

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

---

## *Mendocino Redwood Company Resource Manager Certificate*

### **SCS-FM/COC-0001G**

P.O. Box 996  
Ukiah, California 95482  
Sarah Billig  
[www.mrc.com](http://www.mrc.com)

CERTIFIED	EXPIRATION
17 September 2012	16 September 2017

DATE OF FIELD AUDIT
1-2 November 2016
DATE OF LAST UPDATE
25 July 2017

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

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

## Foreword

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

Cycle in annual surveillance audits				
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <sup>st</sup> annual audit	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <sup>nd</sup> annual audit	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <sup>rd</sup> annual audit	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4 <sup>th</sup> annual audit	<input type="checkbox"/> Other ( <i>expansion of scope, Major CAR audit, special audit, etc.</i> ):
Name of Forest Management Enterprise (FME) and abbreviation used in this report:				
Mendocino Resource Company Resource Manager (MRCRM)				

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

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

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

### Organization of the Report

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

## Table of Contents

---

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY .....	4
1. GENERAL INFORMATION .....	4
1.1 Annual Audit Team.....	4
1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation .....	4
1.3 Standards Employed .....	4
2 ANNUAL AUDIT DATES AND ACTIVITIES .....	5
2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities .....	5
2.2 Evaluation of Management Systems .....	5
3. CHANGES IN MANAGEMENT PRACTICES .....	6
4. RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION .....	6
4.1 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations .....	6
4.2 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations .....	7
5. STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS .....	7
5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted .....	8
5.2 Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Responses from the Team, Where Applicable .....	8
6. CERTIFICATION DECISION .....	8
7. CHANGES IN CERTIFICATION SCOPE .....	8
8. ANNUAL DATA UPDATE .....	13
8.1 Social Information .....	13
8.2 Annual Summary of Pesticide and Other Chemical Use .....	13

## SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY

### 1. General Information

#### 1.1 Annual Audit Team

<b>Auditor Name:</b>	Brendan Grady	<b>Auditor role:</b>	Lead Auditor
<b>Qualifications:</b>	Mr. Grady is the Director of Forest Management Certification for SCS. In that role, he provides daily management and quality control for the program. He participated as a team member and lead auditor in forest certification audits throughout the United States, Europe, and South East Asia. Brendan has a B.S. in Forestry from the University of California, Berkeley, and a Juris Doctorate from the University of Washington School of Law. Brendan is a member of the State Bar of California, and was an attorney in private practice focusing on environmental law before returning to SCS.		

#### 1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation

A. Number of days spent on-site assessing the applicant:	2
B. Number of auditors participating in on-site evaluation:	1
C. Additional days spent on preparation, stakeholder consultation, and post-site follow-up:	0.5
<b>D. Total number of person days used in evaluation:</b>	<b>2.5</b>

#### 1.3 Standards Employed

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

Title	Version	Date of Finalization
FSC US Forest Management Standard	V1-0	8 – July – 2010
FSC standard for group entities in forest management groups (FSC-STD-30-005)	V1-0	31 – August – 2009
All standards employed are available on the websites of FSC International ( <a href="http://www.fsc.org">www.fsc.org</a> ), the FSC-US ( <a href="http://www.fscus.org">www.fscus.org</a> ) or the SCS Standards page ( <a href="http://www.scsglobalservices.com/certification-standards-and-program-documents">www.scsglobalservices.com/certification-standards-and-program-documents</a> ). Standards are also available, upon request, from SCS Global Services ( <a href="http://www.SCSglobalServices.com">www.SCSglobalServices.com</a> ).		

