

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

## *Mendocino Redwood Company Resource Manager Certificate*

**SCS-FM/COC-00001G**

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

CERTIFIED	EXPIRATION
15 September 2017	14 September 2022

DATE OF FIELD EVALUATION
19-21 June 2018
DATE OF LAST UPDATE
4 October 2018

*SCS Contact:*

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

**SCS**global  
SERVICES

*Setting the standard for sustainability™*

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

## Foreword

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

All certificates issued by SCS under the aegis of the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) require annual evaluations 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 evaluations are not intended to comprehensively examine the full scope of the certified forest operations, as the cost of a full-scope evaluation would be prohibitive and it is not mandated by FSC evaluation protocols. Rather, annual evaluations 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 evaluation);
- Follow-up inquiry into any issues that may have arisen since the award of certification or prior to this evaluation; 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 evaluation.

### 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 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 evaluation. Section B contains more detailed results and information for required FSC record-keeping or the use by the FME.

## Table of Contents

---

FOREWORD .....	2
SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY .....	4
1. GENERAL INFORMATION .....	4
1.1 Evaluation Team.....	4
1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation .....	4
1.3 Standards Used .....	4
2. CERTIFICATION EVALUATION PROCESS .....	5
2.1 Evaluation Itinerary, Activities, and Site Notes.....	5
2.2 Evaluation of Management Systems .....	10
3. CHANGES IN MANAGEMENT PRACTICES .....	10
4. RESULTS OF EVALUATION .....	10
4.1 Definitions of Major CARs, Minor CARs and Observations .....	10
4.2 History of Findings for Certificate Period.....	11
4.3 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations .....	12
4.4 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations .....	14
5. STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS .....	18
5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted .....	19
5.2 Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Evaluation Team Responses .....	19
6. CERTIFICATION DECISION .....	19
7. ANNUAL DATA UPDATE .....	20

## SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY

### 1. General Information

#### 1.1 Evaluation Team

Auditor name:	Stefan A. Bergmann	Auditor role:	Lead Auditor
Qualifications:	Mr. Bergmann has been in the forestry and wood products field for 15 years, working across the US in forest policy, landowner extension, executive leadership, and forest certification. Prior to joining SCS in July 2017, he worked for Rainforest Alliance, overseeing the Forest Stewardship Council® (FSC®) Forest Management auditing program in the US. He has successfully completed FSC Forest Management Lead Auditor training, ISO 9001 Lead Auditor training, and is qualified to be a team SFI Auditor. He has served as lead and team auditors on numerous FSC FM audits. He holds a BS in Wildlife Science and an MS in Forest Resources, both from Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon, USA, and is pursuing an MBA at the University of California Davis.		

#### 1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation

A. Number of days spent on-site assessing the applicant:	3
B. Number of auditors participating in on-site evaluation:	1
C. Number of days spent by any technical experts (in addition to amount in line A):	0
D. Additional days spent on preparation, stakeholder consultation, and follow-up:	2
E. Total number of person days used in evaluation:	5

#### 1.3 Standards Used

All standards used are available on the websites of FSC International ([www.fsc.org](http://www.fsc.org)) or SCS Global Services ([www.SCSglobalServices.com](http://www.SCSglobalServices.com)). All standards are available on request from SCS Global Services via the comment form on our website. When no national standard exists for the country/region, SCS Interim Standards are developed by modifying SCS's Generic Interim Standard to reflect forest management in the region and by incorporating relevant components of any Draft Regional/National Standard and comments from stakeholders. More than one month prior to the start of the field evaluation, SCS Draft Interim Standards are provided to stakeholders identified by FSC International, SCS, forest managers under evaluation, and the FSC National or Regional Office for comment. SCS's COC indicators for FMEs are based on the most current versions of the FSC Chain of Custody Standard, FSC Standard for Group Entities in Forest Management Groups (FSC-STD-30-005), and FSC Accreditation Requirements.

