluation.		
<input type="checkbox"/> Applicant wishes to excise portions of the FMU(s) under evaluation from the scope of certification.		
Explanation for exclusion of FMUs and/or excision:	The Conservation Fund is a national organization, with land holdings throughout the United States. The North Coast forests are the only properties owned by TCF in the Western states that support timber harvesting. TCF's other forested properties either: a) are not managed for timber, b) are set to be sold in the near future, or c) are in the process of becoming FSC-certified under a multiple FMU certificate.	
Control measures to prevent mixing of certified and non-certified product (C8.3):	All properties where harvesting occurs use an invoicing system that must state the property of origin.	
Description of FMUs excluded from, or forested area excised from, the scope of certification:		
Name of FMU or Stand	Location (city, state, country)	Size (<input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac)
East Grand Lake	Aroostook County, ME	6,000 ac
Rayonier	Long County, GA	3,000 ac
4 State Forest	NY, VT, NH, ME	30,250 ac
Twin Lakes	Iron County, WI	13,732 ac
Sansavilla	Wayne and Glynn Counties, GA	19,577 ac
Fraser-Reed	Aroostook County, ME	32,341 ac
Brunswick	Brunswick County, GA	3,670 ac
Cranberry Lake	New York	8,162 ac

8. Annual Data Update

8.1 Social Information

Number of forest workers (including contractors) working in forest within scope of certificate (differentiated by gender):		
# of male workers 97	# of female workers 8	
Number of accidents in forest work since last audit: 0	Serious: 0	Fatal: 0

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 (acres)	Reason for use
Imazypyr	Imazypyr	4.16	36	Tanoak reduction
Arsenal	Imazypyr	4 oz/Ac	124	Band spray for woody vegetation control
Oust XP	75% sulfometuron methyl	2 oz/Ac	124	Band spray for woody vegetation control

SECTION B – APPENDICES (CONFIDENTIAL)

Appendix 1 – List of FMUs Selected For Evaluation

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

SCS staff establishes the design and level of sampling prior to each group or multiple FMU evaluation according to FSC-STD-20-007. A list of the FMUs sampled and the rationale behind their selection is listed below. Rationale is based upon an agreed upon sampling design to provide coverage of all FMU's during the annual surveillance audit process. No other rationale is provided.

FMU Name	FMU Size Category: - SLIMF - non-SLIMF - Large > 10,000 ha	Forest Type: - Plantation - Natural Forest	Rationale for Selection: - Random Sample - Stakeholder issue - Ease of access - Other – please describe
Garcia River Forest	24,000 ac	Private	2007-2012, 2015
Gualala Forest	14,000 ac	Private	2012, no activity in 2014 or 2015
Big River/ Salmon Creek Forest	16,000 ac	Private	2007-2012, 2015
Buckeye	18,120 ac	Private	2014, no activity in 2015
Penfield Forest	2,041 ac	Private	
Chesapeake Forest (SCI)	8,600 ac	Private	2014
Success Pond	8,900 ac	Private	2013, 2015
Bobcat Ridge	7,051 ac	Private	2013
McConnell Pond	4,500 ac	Private	2012, 2013, 2014 (separate certificate), 2015
East Grand Lake	5,947 ac	Private	2014

Appendix 2 – List of Stakeholders Consulted

List of FME Staff Consulted

Name	Title	Contact Information	Consultation method
Trevor Cutsinger	Forest Operations Manager		Email, Personal Interview
Holly Newberger	Program Coordinator, North Coast (NC)		Email, Personal Interview
Scott Kelly	Timber Land Manager, NC		Personal Interview
Lauren Fety	Forest Analyst NC		Personal Interview
Madison Thomson	Forester NC		Personal Interview
Mary Mayeda	Forester NC		Personal Interview
Jazmin Varela			Personal Interview
David DeGrutolla	LandVest Timberlands		Personal interview

Nancy Bell	Vermont and NH State Dir, Cons Acquisition		Personal Interview
------------	---	--	--------------------

List of other Stakeholders Consulted

Name	Organization	Contact Information	Consultation method	Requests Cert. Notf.
Robert Piper	Robert Piper Logging		Personal Interview	N

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

Appendix 5 – Detailed Observations

Evaluation Year	FSC P&C Reviewed
2012	All – (Re)certification Evaluation
2013	P6, 7, & 9
2014	P8 plus Obligatory
2015	P2 & 5 plus obligatory
2016	

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

All entries in the checklist are by area of the audit and are shown as NE for the eastern parcels or NC for the North Coast parcels.

