

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

Mendocino Redwood Company Resource Manager Certificate

SCS-FM/COC-0001G

P.O. Box 996
Ukiah, California 95482
Sarah Billig
www.mrc.com

CERTIFIED	EXPIRATION
17 Sept 2012	16 Sept 2017

DATE OF FIELD AUDIT
6-7, 27 Oct 2015
DATE OF LAST UPDATE
18 April 2016

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

SCSglobal
SERVICES
Setting the standard for sustainability™

Foreword

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

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

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

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

Organization of the Report

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

Table of Contents

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY	4
1. GENERAL INFORMATION	4
1.1 Annual Audit Team.....	4
1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation	4
1.3 Standards Employed	4
2 ANNUAL AUDIT DATES AND ACTIVITIES	4
2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities.....	4
2.2 Evaluation of Management Systems	4
3. CHANGES IN MANAGEMENT PRACTICES.....	7
4. RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION.....	7
4.1 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations	7
4.2 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations	11
5. STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS	13
5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted	14
5.2 Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Responses from the Team, Where Applicable	14
6. CERTIFICATION DECISION	14
7. CHANGES IN CERTIFICATION SCOPE	14
8. ANNUAL DATA UPDATE	18
8.1 Social Information.....	18
8.2 Annual Summary of Pesticide and Other Chemical Use	18

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY

1. General Information

1.1 Annual Audit Team

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

1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation

A. Number of days spent on-site assessing the applicant:	3
B. Number of auditors participating in on-site evaluation:	1
C. Additional days spent on preparation, stakeholder consultation, and post-site follow-up:	2
D. Total number of person days used in evaluation:	5

1.3 Standards Employed

1.3.1. Applicable FSC-Accredited Standards

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

2 Annual Audit Dates and Activities

2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities

Date Oct 6, 2015	
FMU/Location/ sites visited	Activities/ notes
9am, MRC office, Ukiah	Opening Meeting: Client annual update, review audit scope, audit plan, update to FSC and SCS standards and protocols, review of open CARs/OBS, final site selection.
Jackson Demonstration State Forest	- Review of planned harvest areas in “Top of Hair” THP. Stands were marked but the plan not submitted for approval yet.

	<p>Silvicultural goal was to retain 160 ft of basal area through primarily uneven aged, selection harvests. Sample mark prepared for review by Jackson Advisory Group.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Adjacent shooting range on the property is characteristic of multiple use of the property. Frequent public recreation, including horse riding, biking, hiking, camping, etc. - Discussed road inventory, recently completed as part of management plan revision. Ongoing monitoring is done by a dedicated road manager for the property, review of culverts during heavy rain, etc. - Thompson Gulch THP, active log loading and hauling, reviewed chain of custody procedures. - West Berry Gulch, 5 year old harvest area, single tree selection plus small groups. - Peterson Gulch THP, Cable yarding operation in action. Reviewed safety and hazardous waste control procedures.
Hollister Ranch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Property is under Non-Industrial Timber Management Plan (NTMP). - Discussed tanoak control methods, chemical vs mechanical - Silvicultural objectives are to focus growth on larger redwoods. Continual thinning from below. Harvesting is controlled on an area basis under the NTMP, where any area is only allowed to be harvested every 5 years. - Review of wildlife protection and habitat improvement measures, purposeful girdling of grand fir in order to create snags.
Date Oct 7, 2015	
FMU/Location/ sites visited*	Activities/ notes
Max	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2400 acre property in Sonoma County, towards southern end of the properties in the group. Covered under NTMP. - Property borders Mill creek, class 1 watercourse running along a county road. 100 foot no management buffer zone is applied. Other class 1 streams on the property receive normal WLPZ buffers. - Silvicultural method is limited to single tree selection with retention of 75 BA. - No herbicide use on the property. Currently only mechanical control of tanoak and other undesirable species. - Reviewed new road construction. Discussion of road decommissioning which is planned for underused legacy roads near watercourses.
Bear Flat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 375 acre NTMP, remaining portion of a 417 acre property is in a reserve status. - Active logging occurring (first on the property since 2008). Property is split into three management units each with a 15 year rotation of entries. Silvicultural goal is single tree selection, harvesting 1/3 of growth on each entry in order to