Standards used NOTE: Please include the full standard name and Version number and check all that apply.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Forest Stewardship Standard(s), including version: V1.0, approved 8 July 2010
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SCS COC indicators for FMEs, V7-0
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FSC Trademark Standard (FSC-STD-50-001 V2-0)
	<input type="checkbox"/> FSC standard for group entities in forest management groups (FSC-STD-30-005), V1-1
	<input type="checkbox"/> Other:

## 2. Certification Evaluation Process

### 2.1 Evaluation Itinerary, Activities, and Site Notes

<b>Date: 19 June 2018</b>	
<b>FMU / location / sites visited</b>	<b>Activities / notes</b>
FME Office, Ukiah, CA Opening Meeting	Introductions, client update, review scope of evaluation, audit plan, intro/update to FSC and SCS standards, confidentiality and public summary, conformance evaluation methods and review of open CARs/OBS, emergency and security procedures for evaluation team, final site selection.
Site 1 (Hollister Ranch FMU) 10-acre Planned Harvest	Landowner has painted all trees to cut following NTO #23, approved by CAL FIRE on 1 June 2018. All management on FMU falls within NTMP #1-92NTMP-003 MEN. Prescription is to cut all Douglas-fir (D-fir) within 30-ft of redwood clumps and 20-ft of individual redwoods. Thinning of redwood clumps to 3 individual trees. Landowner is experienced logger and will fell trees and skid to landing; contractors will load and haul. Landing will be placed along road opposite of Class 3 stream in order to minimize impacts to water. No evidence of tanoak observed, as landowner has aggressively cut and sprayed or completed hack-and-spray on tanoak with good success.
Site 2 (Hollister Ranch FMU) Pond	Seven-acre foot pond installed in 1992 along edge of woods. Resident species: Western pond turtle, bullfrogs, and several species of fish. Landowner reported that the pond attracts birds of all kinds, including occasionally seabirds. Pond was installed to support wildlife and as a source of water for dust abatement and firefighting. Landowner monitors water depth and reports monthly the amount used to California State Water Resources Control Board, as required by law.
Site 3 (Hollister Ranch FMU) Increment Boring	Landowner has bored several trees to measure the effects of forest management practices on growth rings of redwoods. Largest trees are over 85-years old, as this site was impacted by the 1931 stand-replacement Comptche Fire. Increment bores were observed, and the increased growth from tanoak removal in 1988 and D-fir removal in 2003 was clear. Both species had been subdominant to the redwoods at the time of treatment.
Site 4 (Hollister Ranch FMU) 30-acre Planned Harvest	This harvest site has the same prescription as described for Site 1 since it is part of the same NTO #23. Harvest unit is marked and includes steep slopes (40-50% slope). The hill site will be logged with a Cat and winch. The unit borders a Class 3 stream. With the selection-cut prescription, aquatic values in the intermittent stream drainage will be adequately protected.

<p>Site 5 (Hollister Ranch FMU) Stream Crossing &amp; RMZ</p>	<p>Class 2 stream crossing for skidder road. Dirt road approach showed minor signs of rutting, and landowner explained that he didn't realize it was as wet as it was when he drove in this past spring, and he immediately backed up when he realized the road condition. Crossing was last used for a skidder in 2009; landowner had placed D-fir logs and tops to cushion stream during crossing. No sign of erosion at crossing point, and it was well vegetated with horsetail ferns, sedges, tiger lilies, grasses, and other forbs. RPZ flagged with blue/white striped flagging.</p>
<p>Site 6 (Hollister Ranch FMU) Rot Pile</p>	<p>Landowner showed one of his "rot piles." These are small piles of redwood logs and branches that are mounded at the base of redwood clumps. The rot piles are placed on the north side of such clumps in an attempt to retain moisture for the benefit of redwoods.</p>
<p>Site 7 (Hollister Ranch FMU) Forest Road</p>	<p>Primary access and haul road beginning at ranch house and traveling through property back to Comptche Ukiah Road is well graveled with appropriate pitching and cross-drains. Occasional minor rutting noted, but all within normal use and design parameters.</p>
<p>Site 8 (Hollister Ranch FMU) Chemical Storage Shed</p>	<p>Well-constructed and wooden shed used for auto oil, hydraulic fluid, and herbicide storage. All are stored in labeled and leak-proof containers. Shed includes backpack sprayers and PPE. Large firebox located outside shed well-stocked with firefighting hand tools. Shed is unlocked.</p>
<p><b>Date:</b> 20 June 2018</p>	
<p>FMU / location / sites visited</p>	<p>Activities / notes</p>
<p>Site 9 (JSDF FMU) Parkland 17 Harvest</p>	<p>Planned harvest of 500-700 acres. Expected to be sold in 2020. Will be selection cut (possibly some group selection). Current stand is 60% redwood and 40% fir. Prescription will reduce BA to 160 sq-ft. Much of fir is infected with fungi, (often expressed through visible conks). Most of infected trees will be felled, and unmerchantable infected portions of trees will be left onsite for wildlife and potentially for public firewood cutting.</p> <p>The harvest contains some populations of the rare Humboldt milkvetch, which requires disturbance so the logging will be helpful. Formal plant surveys will begin next spring, as required, to see if there are additional botanical values that require protection. Spotted owl surveys will be conducted at that time, too.</p> <p>Interviewed Research and Demonstration Program Manager, who conducts research on JSDF.</p>
<p>Site 10 (JSDF FMU) Bear Gulch Harvest</p>	<p>Planned harvest of 200-300 acres. Group selection cut of redwood and fir. Class 2 and 3 streams in THP will receive</p>