REQUIREMENT	C/NC	COMMENT/CAR
Principle #2: Long-term tenure and use rights to the land and forest resources shall be clearly defined, documented and legally established.		
2.1. Clear evidence of long-term forest use rights to the land (e.g., land title, customary rights, or lease agreements) shall be demonstrated.	C	
2.1.a The forest owner or manager provides clear evidence of long-term rights to use and manage	C	<u>NE</u>

<p>the FMU for the purposes described in the management plan.</p>		<p>Both parcels are owned in fee by TCF; titles are clear; and there are no restrictive easements or encumbrances that might interfere with management of the property. McConnell Pond purchased in 1994; Success Pond parcel in 2012. (Source: Management plans; Cutsinger interview)</p> <p><u>NC</u></p> <p>All of the north coast parcels are held in fee by TCF. These have all been reviewed numerous times and the Option A document lists all of the parcels, except the Buckeye parcel, which is not included in the Option A document. The deeds for the Buckeye parcel were reviewed during the 2015 audit.</p>
<p>2.1.b The forest owner or manager identifies and documents legally established use and access rights associated with the FMU that are held by other parties.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p><u>NE</u></p> <p>Deeds are held in North Carolina office and in TCF's central office, Arlington VA. Deed for McConnell Pond is filed in Brighton VT; deed for Success is filed in Coos County NH. Copies of both deeds were reviewed by the auditor.</p> <p><u>NC</u></p> <p>All deeds are held in the North Carolina office and in TCF's central office. Copies are digitally available at the Caspar offices.</p>
<p>2.1.c Boundaries of land ownership and use rights are clearly identified on the ground and on maps prior to commencing management activities in the vicinity of the boundaries.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p><u>NE</u></p> <p>Excellent maps were available for field visits to both parcels. Boundaries are well marked on the ground and were inspected in several places, both on Success Pond and McConnell Pond.</p> <p><u>NC</u></p> <p>All parcels are included in the GIS system and numerous mapping layers (shapefiles) are available. Use rights for conservation easements are included in the deeds and are mapped on units where easements cover only portions of the parcels. Some of the parcels, such as Salmon Creek have all the boundaries blazed and painted on the ground. Others have the boundaries flagged at the time of harvest with agreement of adjacent landowners.</p>
<p>2.2. Local communities with legal or customary tenure or use rights shall maintain control, to the extent necessary to protect their rights or resources, over forest operations unless they delegate control with free and informed consent to other agencies.</p>	<p>C</p>	

<p><i>Applicability Note: For the planning and management of publicly owned forests, the local community is defined as all residents and property owners of the relevant jurisdiction.</i></p>		
<p>2.2.a The forest owner or manager allows the exercise of tenure and use rights allowable by law or regulation.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p><u>NE</u> Success Pond: long-standing, 5-party crossing rights to access nearby parcels of forest land; snowmobile trail will become a right with easement; annual right for ATVs which will remain annual rights, not permanent. Camps on Pond are owned in fee, with deeded access. McConnell Pond: eight camp leases are provided annually; access rights are deeded to Conti NWR, which borders the TCF property on three sides. (Source: Bell and Cutsinger interviews) <u>NC</u> Other than the rights held by recorded easements, no other tenure or use rights are legally held. The easement documents outline the tenure and use rights. Public access is by permit.</p>
<p>2.2.b In FMUs where tenure or use rights held by others exist, the forest owner or manager consults with groups that hold such rights so that management activities do not significantly impact the uses or benefits of such rights.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p><u>NE</u> Consultation is done where needed, e.g., annual lease agreements are negotiated with camp owners, ATV groups, snowmobile organizations, etc. TCF carries insurance on camps on leased lands. (Source: Cutsinger) <u>NC</u> Easement agreements are recorded to the deeds in perpetuity and no ongoing consultation is required. Public access for other uses, such as hiking, requires a permit and these are issued for a specific time period, and then must be reissued.</p>
<p>2.3. Appropriate mechanisms shall be employed to resolve disputes over tenure claims and use rights. The circumstances and status of any outstanding disputes will be explicitly considered in the certification evaluation. Disputes of substantial magnitude involving a significant number of interests will normally disqualify an operation from being certified.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>2.3.a If disputes arise regarding tenure claims or use rights then the forest owner or manager initially attempts to resolve them through open communication, negotiation, and/or mediation. If</p>	<p>C</p>	<p><u>NE</u> There is no record or recollection of disputes on either parcel. Uncertainty about part of a parcel boundary between McConnell Pond and Conti NWR was resolved</p>