##### 1.3.2. SCS Interim FSC Standards

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

## 2 Annual Audit Dates and Activities

### 2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities

Audit dates	November 1-2, 2016
-------------	--------------------

Date Tuesday Nov 1	
FMU/Location/ sites visited	Activities/ notes
8am, MRC Forestry Office, Ukiah	Opening Meeting: Introductions, client update, review audit scope, audit plan, intro/update to FSC and SCS standards and protocols, review of open CARs/OBS, final site selection
Eureka Valley	Reviewed past harvesting (most recent in 2010). Planned harvest for 2017. Discussion of endangered species management on the FMI (Pt Arena Mountain Beaver, Northern Spotted Owl). Culvert installation as part of previous harvest.
Maillard Ranch	Review of recent harvests (2008, 2010, 2016). Inspection of old growth grove (HCVF site).
Ukiah office	Document Review
Date Wednesday, Nov 2	
FMU/Location/ sites visited*	Activities/ notes
Buckeye	Review of most recent harvest (2015 selection harvest of Douglas-fir). Conservation easement covers the property, of which 80 acres are in the NTMP. Review of historic sites found on the FMU.
Jackson Demonstration State Forest	Top of Hare THP, active logging site. Selection harvest, aiming for 140-160 basal area retention. Interview with logging contractor, review of safety and spill kit procedures.  Peterson Gulch THP, selection harvest, finished 2015. Included right of way clearance for utility line. Adjacent HCVF area included old growth and pygmy forest.  Tunnel #2 THP, Variable Retention unit, post harvest stand reduced to 30 square feet basal area. 10-30% retention requirement was met.
MacMillan	NTMP with owner acting as LTO. Harvests limited to single tree and group selection
	Closing meeting, return to Ukiah

### 2.2 Evaluation of Management Systems

SCS deploys interdisciplinary teams with expertise in forestry, social sciences, natural resource economics, and other relevant fields to assess an FME’s conformance to FSC standards and policies. Evaluation methods include document and record review, implementing sampling strategies to visit a broad number of forest cover and harvest prescription types, observation of implementation of management plans and policies in the field, and stakeholder analysis. When there is more than one team member, team members may review parts of the standards based on their background and

expertise. On the final day of an evaluation, team members convene to deliberate the findings of the assessment jointly. This involves an analysis of all relevant field observations, stakeholder comments, and reviewed documents and records. Where consensus between team members cannot be achieved due to lack of evidence, conflicting evidence or differences of interpretation of the standards, the team is instructed to report these in the certification decision section and/or in observations.

### 3. Changes in Management Practices

There were no significant changes in the management and/or harvesting methods that affect the FME’s conformance to the FSC standards and policies.

Significant changes occurred since the last evaluation that may affect the FME’s conformance to FSC standards and policies (*describe*):

### 4. Results of the Evaluation

#### 4.1 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations

<b>Finding Number: 2015.1</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):	
<b>Deadline</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
<b>FSC Indicator:</b>	FSC-US Forest Management Standard, Indicator 6.5.d
<b>Background:</b> Field review of road work at the Families Blue Lake property showed that water bar following a timber sale were constructed with excessive depth, and lacked the gradual slope into the water bar, so that they appeared closer to trenches. Discussions with the resource manager indicated that a relatively new equipment operator had installed the water bars. While they would function as erosion control devices to channel water off the road, they clearly were not implemented as designed.	
<b>Observation:</b> MRCRM should take necessary steps to ensure that forest workers are provided with sufficient guidance and supervision to implement their portion of the management plan.	
<b>FME response</b> (including any evidence submitted)	This topic was included in annual training and communication with group members.
<b>SCS Review</b>	Erosion control and road maintenance issues were reviewed during the 2016 audit and no recurring instances were found. Given the grading of this finding as an observation, it will be closed and the topic monitored during future years.
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

<b>Finding Number: 2015.2</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):	
<b>Deadline</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
<b>FSC Indicator:</b>	FSC-US Forest Management Standard, Indicator 6.6.d
<b>Background:</b> Interviews with landowners at Hollister Ranch indicated that not all elements of a written prescription for pesticide use required by the indicator were completed, such as inclusion of a map of the treatment area. However, the FMU in question qualifies as a SLIMF, and would meet the less formal requirements under the family forest applicability note for 6.6.d.	
<b>Observation:</b> MRCRM should review its procedures for pesticide application to ensure that the requirements are met for when pesticides are used on its non-SLIMF properties.	
<b>FME response</b> <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	
<b>SCS Review</b>	The observation was not able to be reviewed in detail, since none of the audited non-SLIMF FMUs had pesticide use during the previous year. The observation will be reviewed again during the next audit.
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

## 4.2 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations

No new findings were issued in the course of this audit.