	appropriate RMZ protections. Class 1 stream in THP will include a 50-100 foot no cut RMZ.
Site 11 (JSDF FMU) Forest Road & Bridge	Road 308 along the Noyo River has hard-packed graveled and wide shoulders and is well maintained. It is a state road used for forest work and access to a rustic public camp ground and meets state road requirements. New bridge crossing recently installed; cost \$200K because it was constructed to state standards. No evidence of any erosion at the bridge, which crosses a Class 1 stream that contains salmonids.
Site 12 (JSDF FMU) Active Harvest	Active harvest THP. Road to unit is very steep, graveled one-half way with the rest hard-packed dirt. Contracted workers at the active yarding and landing sites were operating safely all wearing appropriate PPE. Interviewed LTO owner and yarding crew. Fire box and spill kits onsite. Also interviewed trucker who was hauling a load out and observed the appropriate number (four) chain wraps being installed on the load; trucker works for FME, and the load would be going to the FME's mill. Trip/load ticket used by JSDF was verified as meeting FM/COC product tracing and FSC Trademark Standard. CDF brand observed onsite, although FME staff explained that the state does not always use it. The last three numbers of the FM certification code are painted on one of the logs on each truckload.
Site 13 (Garber Naiman FMU) Marked Harvest	This is the newest group member for the FME, added within the last year. Interviewed landowner, who is the new custodian of her family's property. The 12-acre harvest will be combined with operations on a nearby larger property in order to help keep the harvest economically feasible. Grand fir and redwood dominate the FMU, with much of grand fir component in severe decline from an unknown pathogen. Landowner wants to harvest in order to help the forest recovery, and knowing that the forest is certified helped the landowner be comfortable with the harvest. Landowner has built relationship with a consultant forester who seems to understand the issues and values, including the landowner's goal of keeping the forest aesthetically pleasing. All trees to be cut were marked. Seed trees and wildlife trees will be left. An ephemeral pond, which had been dug as a cattle watering hole many years ago by a previous owner, was flagged with a WLPZ. A botany survey identified the presence of the California swamp harebell, and a no-cut and no-equipment zone was flagged as verified by the auditor.
Site 14 (Charles Mtn Ranch FMU) Ranch Road & Pasture	Access through Marions Mill Pasture is hard-packed dirt in generally good condition. Several culverted crossings, all properly installed. Wooded section of pasture has tan oak throughout. Landowner explained that no active management of tanoak has occurred. Commercial species are oak and fir.

	<p>The only invasive species on the property are star thistle, which is pulled by hand (no herbicides used on the ranch). Larkspur also occurs in spots, which is poisonous to cattle.</p> <p>Much of the ranch has a conservation easement, and conservation and archeological values will receive long-term protection under the easement. Property lines clear with barbed wire fencing.</p>
Site 15 (Charles Mtn Ranch FMU) Archeological Sites	Several Native American archeological sites occur on the ranch, including a historic Native American main village, women’s village, workshop, and burial grounds. These sites are identified in the confidential (non-public) portion of the THP. House pits and lithic scatter were observed. The sites are not fenced off to cattle.
Site 14 (Charles Mtn Ranch FMU) Water Features	Several springs are wet areas were observed. While only a few were fenced off to cattle, no erosion was seen on any of the spring sites. Most springs run year-round. Man-made pond observed, thick with duckweed.
Site 15 (Charles Mtn Ranch FMU) New Bridge	New bridge crossing of Therman Creek (Class 1 stream) installed two years ago. Built from a 40-foot flatbed trailer with piers affixed to large concrete footings. Decking produced from D-fir produced and milled on the ranch. All roads and crossings on the ranch, including this bridge, are monitored regularly by the landowner, especially in the winter.
<b>Date: 21 June 2018</b>	
<b>FMU / location / sites visited</b>	<b>Activities / notes</b>
Site 16 (Liscom Hill FMU) Redwood Selection Harvest	The owners of the FMU (Riber-Cox Timberlands) are absentee and have contracted with a consulting forester to implement the NTMP. This harvest (NTO #9) was a selection harvest of a redwood stand cut last year, removing 1M BF. All trees to be cut had been marked by the forester. Skid trails were well armored with slash. No residual damaged noted, and appropriate BMPs implemented. Good regen was noted throughout the unit; larger holes in the forest created by the logging had been planted.
Site 17 (Liscom Hill FMU) Naturally-Occurring Prairie	Prairie area adjacent to Site 16 harvest was observed. The prairie contains a diversity of grasses, forbs, and wildflowers. It has not been planted, but it is being maintained as a prairie.
Site 18 (Liscom Hill FMU) Class 2 Stream	Class 2 stream in Site 16 harvest with 75-ft buffer flagged. Bear and elk damage to redwood noted. There is an NSO activity center in the vicinity, which is monitored as part of annual NSO surveys.
Site 19 (Liscom Hill FMU) Group Selection Harvest	150-acre group selection harvest occurred in 2016. Redwood and D-fir cut to create 1-acre opening that were then planted.