<p>these good-faith efforts fail, then federal, state, and/or local laws are employed to resolve such disputes.</p>		<p>several years ago by purchase of strip of land along border (Source: Bell, Cutsinger, and Maghini interviews) <u>NC</u> No disputes regarding tenure or use rights have occurred on the parcels. Prior to any activity, adjacent landowners are met with to discuss and agree on the boundaries, if there are any unmarked areas. If agreement is not reached, then a licensed surveyor is agreed upon and the boundary is resurveyed to determine the legal boundaries.</p>
<p>2.3.b The forest owner or manager documents any significant disputes over tenure and use rights.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p><u>NE</u> Documentation would be found, in the event of disputes, both in files of consulting forester and in TCF files in NC. (Source: Cutsinger interview) <u>NC</u> Any disputes records would be maintained in the Caspar office and handled by the timberlands manager.</p>
<p>Principle #5: Forest management operations shall encourage the efficient use of the forest’s multiple products and services to ensure economic viability and a wide range of environmental and social benefits.</p>		
<p>5.1. Forest management should strive toward economic viability, while taking into account the full environmental, social, and operational costs of production, and ensuring the investments necessary to maintain the ecological productivity of the forest.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>5.1.a The forest owner or manager is financially able to implement core management activities, including all those environmental, social and operating costs, required to meet this Standard, and investment and reinvestment in forest management.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p><u>NE</u> WFF has significant assets for acquisition, as confirmed in interviews with staff. Revenue from investments and management can be used for management. <u>NC</u> The North Coast Project financial statement was provided to the audit team and illustrated the ability of TCF to sustainably implement the management plans. The implementation includes many habitat improvement projects beyond the normal scope of certification as well as road upgrades to reduce the overall impact of the road systems on stream habitat and fisheries.</p>
<p>5.1.b Responses to short-term financial factors are limited to levels that are consistent with fulfillment of this Standard.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p><u>NE</u> Resources are available for any short-term needs to conform to the Standard. <u>NC</u></p>

		The financial statement of the North Coast Project indicates ability to withstand short-term financial factors. As an example, the recent downturn and recovery were weathered well by the project. As an additional example, TCF has been able to provide short-term loans to contractors to upgrade and acquire logging equipment.
5.2. Forest management and marketing operations should encourage the optimal use and local processing of the forest’s diversity of products.	C	
5.2.a Where forest products are harvested or sold, opportunities for forest product sales and services are given to local harvesters, value-added processing and manufacturing facilities, guiding services, and other operations that are able to offer services at competitive rates and levels of service.	C	<u>NE</u> All harvest operations on Success Pond and McConnell Pond parcel were conducted by local logging companies. Products—pulp logs, chips, and sawlogs—were sold to local processing facilities. A new biomass generating plant has opened nearby, providing yet another opportunity for selling a product locally. <u>NC</u> All recent sales have gone to local California based logging contractors and log buyers. No NTFPs are harvested on the properties. Little opportunity exists for markets other than the traditional log and chip markets.
5.2.b The forest owner or manager takes measures to optimize the use of harvested forest products and explores product diversification where appropriate and consistent with management objectives.	C	<u>NE</u> TCF contracts with LandVest Inc., Timberlands Division (LVI), for management of parcels inspected in NH and VT. LandVest has a separate timber marketing company (LVTC) that pools products from multiple ownerships, creating efficiencies in product diversification and cost. <u>NC</u> Utilization standards are very high and strictly enforced under contract language. Little opportunity exists for product diversification at this time.
5.2.c On public lands where forest products are harvested and sold, some sales of forest products or contracts are scaled or structured to allow small business to bid competitively.	NA	TCF does not include any public lands.
5.3. Forest management should minimize waste associated with harvesting and on-site processing operations and avoid damage to other forest resources.	C	
5.3.a Management practices are employed to minimize the loss and/or waste of harvested forest	C	<u>NE</u>

<p>products.</p>		<p>Site inspections confirmed careful utilization of harvested products. <u>NC</u> On site field inspections during the field audit portion of the annual surveillance audit confirmed high utilization standards.</p>
<p>5.3.b Harvest practices are managed to protect residual trees and other forest resources, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • soil compaction, rutting and erosion are minimized; • residual trees are not significantly damaged to the extent that health, growth, or values are noticeably affected; • damage to NTFPs is minimized during management activities; and • techniques and equipment that minimize impacts to vegetation, soil, and water are used whenever feasible. 	<p>C</p>	<p><u>NE</u> LandVest foresters, and especially the forester who manages the two properties inspected, are known for practices that protect the forest, soil, and water. They routinely arrange contract logging services, allowing them to select operators who can carry out operations in a careful manner. Inspections during the audit confirmed the protection of residual trees, soils, and water. <u>NC</u> Timber harvest plans are designed to utilize appropriate equipment to minimize residual stand damage, soil compaction, rutting, erosion, and to protect other resource values. Yarding methods are included in the THP to protect the resources. On-site inspection during the annual surveillance audit demonstrated the care taken in logging and road construction to protect all forest resources. Residual stand damage in harvested areas was observed to be extremely low.</p>
<p>5.4. Forest management should strive to strengthen and diversify the local economy, avoiding dependence on a single forest product.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>5.4.a The forest owner or manager demonstrates knowledge of their operation’s effect on the local economy as it relates to existing and potential markets for a wide variety of timber and non-timber forest products and services.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>TCF staff and the consulting forester are close to the local communities and quite aware of their impact on the local economy. This is central to the land conservation work that TCF does in this region. Socio-economic monitoring has been standardized for all FMU’s in the WFF. The NC specifically produces the Caspar Index to provide an indication of the socio-economic impact of the FMUs in the North Coast Project.</p>
<p>5.4.b The forest owner or manager strives to diversify the economic use of the forest according to Indicator 5.4.a.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p><u>NE</u> In addition to the harvest of forest products, TCF works in close cooperation with snowmobile and ATV clubs who use trails on their properties. This region is a mecca for motorized outdoor recreation, and this is an essential element of the economy.</p>