## 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

Landowners	
Logging contractors	

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
<b>Economic concerns</b>	
<b>Social concerns</b>	
<b>Environmental concerns</b>	

## 6. Certification Decision

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

## 7. Changes in Certification Scope

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

**Name and Contact Information**

<b>Organization name</b>	<b>Mendocino Redwood Resource Manager Certification Program</b>		
<b>Contact person</b>	Sarah Billig		
<b>Address</b>	Mendocino Redwood Company P.O. Box 996 Ukiah, California 95482	<b>Telephone</b>	707-463-5125
		<b>Fax</b>	707-463-5503
		<b>e-mail</b>	sbillig@mendoco.com
		<b>Website</b>	http://www.mrc.com/

**FSC Sales Information**

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

**Scope of Certificate**

<b>Certificate Type</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Single FMU	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple FMU
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Group	
<b>SLIMF (if applicable)</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Small SLIMF certificate	<input type="checkbox"/> Low intensity SLIMF certificate
	<input type="checkbox"/> Group SLIMF certificate	
<b># Group Members (if applicable)</b>	21	
<b>Number of FMUs in scope of certificate</b>	26	
<b>Geographic location of non-SLIMF FMU(s)</b>	<i>Latitude &amp; Longitude:</i>	
<b>Forest zone</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Boreal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Temperate
	<input type="checkbox"/> Subtropical	<input type="checkbox"/> Tropical
<b>Total forest area in scope of certificate which is:</b> Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac		
privately managed	44,504 ac	
state managed	48,652 ac	
community managed	0	
<b>Number of FMUs in scope that are:</b>		
less than 100 ha in area	9	100 - 1000 ha in area 13
1000 - 10 000 ha in area	3	more than 10 000 ha in area 1

<b>Total forest area in scope of certificate which is included in FMUs that:</b>		<b>Units:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>ac</b>		
are less than 100 ha in area	912 ac	
are between 100 ha and 1000 ha in area	17,309 ac	
meet the eligibility criteria as <i>low intensity</i> SLIMF FMUs	0	
<b>Division of FMUs into manageable units:</b>		
Most group participants represent one FMU – most properties are further divided into management units. Three resource managers (Gill, Lindgren, and Howell) represent multiple FMUs as resource managers. Jackson Demonstration State Forest (JDSF) Maillard Ranch, and Charles Mountain Ranch due to their size, further divide their land for management according to standard stand classifications and treatment options.		

### Production Forests

<b>Timber Forest Products</b>	<b>Units:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac
Total area of production forest (i.e. forest from which timber may be harvested)	93,156
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	93,156
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by natural regeneration, or by a combination of natural regeneration and coppicing of the naturally regenerated stems	0
<b>Silvicultural system(s)</b>	<b>Area under type of management</b>
Even-aged management	
Clearcut (clearcut size range )	0
Shelterwood	2,700
Other:	0
Uneven-aged management	
Individual tree selection	90,606 (will be a mix of IT selection, GS, and other)
Group selection	0
Other:	0
<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)	44.36 million board feet for all group members
<b>Non-timber Forest Products (NTFPs)</b>	
Area of forest protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for the production of NTFPs or services	0
Other areas managed for NTFPs or services	0
Approximate annual commercial production of non-timber forest products included in the scope of the certificate, by product type	0