	<p>Invasive plant species on the property are pampas grass, holly, and English ivy. All are controlled through hand pulling (no herbicides are used). The consultant walks the complete property line every 10 years, re-blazing trees and painting each blaze orange. Property lines observed during the audit were clearly marked.</p> <p>Archeological sites on the property include two historical and two prehistoric. The historical sites have received a 25-ft no-entry buffer. There have been no operations near the prehistoric sites.</p>
<p>Site 20 (Liscom Hill FMU) Culverted Crossing #1</p>	<p>Crossing of Class 2 stream: galvanized metal culvert 60-in wide by 60-ft long installed in 1996. Owner of property wants to oversize the culverts on the property to withstand flooding. Stream bank is well armored with no sign of erosion.</p>
<p>Site 21 (Liscom Hill FMU) WLPZ Area &amp; Crossing #2</p>	<p>Upper end of 2016 harvest (Site 19). WPLZ exclusion zone flagged for Class 3 stream with 18" culverted crossing of well-graveled road. Stream bank is well armored with no sign of erosion. The stream drains a 2-acre seep. Significant bear damage on planted trees observed.</p>
<p>Site 22 (Liscom Hill FMU) Forest Road</p>	<p>Road crossing Class 3 stream discussed in Site 21 is appropriately constructed with rolling dips. 95% of the road system in the FMU is graveled. Three rock pits on the property used to rock the roads; the rock pits are excluded from the NTMP and therefore from the area of FSC FM certified forest.</p>
<p>Site 22 (Liscom Hill FMU) Water Tank</p>	<p>5,000-gallon water tank filled from stream. The tank was installed for fire protection. No water meter is needed and no reporting required to the CA State Water Resources Control Board because it stores less than 10 acre-ft of water. No permit was required.</p>
<p>Site 22 (Liscom Hill FMU) Culverted Crossing #3</p>	<p>72-in wide galvanized metal culvert installed at Noisy Creek crossing in 1995. As discussed in Site 20, owner of property wants to oversize the culverts on the property to withstand flooding. Large trash rack installed in upstream above culvert. After each winter, consultant cleans debris from trash rack. No debris seen during audit. Stream bank is well armored with no sign of erosion.</p>
<p>Site 23 (Sack FMU) Active Logging</p>	<p>Interviewed faller and observed active logging of redwood stand. Faller reported no injuries in his 30-year career, although he was not wearing chaps, ear protection, or eye protection. His son was working with him, and he also did not wear appropriate PPE. Both had hardhats on. See <b>CAR 2018.3</b>.</p>

Site 24 (Sack FMU) Foss Creek	Foss Creek is a Class 1 stream (considered “fish bearing restorable”) occurring in the unit being logged. The stream has an appropriate WLPZ buffer flagged for protection.
Site 25 (Sack FMU) Active Landing	Landing for unit actively being used with logs skidded to landing, bucked, and loaded onto log trucks. Interviewed truck driver and members of landing crew, and observed the crew working. Members of landing crew were not wearing appropriate PPE for the equipment they were using. See <b>CAR 2018.3</b> . Reviewed trip/load ticket. No spill kit onsite. See <b>CAR 2018.1</b> .
FME Office, Ukiah, CA Closing Meeting	Reviewed preliminary findings (potential non-conformities and observations) and discussed next steps.