		<p><u>NC</u> TCF provides recreational opportunities for limited scope activities through the use of the permit system.</p>
<p>5.5. Forest management operations shall recognize, maintain, and, where appropriate, enhance the value of forest services and resources such as watersheds and fisheries.</p>	C	
<p>5.5.a In developing and implementing activities on the FMU, the forest owner or manager identifies, defines and implements appropriate measures for maintaining and/or enhancing forest services and resources that serve public values, including municipal watersheds, fisheries, carbon storage and sequestration, recreation and tourism.</p>	C	<p><u>NE</u> The conservation ethos that drives the work of TCF is clearly linked to protection and enhancement of the resources that serve public values. Management plans for both properties discuss the social and economic impacts of TCF ownership and management.</p> <p><u>NC</u> The North Coast properties are managed with this as a major priority. They are certified under the Climate Action Reserve for carbon sequestration. They sought and obtained a grant from the Bechtel Foundation to upgrade stream crossings that were not up to the current 100-year storm standard and which were not scheduled for upgrading in the near future as part of a THP. The grant provided funding and TCF covered the additional funding required. A major large woody debris placement stream habitat improvement project was implemented on the North Fork of the Garcia River in cooperation with The Nature Conservancy and California Department of Fish and Game (Wildlife).</p>
<p>5.5.b The forest owner or manager uses the information from Indicator 5.5.a to implement appropriate measures for maintaining and/or enhancing these services and resources.</p>	C	<p>Numerous examples observed during field audit: protection of water, grasslands, and wetlands; providing access and trails for recreation; facilitating landscape-scale conservation projects that enhance wildlife populations and enjoyment of wildlife, sediment reduction projects on roads and stream crossing, and habitat improvement projects. See further discussion under 5.5.a.</p>
<p>5.6. The rate of harvest of forest products shall not exceed levels which can be permanently sustained.</p>	C	
<p>5.6.a In FMUs where products are being harvested, the landowner or manager calculates the sustained yield harvest level for each sustained yield planning unit, and provides clear rationale for determining</p>	C	<p><u>NE</u> Both TCF and TVI have used recent inventories to conduct growth simulations for Success Pond and McConnell Pond properties. On both ownerships, growth is estimated as</p>

<p>the size and layout of the planning unit. The sustained yield harvest level calculation is documented in the Management Plan.</p> <p>The sustained yield harvest level calculation for each planning unit is based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • documented growth rates for particular sites, and/or acreage of forest types, age-classes and species distributions; • mortality and decay and other factors that affect net growth; • areas reserved from harvest or subject to harvest restrictions to meet other management goals; • silvicultural practices that will be employed on the FMU; • management objectives and desired future conditions. <p>The calculation is made by considering the effects of repeated prescribed harvests on the product/species and its ecosystem, as well as planned management treatments and projections of subsequent regrowth beyond single rotation and multiple re-entries.</p>		<p>0.333 cords per acre, and an allowable cut is calculated to be 2600-3000 cords per year on Success and 1300-1500 cords on McConnell. Each property has a 10-year harvest schedule that is consistent with the AAC and with objectives of the plan and appropriate silvicultural practices. TCF seeks to move forests on both parcels toward older age classes and improved quality of large trees. As such, most harvests are designed to improve stand conditions.</p> <p><u>NC</u></p> <p>TCF utilizes inventory data from the various FMUs to model sustainable growth levels into the future. The Option A document approved by Cal Fire includes the sustainability calculations for Garcia River, Gualala, Big River, and Salmon Creek. Option A under California Forest Practice Rules requires accurate inventory data and growth and harvest projection over the next 100 year planning period. This information is produced by a growth and yield model with inventory and management inputs and is reviewed by Cal Fire as part of the approval process. The annual harvests from the four parcels in the North Coast Project are far below the AAC calculated in the Option A document.</p>
<p>5.6.b Average annual harvest levels, over rolling periods of no more than 10 years, do not exceed the calculated sustained yield harvest level.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p><u>NE</u></p> <p>On Success Pond, calculated AAC is 2.2% of standing stock. Although there is a 10-year cutting plan in the management plan, TCF has only owned the parcel for three years, and harvest by recent owners was conservative, thus the property is well stocked. Each year, TCF and LVI will review AAC in light of operational needs. A recent inventory was conducted on McConnell Pond, but a 10-year harvest schedule is not included in the recently revised management plan because many of the stands are entering a growth phase. Thus, it is thought that harvest levels will be below AAC in an effort to improve quality of the standing stock.</p> <p><u>NC</u></p> <p>Harvest levels provided to the audit team and published in the annual report are far below the AAC calculated in the approved Option A document,</p>