<b>Explanation of the assumptions and reference to the data source upon which AAH and NTFP harvest rates estimates are based:</b>
All data based on inventory, growth, and yield assessments of group members, all of which are reviewed by the State timber regulatory agency, Cal-Fire, under THP or NTMP review.
<b>Species in scope of joint FM/COC certificate: (Scientific / Latin Name and Common / Trade Name)</b>
<i>Sequoia sempervirens</i> (redwood); <i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i> (Douglas-fir); White fir ( <i>Abies concolor</i> ); Hemlock ( <i>Tsuga heterophylla</i> ); tanoak ( <i>Lithocarpus densiflorus</i> ); Madrone ( <i>Arbutus menziesii</i> ); ( <i>Abies grandis</i> ) Grand fir; ( <i>Picea sitchensis</i> ) Sitka Spruce

**FSC Product Classification**

Timber products		
Product Level 1	Product Level 2	Species
W1	W1-1 – Roundwood (logs)	<i>Sequoia sempervirens</i> (Redwood), <i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i> (Douglas fir)
W1	W1-2 – Fuel wood	Any of the species listed save redwood and Douglas fir
W3	W3-1 – Wood chips	<i>Sequoia sempervirens</i> (Redwood), <i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i> (Douglas fir)
Non-Timber Forest Products		
Product Level 1	Product Level 2	Product Level 3 and Species

**Conservation Areas**

<b>Total area of forest and non-forest land protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for conservation objectives:</b>			
<b>High Conservation Value Forest / Areas</b>			
<b>High Conservation Values present and respective areas:</b>		Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac	
Code	HCV Type	Description & Location	Area
HCV1	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g. endemism, endangered species, refugia).	Type I and II old growth (JDSF and Mailliard Ranch); NSO core areas (most participant sites); MAMU areas (JDSF);	7,397
HCV2	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant large landscape level forests, contained within, or containing the management unit, where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in		

	natural patterns of distribution and abundance.		
HCV3	Forests or areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems.		
HCV4	Forests or areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g. watershed protection, erosion control).		
HCV5	Forests or areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g. subsistence, health).		
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).		
<b>Total Area of forest classified as 'High Conservation Value Forest / Area'</b>			<b>7397 ac</b>

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

<input type="checkbox"/> <i>N/A – All forestland owned or managed by the applicant is included in the scope.</i>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Applicant owns and/or manages other FMUs not under evaluation.</i>		
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Applicant wishes to excise portions of the FMU(s) under evaluation from the scope of certification.</i>		
<b>Explanation for exclusion of FMUs and/or excision:</b>	Jackson Demonstration State Forest is owned and managed by the State of California. JDSF is the only one of the eight state forests to be certified. Information on the other state forests may be found at <a href="http://www.fire.ca.gov/resource_mgt/resource_mgt_stateforests.php">http://www.fire.ca.gov/resource_mgt/resource_mgt_stateforests.php</a>	
<b>Control measures to prevent mixing of certified and non-certified product (C8.3):</b>	None of the state forests are contiguous, nor do they conduct harvests or sales jointly – there is no risk of mixing certified wood products from JDSF with non-certified wood products from other state forests.	
<b>Description of FMUs excluded from, or forested area excised from, the scope of certification:</b>		
<b>Name of FMU or Stand</b>	<b>Location (city, state, country)</b>	<b>Size (<input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac)</b>
LaTour	Shasta	9,033
Mountain Home	Tulare	4,807
Boggs Mountain	Lake	3,493
Soquel	Santa Cruz	2,681
Las Posadas	Napa	796
Mount Zion	Amador	164

## 8. Annual Data Update

### 8.1 Social Information

<b>Number of forest workers (including contractors) working in forest within scope of certificate (differentiated by gender):</b>		
254 of male workers	27 of female workers	
<b>Number of accidents in forest work since last audit:</b>	<b>Serious: 0</b>	<b>Fatal: 0</b>

### 8.2 Annual Summary of Pesticide and Other Chemical Use

<input type="checkbox"/> <i>FME does not use pesticides.</i>				
<b>Commercial name of pesticide / herbicide</b>	<b>Active ingredient</b>	<b>Quantity applied annually (kg or lbs)</b>	<b>Size of area treated during previous year</b>	<b>Reason for use</b>
Glyphosate	Glyphosate	16.52 lbs	Spots on roads	Invasive weed management, protection of rare plants