## 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 reviewing documents and records, interviewing FME personnel and contractors, implementing sampling strategies to visit a broad number of forest cover and harvest prescription types, observing implementation of management plans and policies in the field, and collecting and analyzing stakeholder input. When there is more than one team member, each member 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, interviews, stakeholder comments, and reviewed documents and records. Where consensus among 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 Evaluation

---

### 4.1 Definitions of Major CARs, Minor CARs and Observations

*Major CARs:* Major nonconformances, either alone or in combination with nonconformances of all other applicable indicators, result (or are likely to result) in a fundamental failure to achieve the objectives of the relevant FSC Criterion given the uniqueness and fragility of each forest resource. These are corrective actions that must be resolved or closed out before a certificate can be awarded. If Major

CARs arise after an operation is certified, the timeframe for correcting these nonconformances is typically shorter than for Minor CARs. Certification is contingent on the certified FME’s response to the CAR within the stipulated time frame.

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

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

#### 4.2 History of Findings for Certificate Period

FM Principle	Cert/Re-cert Evaluation	1 <sup>st</sup> Annual Evaluation	2 <sup>nd</sup> Annual Evaluation	3 <sup>rd</sup> Annual Evaluation	4 <sup>th</sup> Annual Evaluation
P1					
P2					
P3					
P4		OBS 2018.3			
P5					
P6	OBS 2017.1 OBS 2017.2	CAR 2018.1 OBS 2018.2			
P7					
P8					
P9		OBS 2018.5			
P10					
COC for FM		OBS 2018.4			
Trademark	CAR 2017.3				
Group					
Other					

### 4.3 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations

<b>Finding Number: 2017.1</b>	
Select one: <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):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification/recertification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 12 months or next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Observation – response is optional <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US Forest Management Standard 6.7.a.
<b>Non-Conformity</b> (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): No evidence of spills were noted on any harvest sites or log landings visited. Both of the active operations inspected during the audit were clean of spills, multiple spill kits were available at each active site, and staff interviewed were familiar with hazardous spill procedures. However, logging operators and Registered Professional Foresters (RPF) interviewed during the course of the audit did not know reportable spill amounts. Interviewees indicated they would be able to quickly find that information. However, uncertainty around this subject area merits an observation.	
<b>Corrective Action Request (or Observation):</b> The forest owner or manager, and employees and contractors, have the equipment and training necessary to respond to hazardous spills. This includes but is not limited to: spill kits, plans, and knowledge of qualified personnel to call on in an event of a hazardous spill.	
<b>FME response</b> (including any evidence submitted)	FME sent email on 15 May 2018 providing guidance to all group participants on the requirements for spill reporting procedures under state and federal law. A copy of the email was reviewed by the auditor and interviewed group members confirmed receipt of this communication.  FME has stated that it also reinforced these requirements with those group members visited in person by providing the document, "California Hazardous Materials Spill / Release Notification Guidance," published by the California Governor's Office of Emergency Services (dated February 2014). A copy of this guidance was reviewed by the auditor.
SCS review	During the 2018 annual surveillance audit, one of the two active harvest sites did not have a spill kit onsite. Since this is an ongoing issue for the second year in a row, the finding has been upgraded to a Minor CAR (see <b>CAR 2018.1</b> ).
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

<b>Finding Number: 2017.2</b>	
Select one: <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):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification/recertification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 12 months or next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Observation – response is optional <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC-STD-40-004, 6.1 and 6.2
<b>Non-Conformity</b> (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): Inspection of sales contracts used by Jackson Demonstration State Forest did not include FSC certificate identification information as related to log load tickets. However, this was already identified during MRCRM internal audit for 2016-2017 and corrective actions are already being addressed. Thus, it is being graded as an Observation. Sales identification information does allow accurate tracking of raw logs via log load tickets and contract documentation in organization databases.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): FME shall ensure that all sales and delivery documents issued for outputs sold with all of the information listed under 6.1 including cases that if separate delivery documents are issued, information sufficient to link the sale and related delivery documentation to each other. Also the same information as required in clause 6.1.1 shall be included in the related delivery documentation, if the sales documentation (or copy of it) is not included with the shipment of the product.	
<b>FME response</b> (including any evidence submitted)	FME has itself issued Jackson Demonstration State Forest a CAR. The expectation is that they will provide a letter referencing all the contracts that were FSC certified identifying them as such to the purchasers no late than 31 July 2018.
SCS review	Since the 2018 audit was conducted less than 12-months from the 2017 re-certification when the OBS was issued, plus the fact that the FME is in the process of addressing this issue, the finding will remain as an open observation. See <b>OBS 2018.2</b> .
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

<b>Finding Number: 2017.3</b>	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification/recertification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 12 months or next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Observation – response is optional <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 1.15/1.16