<p>5.6.c Rates and methods of timber harvest lead to achieving desired conditions, and improve or maintain health and quality across the FMU. Overstocked stands and stands that have been depleted or rendered to be below productive potential due to natural events, past management, or lack of management, are returned to desired stocking levels and composition at the earliest practicable time as justified in management objectives.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p><u>NE</u> See above for McConnell Pond. Management plans for both parcels emphasize the importance of employing harvest strategies to address the desires of TCF to improve value of the standing timber, both financially and ecologically. <u>NC</u> The Option A document covers all of these items and does include productivity issues of units in the various FMU's. Using a combination of single tree selection and group selection the forest health, stocking levels, and restoring depleted or overstocked stands is addressed at the time of marking. Many examples of this type of stand treatment were observed during the field audit stops.</p>
<p>5.6.d For NTFPs, calculation of quantitative sustained yield harvest levels is required only in cases where products are harvested in significant commercial operations or where traditional or customary use rights may be impacted by such harvests. In other situations, the forest owner or manager utilizes available information, and new information that can be reasonably gathered, to set harvesting levels that will not result in a depletion of the non-timber growing stocks or other adverse effects to the forest ecosystem.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p><u>NE</u> NA on the NH and VT parcels. <u>NC</u> Not applicable on the North Coast Project parcels.</p>
<p>Principle #6: Forest management shall conserve biological diversity and its associated values, water resources, soils, and unique and fragile ecosystems and landscapes, and, by so doing, maintain the ecological functions and the integrity of the forest.</p>		
<p>6.2 Safeguards shall exist which protect rare, threatened and endangered species and their habitats (e.g., nesting and feeding areas). Conservation zones and protection areas shall be established, appropriate to the scale and intensity of forest management and the uniqueness of the affected resources. Inappropriate hunting, fishing, trapping, and collecting shall be controlled.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>6.2.a If there is a likely presence of RTE species as identified in Indicator 6.1.a then either a field survey to verify the species' presence or absence is conducted prior to site-disturbing management activities, or management occurs with the assumption that potential RTE species are present.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p><u>NE</u> TCF has hired one the region's best field ecologists to conduct detailed biological surveys of both parcels. These surveys are useful to TCF in identifying rare species and communities that enhance justifications for cooperative funds to purchase these lands. The information also is used</p>

<p>Surveys are conducted by biologists with the appropriate expertise in the species of interest and with appropriate qualifications to conduct the surveys. If a species is determined to be present, its location should be reported to the manager of the appropriate database.</p>		<p>to protect habitats for and locations of RTE elements. These surveys are used in conjunction with heritage data from both states as well as other conservation plans, such as State Wildlife Action Plans.</p> <p><u>NC</u> TCF utilizes the CNDDDB for general indications of potential RTE species on the parcels. In addition RTE surveys for wildlife species are conducted by a wildlife biologist from the Mendocino County RCD. Botanical surveys are conducted by either a botanist from Mendocino County or UC Cooperative Extension. Any RTE species presence is reported to the CNDDDB for inclusion in the database.</p>
<p>6.2.b When RTE species are present or assumed to be present, modifications in management are made in order to maintain, restore or enhance the extent, quality and viability of the species and their habitats. Conservation zones and/or protected areas are established for RTE species, including those S3 species that are considered rare, where they are necessary to maintain or improve the short and long-term viability of the species. Conservation measures are based on relevant science, guidelines and/or consultation with relevant, independent experts as necessary to achieve the conservation goal of the Indicator.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p><u>NE</u> The only actual example observed on the audit was protection of tall white pine trees as possible nesting sites for ospreys, a listed species in NH. But management plans for both parcels clearly direct protection for important sites.</p> <p><u>NC</u> TCF works with the qualified biologists and CAL Fish and Wildlife to establish protected areas for RTE species discovered during the survey process. Many RTE species have been found on the NC Project parcels and several examples of modification in management to provide protected areas were observed during the field audit, specifically for northern spotted owls and anadromous fish. The LWD project on the North Fork of the Garcia River provided a good example of habitat restoration for anadromous fish.</p>
<p>6.2.c For medium and large public forests (e.g. state forests), forest management plans and operations are designed to meet species' recovery goals, as well as landscape level biodiversity conservation goals.</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>TCF does not include any public lands.</p>
<p>6.2.d Within the capacity of the forest owner or manager, hunting, fishing, trapping, collecting and other activities are controlled to avoid the risk of impacts to vulnerable species and communities (See Criterion 1.5).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p><u>NE</u> The most convenient access point to Success Pond is controlled with a private gate (TCF employees have keys). Other access points are not controlled. McConnell Pond access road is gated by TCF, but keys are possessed by owners of 12 camps on the property. A key also is</p>