	<p>progressively increase volume on the property. Generally favoring removal of doug-fir and promotion of redwood.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Favoring non-timber tree species such as black oak and madrone for mast production. - Spotted Owl protection center is placed around an identified nest on the property, 500' no cut radius, 1000' reduced harvest radius. - Individual heritage trees are marked, tagged for no harvest as part of the NTMP (calls for 1 legacy tree and 2 wildlife trees per acre. - Limited pesticide use for control of exotic broom. - Small portable sawmill on the property, currently only producing wood for personal use.
Date Oct 27, 2015	
FMU/Location/ sites visited*	Activities/ notes
Families Blue Lakes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Property under and NTMP, re-entry goal of every 15 years on each stand, generally some harvesting occurs somewhere on the property each year. - Silvicultural method is thin from below, single tree selection. - Reviewed monitoring system, periodic inventory along with permanent sample plots, standing volume has been increasing with each inventory. - Reviewed recent harvest, road construction. - Reviewed harvest completed in the past year, near a seasonal marsh area that received WLPZ protection (marsh was particularly dry due to the drought). - Large woody debris placement in stream, done in partnership with Fish and Wildlife Service in order to increase fish habitat.
Charles Mountain Ranch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Newly enrolled property, discussed procedure for joining the certified group. - Property is under a conservation easement held by the North Coast Regional Land Trust and funded by a grant from the Wildlife Conservation Board. The easement prevents subdivision and development of the property. - Active logging occurring, single tree selection in primarily Douglas-fir type. - Archeological sites present on the property, receive no entry zones. Old homestead sites are also present.
Date Oct 29, 2015	
Remote	Closing Meeting

2.2 Evaluation of Management Systems

SCS deploys interdisciplinary teams with expertise in forestry, social sciences, natural resource economics, and other relevant fields to assess an FME's conformance to FSC standards and policies. Evaluation methods include document and record review, implementing sampling strategies to visit a broad number of forest cover and harvest prescription types, observation of implementation of

management plans and policies in the field, and stakeholder analysis. When there is more than one team member, team members may review parts of the standards based on their background and expertise. On the final day of an evaluation, team members convene to deliberate the findings of the assessment jointly. This involves an analysis of all relevant field observations, stakeholder comments, and reviewed documents and records. Where consensus between team members cannot be achieved due to lack of evidence, conflicting evidence or differences of interpretation of the standards, the team is instructed to report these in the certification decision section and/or in observations.

3. Changes in Management Practices

No major changes in management practices occurred within the certificate this year. The only change to the group was the minor addition of new group members.

4. Results of the Evaluation

4.1 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations

Finding Number: 2014.1	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC US FM Standard, Indicator 6.4.d
<p>Non-Conformity: The group entity typically conducts RSA assessments for group participants upon entry into the group or acquisition of new land, using the HCVF/RSA Assessment Form as guidance. However, different assessment forms are in use for group participants in Humboldt County versus Mendocino County, with different potential RSA types listed on the two different forms. For example, the assessment form for Humboldt County participants includes RSA types of Western Lily, Chinquapin stands and Oregon White Oak stands, which are not included on the form in use in Mendocino County. Not only do the potential RSA and HCVF types differ between forms, but the understanding of the definitions of and differences between HCVF and RSAs may differ among internal auditors. While it is expected that there may be some differences between RSA or HCVF categories between counties based on different ecotypes present, these differences should be arrived at through a common understanding of the internal auditors.</p> <p>Additionally, RSAs and HCVF are tracked in the group participant database by member number, but not by category. Acreage is estimated and HCVF and RSAs are not differentiated. Unless the auditor has specific knowledge of a property, there is no way to know if the special area identified has been designated as an RSA or as HCVF. This likely leads to additional confusion between categories for internal auditors.</p>	

<p>Corrective Action Request: The internal auditors for group participants shall coordinate a review of the HCVF/RSA assessment form so that the need for HCVF and RSA designation can be reviewed and the types revised based on more current assessments and a common understanding of the area under the scope of the group certificate. Once specific categories are clarified, all identified areas listed in the database shall be designated as either RSA or HCVF.</p>	
<p>FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i></p>	<p>A review of the assessment form was conducted – all areas were found to be appropriate based on the county of assessment (Humboldt and Mendocino/Sonoma county as two separate FMUs). The Mendocino/Humboldt form was revised (as well as the MRCRM participant database) to update which areas are HCVF versus RSA (attached to this response (a) Mendo_Sonoma_HCVF_RSA_form.pdf and (b) HCVF_RSA_form_HCO.pdf).</p>
<p>SCS review</p>	<p>The revised forms have incorporated the changes identified in the non-conformance. Completed form was reviewed for new group member Charles Mountain Ranch.</p>
<p>Status of CAR:</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i></p>