<b>Non-Conformity</b> (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): Review of, “Operations Manual – Mendocino Redwood Company Resource Manager (MRCRM)” included use of the FSC trademark without appropriate trademark symbol.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): The FME shall ensure use of the FSC “checkmark-and-tree” logo is directly accompanied by the trademark symbols® or ™ (in superscript font). The appropriate symbol shall also be added to “FSC” or “Forest Stewardship Council” for the first use in any text. Also the FME shall ensure any such reproductions of FSC trademarks are submitted to the certification body for approval.	
<b>FME response</b> (including any evidence submitted)	Copy of updated manual was provided. FME also provided a copy of SCS approval email for document, “RE_Trademark approval for public website posting of three MRC Resource Manager documents.”
SCS review	Auditor has confirmed revisions as described above are in conformance with requirements in indicators 1.15 and 1.16.
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

#### 4.4 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations

<b>Finding Number: 2018.1</b>	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification/recertification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 12 months or next regularly scheduled audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Observation – response is optional <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US Forest Management Standard 6.7.a.
<b>Non-Conformity</b> (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): The forest owner or manager, and employees and contractors, have the equipment and training necessary to respond to hazardous spills. This includes but is not limited to: spill kits, plans, and knowledge of qualified personnel to call on in an event of a hazardous spill.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): During 2017 re-certification audit, no evidence of spills were noted on any harvest sites or log landings visited. Both of the active operations inspected during the audit were clean of spills, multiple spill kits were available at each active site, and staff interviewed were familiar with hazardous spill procedures. However, logging operators and Registered Professional Foresters (RPFs) interviewed during the course of the audit did not know reportable spill amounts. Interviewees indicated they would be able to quickly find that information. Uncertainty around this subject area merited an observation (see <b>OBS 2017.1</b> ).  In response to the finding, the FME sent an email on 15 May 2018 providing guidance to all group participants on the requirements for spill reporting procedures under state and federal law. A copy of the email was reviewed by the auditor during the 2018 annual surveillance audit, and interviewed group members confirmed receipt of this communication.	

<p>The FME has stated that it also reinforced these requirements with those group members visited in person by providing the document, “California Hazardous Materials Spill / Release Notification Guidance,” published by the California Governor’s Office of Emergency Services (dated February 2014). A copy of this guidance was reviewed by the auditor.</p> <p>During the 2018 annual surveillance audit, at Site 23 (one of the two active harvests evaluated) the landing crew did not have a spill kit onsite. Since an issue related to preparations for hazardous spill responses has occurred for a second year in a row, the 2017 finding has been upgraded to a Minor CAR.</p>	
<p><b>FME response</b> (including any evidence submitted)</p>	
<p>SCS review</p>	
<p>Status of CAR:</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Closed</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)</p>

<p><b>Finding Number: 2018.2</b></p>	
<p>Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR    <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR    <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation</p>	
<p><b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):</p>	
<p>Deadline</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification/recertification</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 12 months or next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Observation – response is optional</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):</p>
<p>FSC Indicator:</p>	<p>FSC-STD-40-004, 6.1 and 6.2</p>
<p><b>Non-Conformity</b> (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):</p> <p>During 2017 re-certification audit, inspection of sales contracts used by Jackson Demonstration State Forest did not include FSC certificate identification information as related to log load tickets. However, this was already identified during MRCRM internal audit for 2016-2017 and corrective actions were already being addressed. Thus it was graded as an Observation (see <b>OBS 2017.2</b>). Sales identification information did allow accurate tracking of raw logs via log load tickets and contract documentation in organization databases.</p> <p>In response, FME itself issued Jackson Demonstration State Forest a CAR. The expectation is that they will provide a letter referencing all the contracts that were FSC certified identifying them as such to the purchasers no late than 31 July 2018.</p> <p>Since the 2018 audit was conducted less than 12 months from the 2017 re-certification when the OBS was issued, plus the fact that the FME is in the process of addressing this issue, the finding will remain as an open observation.</p>	

<p><b>Corrective Action Request (or Observation):</b>                  FME shall ensure that all sales and delivery documents issued for outputs sold with all of the information listed under 6.1 including cases that if separate delivery documents are issued, information sufficient to link the sale and related delivery documentation to each other. Also the same information as required in clause 6.1.1 shall be included in the related delivery documentation, if the sales documentation (or copy of it) is not included with the shipment of the product.</p>	
<p><b>FME response</b>                  (including any evidence submitted)</p>	
<p>SCS review</p>	
<p>Status of CAR:</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