		<p>maintained by managers of the adjacent Conti NWR, which has access rights.</p> <p>State and local law enforcement personnel can be expected to respond to any calls related to illegal activities that threaten species or communities, per interviews with staff.</p> <p><u>NC</u></p> <p>All access to the North Coast Project parcels are controlled through the access permit process. Cal Fish and Wildlife is the regulatory agency charged with control of wildlife and plant species to avoid the risk to vulnerable species and communities.</p>
<p>6.3. Ecological functions and values shall be maintained intact, enhanced, or restored, including: a) Forest regeneration and succession. b) Genetic, species, and ecosystem diversity. c) Natural cycles that affect the productivity of the forest ecosystem.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>6.3.a.1 The forest owner or manager maintains, enhances, and/or restores under-represented <i>successional</i> stages in the FMU that would naturally occur on the types of sites found on the FMU. Where old growth of different community types that would naturally occur on the forest are under-represented in the landscape relative to natural conditions, a portion of the forest is managed to enhance and/or restore old growth characteristics.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p><u>NE</u></p> <p>Management plans for both parcels emphasize the importance of the surrounding landscape in setting goals for these ownerships. Both parcels are in a matrix of lands with long histories of forest harvest, thus TCF’s goals of enhancing the abundance and quality of older-aged stands.</p> <p><u>NC</u></p> <p>All of the communities present on the FMUs are mapped. Those that are under-represented, such as the beach pine stands that are found on terraces in Mendocino County. Many areas of restricted harvest are present on FMUs, including the Ecological Reserve on the Garcia River parcel with a conservation easement held by TNC. Upper diameter limits for harvest are in place over the parcels. Current cut restrictions are no cuts on redwood over 48 inches, Douglas-fir over 38 inches and old growth.</p>
<p>6.3.a.2 When a <i>rare ecological community</i> is present, modifications are made in both the management plan and its implementation in order to maintain, restore or enhance the viability of the community. Based on the vulnerability of the existing community, <i>conservation zones</i> and/or <i>protected areas</i> are established where warranted.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p><u>NE</u></p> <p>Many acres of quality wetlands and riparian zones are found on both properties, described in the management plans, and are protected in the field. The TVI forester establishes wider buffers in riparian zones than required by either NH or VT.</p> <p><u>NC</u></p>

		<p>Rare communities are identified on the parcels and mapped. Once this is done management strategies are developed to maintain, restore, or enhance the community. The beach pine stands and coastal grasslands are two examples. RMZs are established on all class of watercourses on the parcels and special buffers are applied to anadromous fish streams. Buffers in the ecological reserve are larger than required by state regulation or FSC. The LWD habitat improvement project is a good example of enhancement efforts.</p>
<p>6.3.a.3 When they are present, management maintains the area, structure, composition, and processes of all Type 1 and Type 2 old growth. Type 1 and 2 old growth are also protected and buffered as necessary with conservation zones, unless an alternative plan is developed that provides greater overall protection of old growth values.</p> <p>Type 1 Old Growth is protected from harvesting and road construction. Type 1 old growth is also protected from other timber management activities, except as needed to maintain the ecological values associated with the stand, including old growth attributes (e.g., remove exotic species, conduct controlled burning, and thinning from below in dry forest types when and where restoration is appropriate).</p> <p>Type 2 Old Growth is protected from harvesting to the extent necessary to maintain the area, structures, and functions of the stand. Timber harvest in Type 2 old growth must maintain old growth structures, functions, and components including individual trees that function as refugia (see Indicator 6.3.g).</p> <p>On public lands, old growth is protected from harvesting, as well as from other timber management activities, except if needed to maintain the values associated with the stand (e.g.,</p>	<p>C</p>	<p><u>NE</u> There are no old-growth stands on either property, as confirmed in interviews with staff and contractors and a review of inventory information.</p> <p><u>NC</u> The North Coast Project has established a no-cut policy on all old growth stands and trees. On timber sales marked for pre-harvest inspection, no trees above the cut limit diameters were marked, confirming application of the policy.</p>

<p>remove exotic species, conduct controlled burning, and thinning from below in forest types when and where restoration is appropriate).</p> <p>On American Indian lands, timber harvest may be permitted in Type 1 and Type 2 old growth in recognition of their sovereignty and unique ownership. Timber harvest is permitted in situations where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Old growth forests comprise a significant portion of the tribal ownership. 2. A history of forest stewardship by the tribe exists. 3. High Conservation Value Forest attributes are maintained. 4. Old-growth structures are maintained. 5. Conservation zones representative of old growth stands are established. 6. Landscape level considerations are addressed. 7. Rare species are protected. 		
<p>6.3.b To the extent feasible within the size of the ownership, particularly on larger ownerships (generally tens of thousands or more acres), management maintains, enhances, or restores habitat conditions suitable for well-distributed populations of animal species that are characteristic of forest ecosystems within the landscape.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p><u>NE</u></p> <p>Although these VT and NH parcels are too small to contribute substantially to landscape-levels goals for habitat, both properties were purchased by TCF as part of a larger effort to establish appropriate ownership, protection, and management of an entire landscape. (Illustrated by maps exhibited by N. Bell).</p> <p><u>NC</u></p> <p>TCF manages with habitat improvement and maintenance in mind. Sections of the approved Option A cover northern spotted owl and anadromous fish. Many species of plants and animals that are RTE are managed for on the parcels. Habitat improvement and enhancement projects are in place on the parcels. Conservation easements are in place on all of the parcels, to provide even more protection.</p>
<p>6.3.c Management maintains, enhances and/or restores the plant and wildlife habitat of Riparian Management Zones (RMZs) to provide:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) habitat for aquatic species that breed in surrounding uplands; b) habitat for predominantly terrestrial species that breed in adjacent aquatic habitats; 	<p>C</p>	<p><u>NE</u></p> <p>TCF management of riparian zones exceeds normal BMP requirements. Especially on the McConnell Pond parcel, where some riparian areas are delineated as HC VF, such areas receive special attention.</p> <p><u>NC</u></p>

