

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.hrcllc.com

CERTIFIED	EXPIRATION
14 September 2017	13 September 2022

DATE OF FIELD EVALUATION
26-28 May 2020
DATE OF REPORT FINALIZATION
13 August 2020

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

SCSglobal
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

Foreword

Cycle in annual surveillance evaluations				
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 st annual evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 nd annual evaluation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 rd annual evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 th 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

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	5
3. CHANGES IN MANAGEMENT PRACTICES.....	5
4. RESULTS OF EVALUATION	6
4.1 Definitions of Major CARs, Minor CARs and Observations	6
4.2 History of Findings for Certificate Period.....	6
4.3 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations	7
4.4 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations	10
5. STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS	12
5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted.....	12
5.2 Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Evaluation Team Responses	13
6. CERTIFICATION DECISION	13
7. ANNUAL DATA UPDATE	13

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY

1. General Information

1.1 Evaluation Team

Auditor name:	Stefan A. Bergmann	Auditor role:	Audit Team Leader
Qualifications:	Mr. Bergmann has been in the forestry and wood products field for nearly 20 years, working across the US on forest policy, landowner extension, and forest certification. He also has senior staff executive experience with two forestry non-profits in the Midwest. Prior to joining SCS in 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 an SFI team auditor. He has served as lead and team auditors on numerous FSC FM audits around the country. He holds a BS in Wildlife Science and an MS in Forest Resources, both from Oregon State University, and an MBA from University of California Davis.		

1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation

A. Number of days spent onsite (desk-based) for evaluation:	1.5
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:	3.5

1.3 Standards Used

All standards used are available on the websites of FSC International (www.fsc.org) or SCS Global Services (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 applicable <i>NOTE: Please include the full standard name and Version number and check all that apply.</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Forest Stewardship Standard(s), including version: FSC-US Forest Management Standard (v1.0, 8 July 2010)
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FSC Trademark Standard (FSC-STD-50-001 V2-0)
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SCS COC indicators for FMEs, V8-0
	<input checked="" 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

26 May 2020 (Tuesday)	
FMU / location / sites visited	Activities / notes
Opening meeting, remote 0900 – 1030	Introductions, scope of evaluation, confidentiality and public summary, evaluation methods, client update, review open CARs/OBS and review of sampled group members.
Desk review, remote 1030 – 1800	Auditor conducted document review and interviews.
27 May 2020 (Wednesday)	
FMU / location / sites visited	Activities / notes
Desk review, remote 0800 – 1800	Auditor conducted document review and interviews.
28 May 2020 (Thursday)	
FMU/ location/ sites visited	Activities/ notes
Closing meeting prep, remote 0800 – 1100	Auditor consolidated notes and confirms preliminary evaluation findings.
Closing meeting, remote 1100 – 1200	Auditor 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 st Annual Evaluation	2 nd Annual Evaluation	3 rd Annual Evaluation	4 th Annual Evaluation
No findings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
P1			CAR 2019.3	OBS 2020.2: 1.6.a	
P2			CAR 2019.2		
P3					
P4		OBS 2018.3			
P5					
P6	OBS 2017.1 OBS 2017.2	CAR 2018.1 OBS 2018.2	OBS 2019.1	Minor 2020.1: 6.6.a & 6.6.e	
P7					
P8					
P9		OBS 2018.5			
P10					
COC for FM		OBS 2018.4			
Trademark	CAR 2017.3				
Group				Minor 2020.3: 1.3	
Other					

4.3 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations

Finding Number: 2019.1	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to: Bear Creek FMU	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification/recertification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> 12 months or next regularly scheduled audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation – response is optional <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US Forest Management Standard, Indicator 6.5.d
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): Minor erosion associated with roading was observed on Bear Creek FMU. A water bar on a side road uphill of Bear Creek Road had been compromised during winter precipitation, and some rilling of the side road and Bear Creek Road was observed as a result. In addition, below a culverted crossing of an ephemeral stream, also at Bear Creek Road, there was evidence of minor siltation that appeared to be caused by insufficient armoring of the downstream side of the culvert. The ephemeral stream flows into Bear Creek, which then feeds a Class 1 stream with anadromous fish.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): The transportation system, including design of temporary and permanent roads, trails, and water crossings, shall be designed, constructed, and maintained to reduce short and long-term environmental impacts. This shall include minimizing erosion and sediment discharge to streams.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	Roads were re-drained and smoothed since the audit detected rilling last year. Group member reported there had not been an excavator onsite, though he had completed some hand work to mitigate the upstream diversion. That road is under review for access to cell tower (discussed during the audit) and is expected to rebuilt when installing cable. They continue to maintain outsloping on the Bear Creek Road but have not installed inboard ditches. Due to COVID-19, we were unable to go onsite and review any changes to the site in question.
SCS review	Auditor contacted group member via email, who replied with additional information about work accomplished at the erosion site identified in 2019 (email response dated 30 June 2020). Group member explained that the erosion was determined to be from concentrated draining of an entire small watershed at one crossing point on Bear Creek Road—a result of a historic logging activities in the watershed. The report contained photos from the field analysis conducted by the group member and a water bar that had been re-established by hand at the concentration point. The group member confirmed that roads on the property, including Bear Creek Road, receive drainage maintenance before and during the rainy season. The written and photo evidence provided by the group member demonstrated that the erosion identified in 2019 has been addressed, thereby justifying closure of the OBS.