<p><b>Finding Number: 2018.3</b></p>	
<p>Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR    <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR    <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation</p>	
<p><b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):</p>	
<p>Deadline</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification/recertification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 12 months or next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Observation – response is optional <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
<p>FSC Indicator:</p>	<p>FSC-US Forest Management Standard, 4.2.b</p>
<p><b>Non-Conformity</b> (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):                  At one of the two active harvests evaluated during the 2018 audit, auditor observations and interviews with employees on the landing (Site 25) and with sub-contracted fallers (Site 23) revealed inadequate use of PPE. Of the two fallers, neither were wearing chaps and one was not wearing eye protection. Of the three LTO employees working on the landing, none were wearing chaps (including the landing operator who was bucking logs), none were wearing eye protection, and only one was wearing ear plugs. One employee stated that PPE is made available to employees, but unless an employee is new to the job then none are required to wear it. The one who was bucking was new to the logging industry, having only been there for one month—he wore no PPE except a hardhat.                   At the other active harvest evaluated this year (Site 12), the three employees who were working on the landing and at the yarding site all wore appropriate PPE, suggesting that the issue is limited in scope and thereby justifying an Observation.</p>	
<p><b>Corrective Action Request (or Observation):</b>                  The forest owner or manager and their employees and contractors demonstrate a safe work environment. Contracts or other written agreements include safety requirements.</p>	
<p><b>FME response</b>                  (including any evidence submitted)</p>	
<p>SCS review</p>	

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

<b>Finding Number: 2018.4</b>	
Select one: <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):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification/recertification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 12 months or next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Observation – response is optional <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	SCS COC Indicators for FMEs, 2.3
<b>Non-Conformity</b> (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): Tickets that accompany each load of logs is an essential part of the FME’s system for passing along the FSC certification claim at the forest gate. Samples of both completed and incomplete trip ticket did not correctly state “FSC 100%” in the claim.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): The FME shall ensure that all sales documents issued for outputs sold with FSC claims include the clear indication of the FSC claim for each product item or the total products as “FSC 100%” for products from FSC 100% product groups.	
<b>FME response</b> (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)

<b>Finding Number: 2018.5</b>	
Select one: <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):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification/recertification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 12 months or next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Observation – response is optional <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC-STD-30-005 V1-1, 9.2
<b>Non-Conformity</b> (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): COC procedures as described in <i>Operations Manual – Mendocino Redwood Company Resource Manager</i> (dated July 2017) state on page 12:  “Each member will ensure their logs are tracked and sent appropriately by using the MFP or HRC trip ticket provided for log trucks. This ensures that employees at the sawmill log yard can track the location and certification status of delivered logs and treat them appropriately. All delivered loads must use the trip ticket provided by the MFP or HRC sales/accounting staff.”  Examination of harvest information for the group member Jackson State Demonstration Forest (JSDF) revealed that the member uses its own trip ticket, not one provided by MFP or HRC.	
<b>Corrective Action Request</b> (or <i>Observation</i> ): For the purpose of ensuring that non-certified material is not being mixed with FSC-certified material, FSC products shall only be sold according to a sales protocol agreed by the Group members and the Group entity.	
<b>FME response</b> (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 FME 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).

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.

### 5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted

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. Stakeholder groups who are consulted as part of the evaluation include FME management and staff, consulting foresters, contractors, lease holders, adjacent property owners, local and regionally-based social interest and civic organizations, purchasers of logs harvested on FME forestlands, recreational user groups, tribal members and/or representatives, members of the FSC National Initiative, members of the regional FSC working group, FSC International, local and regionally-based environmental organizations and conservationists, and forest industry groups and organizations, as well as local, state, and federal regulatory agency personnel and other relevant groups.

### 5.2 Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Evaluation Team Responses

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.

<input type="checkbox"/> FME has not received any stakeholder comments from interested parties as a result of stakeholder outreach activities during this annual evaluation.	
Stakeholder Comment	SCS Response
Numerous positive comments	Over the course of the audit, many positive comments were received about MRCRM from group members, contractors, and community members. The staff at MRCRM are viewed as excellent—open minded, good communicators, and with a positive customer service orientation. These comments are consistent with the auditor’s experience in working with the FME during the audit. No negative comments were received, and no issues triggering subsequent investigation during the evaluation were received.