<p>c) habitat for species that use riparian areas for feeding, cover, and travel;</p> <p>d) habitat for plant species associated with riparian areas; and,</p> <p>e) stream shading and inputs of wood and leaf litter into the adjacent aquatic ecosystem.</p>		<p>RMZs on the North Coast Project parcels meet or exceed the requirements of Cal Fire and FSC. Some parcels have enlarged RMZs required as part of the conservation easements in place on those parcels. Riparian habitat projects have been implemented on some of the parcels. Road improvements to reduce sediment input from the road systems have been made through a grant program from the Bechtel Foundation.</p>
<p>Stand-scale Indicators</p> <p>6.3.d Management practices maintain or enhance plant species composition, distribution and frequency of occurrence similar to those that would naturally occur on the site.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p><u>NE</u></p> <p>This is an essential goal of management by TCF and LVI.</p> <p><u>NC</u></p> <p>As an example of the level of commitment to this objective, management plans for the North Coast Project include the following management objectives (Buckeye Parcel Draft IRMP):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve ecological conditions by protecting and enhancing water quality. • Improve ecological conditions by protecting and enhancing terrestrial and aquatic habitat on the Forest.
<p>6.3.e When planting is required, a local source of known provenance is used when available and when the local source is equivalent in terms of quality, price and productivity. The use of non-local sources shall be justified, such as in situations where other management objectives (e.g. disease resistance or adapting to climate change) are best served by non-local sources. Native species suited to the site are normally selected for regeneration.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p><u>NE</u></p> <p>Planting is not done; all regeneration is natural as observed in the field.</p> <p><u>NC</u></p> <p>Planting is utilized on a limited basis, mostly in group selection areas where desired stocking levels and species composition may not be attained without supplemental planting. This is one way that unhealthy stands and underproductive areas are restored to productive, healthy forests. The seed source for all planting is local from the Jackson State Forest, which is located among the five parcels and adjacent to some of them.</p>
<p>6.3.f Management maintains, enhances, or restores habitat components and associated stand structures, in abundance and distribution that could be expected from naturally occurring processes. These components include:</p> <p>a) large live trees, live trees with decay or declining health, snags, and well-distributed coarse down and dead woody material. Legacy trees where present are not harvested; and</p>	<p>C</p>	<p><u>NE</u></p> <p>Field inspections documented an excellent effort to mark and leave large live trees, snags, legacy trees, and woody debris. In fact, legacy trees have been identified and mapped across the entire McConnell Pond parcel.</p> <p><u>NC</u></p> <p>All of the management plans and the Option A document address large live trees, snags, LWD, and legacy trees. The no-cut policy for redwood, Douglas-fir, and old growth trees</p>

<p>b) vertical and horizontal complexity. Trees selected for retention are generally representative of the dominant species found on the site.</p>		<p>provide an equivalent and more extensive retention program than a legacy tree program. Review of the silvicultural systems during the various stops on the field audit confirmed the retention of the representative dominant species on the site.</p>
<p>6.3.g.1 In the Southeast, Appalachia, Ozark-Ouachita, Mississippi Alluvial Valley, and Pacific Coast Regions, when even-aged systems are employed, and during salvage harvests, live trees and other native vegetation are retained within the harvest unit as described in Appendix C for the applicable region.</p> <p>In the Lake States Northeast, Rocky Mountain and Southwest Regions, when even-aged silvicultural systems are employed, and during salvage harvests, live trees and other native vegetation are retained within the harvest unit in a proportion and configuration that is consistent with the characteristic natural disturbance regime unless retention at a lower level is necessary for the purposes of restoration or rehabilitation. See Appendix C for additional regional requirements and guidance.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p><u>NE</u> Both management plans address the importance of retention in even-aged silviculture. Only one site provided such examples in the field.</p> <p><u>NC</u> Generally single tree selection or group selection are utilized on all the parcels in the North Coast Project. Even-aged methods such as clearcutting, seed tree removal and shelterwood removal are not modeled for the approved Option A. However, they may be used in the event of severe damage resulting from natural causes such as fire, wind or bears to capture mortality and regenerate the site.</p>
<p>6.3.g.2 Under very limited situations, the landowner or manager has the option to develop a qualified plan to allow minor departure from the opening size limits described in Indicator 6.3.g.1. A qualified plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is developed by qualified experts in ecological and/or related fields (wildlife biology, hydrology, landscape ecology, forestry/silviculture). 2. Is based on the totality of the best available information including peer-reviewed science regarding natural disturbance regimes for the FMU. 3. Is spatially and temporally explicit and includes maps of proposed openings or areas. 4. Demonstrates that the variations will result in equal or greater benefit to wildlife, water 	<p>NA</p>	<p>See discussion under 6.3.g.1; TCF does not depart from even-aged management restrictions. There are no opening size restrictions established for NE in the FSC-US standard.</p>