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: 2019.2	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to: JDSF 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	SCS COC Indicators for FMEs, Indicator 2.1
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): As part of the COC tracking system for JDSF, harvest contracts require that LTOs use brands on logs. However, no such brands were observed on logs loaded onto a log truck during the audit, nor were any other identifying marks other than a trip ticket stapled to one log. A sampled timber sale contract for JDSF (Wonder Crossing Timber Sale; contract #8CA03601) was reviewed; Exhibit A (Scope of Work), Item 9, states that the LTO “shall identify all timber by making a mark with a brand provided by the STATE.” The JDSF administrator of the active sale evaluated during the audit explained that all brand hammers have been lost and therefore no hammers were issued to the LTO; not issuing brand hammers conflicts with the requirements in the harvest contract.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): Products from the certified forest area shall be identifiable as certified at the forest gate(s). This shall include implementing COC procedures that are required in the harvest contract.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	On 16 April 2020, Timber Sale Program Manager at Jackson Demonstration State Forest provided a photo of a branding hammer being made with ten more in the works. Review with the Log Resource Manager for MRC and HRC indicated that he had seen brands on loads coming in from JDSF. Due to the limited availability of hauling days due to rain and log yard closures for most of March and April, we have not yet captured photos of brands on logs but can confirm the brands have been made and have been witnessed on the limited loads brought to the Ukiah Sawmill yard.
SCS review	Auditor observed photo of a new branding hammer provided by the group member through the group manager. Auditor also reviewed photos of a completed trip ticket from Gulch 23 timber sale (log receipt #9474, dated 27 May 2020) attached to a branded log from a load received at the Mendocino Forest Products mill in Ukiah during the audit. These photos provided evidence that new branding hammers have been produced by the group member and are being used in accordance with Exhibit A of the group member’s timber sale contracts, thereby justifying closure of the CAR.

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: 2019.3	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to: JDSF 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 Trademark Standard, Indicator 1.4
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): The current MRCRM load tickets, which are provided to members who don't have their own tickets, incorrectly use the copyright (©) sign for the FSC acronym, instead of the federal trademark registration (®) sign. Additionally, the current load tickets for the group member JDSF state "FSC 100%" with the FSC acronym missing the federal trademark registration (®) sign.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): The symbol ® shall be added to 'FSC' at the first or most prominent use in any text, including on load tickets that contain the FSC claim of 100%.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	Per the Log Resources Manager at MRC and HRC, who has been filling in at the Scale Shack during mill shutdowns, CAL FIRE has decided to add the ® by hand to tickets this year as pre-printed copies were already made. A copy of a load ticket was provided to Auditor.
SCS review	Auditor reviewed photos of a completed load tickets from JDSF Gulch 23 timber sale (log receipts #9474, dated 27 May 2020, and #9264, dated 1 May 2020), verifying the handwritten federal trademark registration (®) sign. Auditor also reviewed a photo of a blank MRCRM load ticket log receipt #355961), which are provided to members who don't have their own tickets, verifying the presence of the federal trademark registration (®) sign.
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