Finding Number: 2014.2	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC US FM Standard, Indicator 8.5.a
<p>Non-Conformity: MRCRM posts an annual monitoring report on their website, summarizing the last year's annual internal monitoring visits to group participants' properties. Information in the online report includes basic data regarding group participants, the number of sites visited during the internal audit, any internal findings issued and any significant discoveries. Although much of the monitoring information required under 8.2 is collected by the participants themselves prior to harvests, a summary of this information is not included in annual monitoring reports. This includes updated information on inventory, significant/unanticipated loss, road conditions, stakeholder comments, timber harvest records and proper implementation of site specific plans.</p>	
<p>Corrective Action Request: While protecting landowner confidentiality, and retaining any sensitive information, MRCRM shall present either full monitoring results or an up to date summary of the most recent monitoring information, covering the indicators listed in Criterion 8.2, for group participants.</p>	
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	<p>MRCRM staff updated the annual monitoring report to include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) # of Erosion Control sites treated (2) NSO surveys completed (3) Rare plants detected <p>This information was added to the reporting scheme to cover more reporting on biological and systems outcomes and updates. As noted, in the CAR, the goal was to report on more systematic biological information while still respecting the confidentiality of each participant's information.</p> <p>Evidence attached:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) MRCRM_monitoring_report_2014.pdf
SCS review	Updated monitoring report has been completed and made available on the MRC/HRC website.
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2014.3	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC US FM Standard, Indicator 9.1.a
Non-Conformity: Although each group participant property is assessed for the presence of HCVF, those areas identified have not been mapped.	
Corrective Action Request: All HCVF areas identified on group participant properties shall be mapped.	
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	<p>Through the HCVF/RSA assessment, six potential HCVF types have been identified: (1) Class I WLPZ; (2) Class II WLPZ; (3) Pygmy forest; (4) Marbled Murrelet occupied areas; (5) Old Growth Type I; and (6) Old Growth Type II.</p> <p>Forestlands within the group certificate include all types except Marbled Murrelet occupied areas. Class I and Class II WLPZ are mapped in management plans. Only three participants have old growth stands on their forestlands – Webb-Harpe, Maillard, and JDSF (maps attached: JDSF_special_mgmt_areas_11x17_100k_topo.pdf; Maillard_old_growth.pdf; and Harpe_old_growth.pdf [page 61 listed as late seral areas]). The pygmy forest on JDSF is also shown on the JDSF special areas map.</p>
SCS review	Reviewed maps indicating HCVF areas. Reviewed management plan confirming that WLPZ zones are mapped.
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2014.4	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	Group Standard 30-005 4.1
<p>Non-Conformity: The auditor reviewed the information provided to two new group members this year and found most all the following information to be provided. The information provided new group members includes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) A welcome letter detailing requirements of the program 2) An executed copy of the participation agreement 3) A copy of the internal audit report of the property <p>However, group members are not provided with access or a link to the Group Operations Manual, which is located on the MRC website: http://www.mrc.com/pdf/MRCRM_manual_2010.pdf . Much of the information required under 4.1 is more completely described in this manual. Furthermore, the version of the manual currently on the website is out of date (2010, as opposed to the most recent 2012 version).</p>	
<p>Corrective Action Request: MRCRM shall update the Operations Manual found on the website and ensure all group members have access to this document.</p>	
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	
SCS review	The most recent vintage of the operations manual (2012) was added to the website.
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

4.2 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations

Finding Number: 2015.1	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US Forest Management Standard, Indicator 6.5.d
Background: Field review of road work at the Families Blue Lake property showed that water bar following a timber sale were constructed with excessive depth, and lacked the gradual slope into the water bar, so that they appeared closer to trenches. Discussions with the resource manager indicated that a relatively new equipment operator had installed the water bars. While they would function as erosion control devices to channel water off the road, they clearly were not implemented as designed .	
Observation: MRCRM should take necessary steps to ensure that forest workers are provided with sufficient guidance and supervision to implement their portion of the management plan.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2015.2	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US Forest Management Standard, Indicator 6.6.d
Background: Interviews with landowners at Hollister Ranch indicated that not all elements of a written prescription for pesticide use required by the indicator were completed, such as inclusion of a map of the treatment area. However, the FMU in question qualifies as a SLIMF, and would meet the less formal requirements under the family forest applicability note for 6.6.d.	
Observation: MRCRM should review its procedures for pesticide application to ensure that the requirements are met for when pesticides are used on its non-SLIMF properties.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

5. Stakeholder Comments

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

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

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

5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted

Group members	Consulting Foresters
---------------	----------------------

Stakeholder consultation activities are organized to give participants the opportunity to provide comments according to general categories of interest based on the three FSC chambers, as well as the SCS Interim Standard, if one was used. The table below summarizes the major comments received from stakeholders and the assessment team’s response. Where a stakeholder comment has triggered a subsequent investigation during the evaluation, the corresponding follow-up action and conclusions from SCS are noted below.