## 6. Certification Decision

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

## 7. Annual Data Update

<input type="checkbox"/> No changes since previous evaluation.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information in the following sections has changed since previous evaluation.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Name and Contact Information <input type="checkbox"/> FSC Sales Information <input type="checkbox"/> Scope of Certificate <input type="checkbox"/> Non-SLIMF FMUs <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Social Information	<input type="checkbox"/> Pesticide and Other Chemical Use <input type="checkbox"/> Production Forests <input type="checkbox"/> FSC Product Classification <input type="checkbox"/> Conservation & High Conservation Value Areas <input type="checkbox"/> Areas Outside of the Scope of Certification

### Name and Contact Information

Organization name	Mendocino Redwood Resource Manager Certification Program		
Contact person	Sarah Billig		
Address	Mendocino Redwood Company	Telephone	707-463-5125
	P.O. Box 996	Fax	707-463-5530
	Ukiah, California 95482a	e-mail	sbillig@mendoco.com
		Website	http://www.mrc.com/

### 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 type="checkbox"/> Multiple FMU
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Group (contains SLIMF & non-SLIMF)	
SLIMF (if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/> Small SLIMF certificate	<input type="checkbox"/> Low intensity SLIMF certificate
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Group SLIMF certificate (contains SLIMF & non-SLIMF)	
# Group Members (if applicable)	21	
Number of FMUs in scope of certificate	26	
Geographic location of non-SLIMF FMU(s)	Latitude & Longitude: Various	
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	44,504 ac	
state managed	48,652 ac	

community managed	0		
Number of FMUs in scope that are:			
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
Total forest area in scope of certificate included in FMUs that: Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac			
are less than 100 ha in area	907 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		
Division of FMUs into manageable units:			
Each group participant represents one FMU. Most properties are further divided into management units. See Group Management Program Members table in Appendix B below.			

**Non-SLIMF FMUs (Group or Multiple FMU Certificates)**

Name	Contact information	Latitude/ longitude of Non-SLIMF FMUs	
Jackson Demonstration State Forest	Mike Powers, Forester Cal Fire	39.352260	-123.558623
Mailliard Ranch	Todd McMahon, NCRM	39.125488	-123.475307
Families Blue Lakes	Bob Kelley, NRM	40.54	-124.00
Tim Pricer	Tim Pricer, Owner	40.33	-123.68

**Social Information**

Number of forest workers (including contractors) working in forest within scope of certificate (differentiated by gender):		
male workers: 254	female workers: 27	
Number of accidents in forest work since previous evaluation:	Serious: 0	Fatal: 1

**Pesticide and Other Chemical Use**

<input type="checkbox"/> FME does not use pesticides.				
Commercial name of pesticide / herbicide	Active ingredient	Quantity applied since previous evaluation (kg or lbs.)	Total area treated since previous evaluation (ha or ac)	Reason for use
Garlon 4 Ultra	Triclopyr ester	4 lbs	1 acre	Invasive weed management
Alligare 4SL	Imazapyr	41 lbs	48 acres	Reduce tanoak density prior to reforestation

**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)	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
Silvicultural system(s)	Area under type of management
Even-aged management	
Clearcut (clearcut size range )	0
Shelterwood	0
Other:	0
Uneven-aged management	
Individual tree selection	93,156 (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.)	0
<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>Species in scope of joint FM/COC certificate: (Scientific / Latin Name and Common / Trade Name)</b>	
Sequoia sempervirens (redwood); Pseudotsuga menziesii (Douglas-fir); White fir (Abies concolor); Hemlock (Tsuga heterophylla); tanoak (Lithocarpus densiflorus); Madrone (Arbutus menziesii); (Abies grandis) Grand fir; (Picea sitchensis) Sitka Spruce	

**FSC Product Classification**

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

Product Level 1	Product Level 2	Product Level 3 and Species
none	none	none

**Conservation and High Conservation Value Areas**

<b>Conservation Area</b>	Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac
<b>Total amount</b> of land in certified area protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for conservation objectives (includes both forested and non-forested lands).*	2,239

*\*Note: Total conservation and HCV areas may differ since these may serve different functions in the FME’s management system. Designation as HCV may allow for active management, including commercial harvest. Conservation areas are typically under passive management, but may undergo invasive species control, prescribed burns, non-commercial harvest, and other management activities intended to maintain or enhance their integrity. In all cases, figures are reported by the FME as it pertains local laws & regulations, management objectives, and FSC requirements.*

High Conservation Value Forest / Areas			Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input 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.	-	0
HCV3	Forests or areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems.	-	0
HCV4	Forests or areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g. watershed protection, erosion control).	-	0
HCV5	Forests or areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g. subsistence, health).	-	0
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).	-	0
Total area of forest classified as ‘High Conservation Value Forest / Area’			7,397

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

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:	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>	
Control measures to prevent mixing of certified and non-certified product (C8.3):	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.	
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)
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