<p>quality, and other values compared to the normal opening size limits, including for sensitive and rare species.</p> <p>5. Is reviewed by independent experts in wildlife biology, hydrology, and landscape ecology, to confirm the preceding findings.</p>		
<p>6.3.h The forest owner or manager assesses the risk of, prioritizes, and, as warranted, develops and implements a strategy to prevent or control <i>invasive species</i>, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. a method to determine the extent of invasive species and the degree of threat to native species and ecosystems; 2. implementation of management practices that minimize the risk of invasive establishment, growth, and spread; 3. eradication or control of established invasive populations when feasible: and, 4. monitoring of control measures and management practices to assess their effectiveness in preventing or controlling invasive species. 	<p>C</p>	<p><u>NE</u></p> <p>A state management goal for both parcels was to combat invasive species. Fortunately, only a few instances of invasive plants have been documented on or near the ownerships. On McConnell Pond, TCF works cooperatively with the adjacent Conti NWR to inventory and control invasive plants.</p> <p><u>NC</u></p> <p>Invasive plan species identification, monitoring and control are included in the IRMPs for the five North Coast Project parcels. Several examples of control efforts were viewed during the course of the field audit. Some discussion was held in the field about control of invasive species where the management staff had opted not to implement control. Priorities are set on a case by case basis to make the effort where the spread is more of a risk.</p>
<p>6.3.i In applicable situations, the forest owner or manager identifies and applies site-specific fuels management practices, based on: (1) natural fire regimes, (2) risk of wildfire, (3) potential economic losses, (4) public safety, and (5) applicable laws and regulations.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p><u>NE</u></p> <p>Fires are not common and fuel management is rarely addressed in northern New England.</p> <p><u>NC</u></p> <p>Fuels management practices are generally limited to treatment of slash following logging. Wildfires are not common in the redwood belt of Northern California, although they do occur, especially during extreme drought periods. The hack and squirt herbicide treatment to reduce tanoak has been raised as an issue by the local fire department.</p>
<p>6.9. The use of exotic species shall be carefully controlled and actively monitored to avoid adverse ecological impacts.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>No exotic species are or have been used on these properties.</p>
<p>6.9.a The use of <i>exotic species</i> is contingent on the availability of credible scientific data indicating that any such species is non-invasive and its application does not pose a risk to native biodiversity.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>No exotic species are or have been used on these properties, as confirmed via field observation and interviews with TCF.</p>
<p>6.9.b If exotic species are used, their provenance</p>	<p>NA</p>	

<p>and the location of their use are documented, and their ecological effects are actively monitored.</p>		
<p>6.9.c The forest owner or manager shall take timely action to curtail or significantly reduce any adverse impacts resulting from their use of exotic species</p>	<p>NA</p>	
<p>9.4 Annual monitoring shall be conducted to assess the effectiveness of the measures employed to maintain or enhance the applicable conservation attributes.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>9.4.a The forest owner or manager monitors, or participates in a program to annually monitor, the status of the specific HCV attributes, including the effectiveness of the measures employed for their maintenance or enhancement. The monitoring program is designed and implemented consistent with the requirements of Principle 8.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p><u>NE</u> The McConnell Pond management plan states the following with regard to monitoring: “The annual monitoring includes a thorough review of road conditions and maintenance needs, invasive species concerns, condition of identified High Conservation Value Forests, condition of identified Representative Sample Areas, and monitoring of current and past (up to 2 years) harvest areas.” Trevor Cutsinger exhibited similar text in a document addressing a number of management policies.</p> <p><u>NC</u> TCF has adopted a standard monitoring guideline for all parcels that are FSC certified. This statement is included in the monitoring guidelines: “The annual monitoring includes a thorough review of road conditions and maintenance needs, invasive species concerns, condition of identified High Conservation Value Forests, condition of identified Representative Sample Areas, and monitoring of current and past (up to 2 years) harvest areas.” http://www.conservationfund.org/images/The_Conservation_Fund_Public_Monitoring_Summary_for_Website_2015.pdf</p>
<p>9.4.b When monitoring results indicate increasing risk to a specific HCV attribute, the forest owner/manager re-evaluates the measures taken to maintain or enhance that attribute, and adjusts the management measures in an effort to reverse the trend.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>No monitoring results have indicated an increasing risk to the specific HCV attributes. TCF does have an adaptive management policy to address such needs if they arise.</p>

Appendix 6 – Chain of Custody Indicators for FMEs

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