5.2 Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Responses from the Team, Where Applicable

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FME has not received any stakeholder comments from interested parties as a result of stakeholder outreach activities during this annual audit.	
Stakeholder comments	SCS Response
Economic concerns	
Social concerns	
Environmental concerns	

6. Certification Decision

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

7. Changes in Certification Scope

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

Name and Contact Information

Organization name	Mendocino Redwood Resource Manager Certification Program		
Contact person	Sarah Billig		
Address	Mendocino Redwood	Telephone	707-463-5125
	Company	Fax	707-463-5503
	P.O. Box 996	e-mail	sbillig@mendoco.com
	Ukiah, California 95482	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		
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)	21		
Number of FMU's in scope of certificate	26		
Geographic location of non-SLIMF FMU(s)	<i>Latitude & Longitude:</i>		
Forest zone	<input type="checkbox"/> Boreal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Temperate	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Subtropical	<input type="checkbox"/> Tropical	
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is: Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac			
privately managed	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 which is included in FMUs that: Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac			
are less than 100 ha in area	912 ac		
are between 100 ha and 1000 ha in area	17,309 ac		
meet the eligibility criteria as <i>low intensity</i> SLIMF FMUs	0		
Division of FMUs into manageable units:			
<p>Most group participants represent one FMU – most properties are further divided into management units. Three resource managers (Gill, Lindgren, and Howell) represent multiple FMUs as resource managers. Jackson Demonstration State Forest (JDSF) Mailliard Ranch, and Charles Mountain Ranch due to their size, further divide their land for management according to standard stand classifications and treatment options.</p>			

Non-SLIMF Group Members

Name	Contact information	Latitude/ longitude of Non-SLIMF FMUs	
Jackson Demonstration State Forest	Pam Linstedt, Forester Cal Fire	39.352260	-123.558623
Mailliard Ranch	Todd McMahan, NCRM	39.125488	-123.475307

Families Blue Lakes	Bob Kelley, NRM	40.54	-124.00
Charles Mountain Ranch	Tim Pricer, Owner	40.33	-123.68

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	2,700
Other:	0
Uneven-aged management	
Individual tree selection	90,606 (will be a mix of IT selection, GS, and other)
Group selection	0
Other:	0
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (e.g. nursery, recreation area, windbreak, bamboo, silvo-pastoral system, agro-forestry system, etc.)	
The sustainable rate of harvest (usually Annual Allowable Harvest or AAH where available) of commercial timber (m3 of round wood)	44.36 million board feet for all group members
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
Explanation of the assumptions and reference to the data source upon which AAH and NTFP harvest rates estimates are based:	
All data based on inventory, growth, and yield assessments of group members, all of which are reviewed by the State timber regulatory agency, Cal-Fire, under THP or NTMP review.	
Species in scope of joint FM/COC certificate: <i>Scientific/ Latin Name (Common/ Trade Name)</i>	
<i>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</i>	

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

Conservation Areas

Total area of forest and non-forest land protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for conservation objectives				
High Conservation Value Forest/ Areas				
High Conservation Values present and respective areas:		Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Code	HCV Type	Description & Location	Area
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV1	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g. endemism, endangered species, refugia).	Type I and II old growth (JDSF and Mailliard Ranch); NSO core areas (most participant sites); MAMU areas (JDSF);	7,397
<input type="checkbox"/>	HCV2	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant large landscape level forests, contained within, or containing the management unit, where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance.		
<input type="checkbox"/>	HCV3	Forests or areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems.		
<input type="checkbox"/>	HCV4	Forests or areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g. watershed protection, erosion control).		
<input type="checkbox"/>	HCV5	Forests or areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g. subsistence, health).		

<input type="checkbox"/>	HCV6	Forests or areas critical to local communities' traditional cultural identity (areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in cooperation with such local communities).		
Total Area of forest classified as 'High Conservation Value Forest/ Area'				7397 ac

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

<input type="checkbox"/> N/A – All forestland owned or managed by the applicant is included in the scope.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Applicant owns and/or manages other FMUs not under evaluation.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Applicant wishes to excise portions of the FMU(s) under evaluation from the scope of certification.	
Explanation for exclusion of FMUs and/or excision:	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 http://www.fire.ca.gov/resource_mgt/resource_mgt_stateforests.php
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

8. Annual Data Update

8.1 Social Information

Number of forest workers (including contractors) working in forest within scope of certificate (differentiated by gender):		
120 of male workers	2 of female workers	
Number of accidents in forest work since last audit:	Serious: 0	Fatal: 0

8.2 Annual Summary of Pesticide and Other Chemical Use

<input type="checkbox"/> FME does not use pesticides.				
Commercial name of pesticide / herbicide	Active ingredient	Quantity applied annually (kg or lbs)	Size of area treated during previous year	Reason for use
Glyphosate	Glyphosate	46.5 lbs.	20 + road	Control of invasive weeds
Imazapyr	Imazapyr	77 lbs	168	Tanoak control