Finding Number: 2020.1	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to: Group Entity	
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 (V1-0), Indicators 6.6.a & 6.6.e
<p>Non-Conformity: Power utility and gas companies have easements allowing them to control vegetation in powerline corridors and above gas transmission pipelines that traverse some of the certified group member properties. During interviews with Auditor, the group manager stated that herbicides are likely applied by the utility and gas companies in these rights-of-ways.</p> <p>FSC recently released an interpretation clarifying that “a right-of-way or other easement that is located within the boundaries of a certified MU is subject to FSC pesticide reporting. The names and quantities of pesticides applied, and size of area treated must be included in the certificate holder’s certification report summary of quantitative pesticides data. If the areas are excised from the scope of the certificate following FSC-POL-20-003, then the certificate holder is not required to report pesticide application in these areas” (INT-STD-20-2007a_03, dated 3 April 2020).</p> <p>The FM Standard requires certificate holders to ensure that no products on the FSC list of Highly Hazardous Pesticides are used (Indicator 6.6.a), as well as requires monitoring any chemical use on the FMUs (Indicator 6.6.e). MRCRM has not requested information on herbicide applications from easement holders, nor has it placed chemical use restrictions on those easement holders; therefore, a CAR has been raised. It is graded as a Minor CAR because the non-conformity is limited to easements held by other parties, which are relatively small areas on group member properties.</p>	
<p>Corrective Action Request: The group entity shall ensure that no products on the FSC list of Highly Hazardous Pesticides are used on certified group member properties. For chemicals that are used, the effects shall be monitored and the results used for adaptive management. Additionally, records shall be kept of pest occurrences, control measures, and incidences of worker exposure to chemicals applied on the FMUs.</p>	
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision <i>(refer to description above)</i>

Finding Number: 2020.2	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to: Group Entity	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification/recertification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> 12 months or next regularly scheduled audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation – response is optional <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator	FSC-US Forest Management Standard (V1-0), Indicator 1.6.a.
Background: MRCRM has been FSC-certified for many years, which in itself demonstrates a long-term commitment to the FSC system. Over this time, including the period covered by this report, MRCRM has demonstrated strong conformance with the FSC Principles and Criteria. The MRCRM website also contains a publicly available group participant commitment to “demonstrate a long-term commitment to adhere to FSC Principles and Criteria, and FSC and FSC-US policies, including the FSC-US Land Sales Policy.” The commitment lists all group participants in the certificate, although the list is slightly out of date. MRCRM is in conformance with this indicator, but it should update the list of group participants to ensure that it reflects the current members.	
Observation: FME should update the list of group participants on the publicly available statement of long-term commitment to reflect the current members.	
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	
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: 2020.3	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to: JDSF 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 Trademark Standard (V2-0), Indicator 1.5
Non-Conformity: Out of 6 trademark uses evaluated, 5 were found to be in conformance. However, no approval from SCS can be found for the FSC trademark use on group member JDSF’s trip tickets. These tickets are actively being used for timber sales.	

Corrective Action Request: The FME shall submit all intended uses of the FSC trademarks to SCS for approval.	
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	
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 (paraphrased)	SCS Response
<p>The process of enrolling in the group was positive and included meeting in person with me and neighbors to discuss management objectives.</p>	<p>The group entity has a strong track record of maintaining open lines of communication with members and other landowners neighboring group member properties. This comment from a new group member is an example and is evidence of conformance for FM Indicator 4.4.c, which requires that people subject to direct adverse effects of management operations are apprised of relevant activities in advance of the action so that they may express concern.</p>

6. Certification Decision

<p>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.</p>	<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Comments: MRCRM provides an opportunity for small landowners to be FSC certified. Through its internal monitoring and accessibility, the company also provides added value to its group members. Additionally, the FME’s recent decision to offer a price premium for any group members who choose to sell harvested wood products to one of the FME’s mills demonstrates the company’s commitment to the long-term sustainability of the group. Review of internal monitoring and other records, interviews with stakeholders, and field observations demonstrate that the FME is in strong compliance with the FSC standard.</p>	

7. Annual Data Update

<input type="checkbox"/> No changes since previous evaluation.	
<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scope of Certificate <input type="checkbox"/> Non-SLIMF FMUs <input type="checkbox"/> Social Information	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pesticide and Other Chemical Use <input checked="" 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 95482	e-mail	sbillig@mendoco.com
		Website	http://www.mrc.com/

FSC Sales Information

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>FSC Sales contact information same as above.</i>			
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			
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)	24			
Number of FMUs in scope of certificate	29			
Geographic location of non-SLIMF FMU(s)	<i>Latitude & Longitude: Various</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:	93,712			
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is:	Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac			
privately managed	45,060			
state managed	48,652			
community managed	0			
Number of FMUs in scope that are:				
less than 100 ha in area	12	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 which is included in FMUs that:	Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac			
are less than 100 ha in area	1,468			
are between 100 ha and 1000 ha in area	17,309			
meet the eligibility criteria as <i>low intensity</i> SLIMF FMUs	0			

Division of FMUs into manageable units:
Most group participants represent one FMU, which are further divided into management units. Several resource managers represent multiple FMUs as consulting foresters managers. Jackson Demonstration State Forest, Mailliard Ranch and Families Blue Lakes, due to their size, further divide their land for management according to standard stand classifications and treatment options.

Non-SLIMF FMUs (Group or Multiple FMU Certificates)

Name	Contact information	Latitude/ longitude of Non-SLIMF FMUs
Jackson Demonstration State Forest	Excluded to comply with EU privacy law.	
Mailliard Ranch		
Charles Mountain		
Families Blue Lakes		

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: 0

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
Triclopy ester	Triclopyr ester	80	Treatment of exotic species along forest roads (22 miles)	Invasive weed species
Imazapyr	Imazapyr	1	5 ac	Reduce tanoak density prior to reforestation
Clopyralid	Clopyralid	0.05	Treatment of exotic species along forest roads (0.25 mile)	Invasive weed – yellow star thistle control
Glyphosate	Glyphosate	55	Treatment of exotic species along forest roads (22 miles)	Invasive weed species

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)	91,370

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	91,370
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	0
Clearcut (clearcut size range: NA)	0
Shelterwood	0
Other:	0
Uneven-aged management	0
Individual tree selection	0
Group selection	0
Other: Mix of individual tree selection and group selection	91,370
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (e.g. nursery, recreation area, windbreak, bamboo, silvo-pastoral system, agro-forestry system, etc.)	0
Non-timber Forest Products (NTFPs)	
Area of forest protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for the production of NTFPs or services	0
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
Species in scope of joint FM/COC certificate: (Scientific / Latin Name and Common / Trade Name)	
<i>Sequoia sempervirens</i> (redwood), <i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i> (Douglas-fir), <i>Abies concolor</i> (white fir), <i>Tsuga heterophylla</i> (hemlock), <i>Lithocarpus densiflorus</i> (tanoak), <i>Arbutus menziesii</i> (madrone), <i>Abies grandis</i> (grand fir), and <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	<i>Abies concolor</i> (white fir), <i>Tsuga heterophylla</i> (hemlock), <i>Lithocarpus densiflorus</i> (tanoak), <i>Arbutus menziesii</i> (madrone), <i>Abies grandis</i> (grand fir), <i>Picea sitchensis</i> (Sitka spruce)
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
NA	NA	NA

Note: W1, W2, and W3 product groups usually do not require a separate evaluation to FSC-STD-40-004 (COC) if processing occurs in the field for FM/COC and CW/FM certificate types. N1-N10 (NTFPs) are eligible to be sold with FSC claims under FM/COC certification if reported here. Bamboo and NTFPs derived from trees (e.g. cork, resin, bark) may be eligible for FM/COC and CW/FM certification. NTFPs used for food and medicinal purposes are not eligible for CW/FM certification. Check with SCS if you have any products intended to be sold with an FSC claim outside of any of these categories.

Conservation and High Conservation Value Areas

Conservation Area	Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac
Total amount of land in certified area protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for conservation objectives (includes both forested and non-forested lands).*	2,342

*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 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, Mailliard Ranch, and 10-Mile Parker); NSO core areas (most participant sites); riparian areas; MAMU areas (JDSF)	7,500
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’			7,500

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

<input type="checkbox"/> <i>N/A – All forestland owned or managed by the certificate holder is included in the scope.</i>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Certificate holder owns and/or manages other FMUs not under evaluation.</i>		
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Certificate holder wishes to excise portions of the FMU(s) under evaluation from the scope of certification.</i>		
Note: <i>Excision cannot be applied to CW/FM certificates.</i>		
Explanation for exclusion of FMUs and/or excision:	<p>Jackson Demonstration State Forest is owned and managed by the State of California. It is the only California state forest that is certified; there are eight state forests in all. All other seven state forests are excluded from the scope of this certificate.</p> <p>The owner of the SLIMF FMU Bear Creek also owns a parcel in a separate county. That parcel is not included in the NTMP that covers Bear Creek.</p>	
Control measures to prevent mixing of certified and non-certified product (C8.3):	<p>None of the state forests are contiguous, nor do they conduct harvests or sales jointly. Therefore, there is no risk of mixing certified wood products from JDSF with non-certified wood products from other state forests.</p>	
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, CA	9,033
Mountain Home	Tulare, CA	4,807
Boggs Mountain	Lake, CA	3,493
Soquel	Santa Cruz, CA	2,681
Las Posadas	Napa, CA	796
Mount Zion	Amador, CA	164
Second property of group member	Elk, CA	320

