



RA-Cert Division Headquarters
65 Millet St. Suite 201
Richmond, VT 05477 USA
Tel: 802-434-5491
Fax: 802-434-3116
www.rainforest-alliance.org

Audit Managed by:
United States Regional Office
801 Highway 3 North, Suite 201
Northfield, MN 55057
Tel: 507-663-1115
Fax: 507-663-7771
Contact person: Beth Jacqumain
Email: bjacqumain@ra.org



ACCREDITED
FSC-ACC-004

FM-06 19 April 2012



Forest Management
2012 Annual audit
Report for:

Humbolt Redwood Company,
LLC
In
Scotia, California USA

Report Finalized: October 17, 2012
Audit Dates: May 24 & 25, 2012
Audit Team: Karen Brenner
Tawney Lem
Kyle Meister

Certificate code: SW-FM/COC-04551
Certificate issued: 12/14/09
Certificate expiration: 12/13/14

Organization Contact: Maralyn Renner,
Stewardship Director
Address: P.O. Box 37
Scotia, CA 95565

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	3
2. AUDIT FINDINGS AND RESULTS	3
2.1. AUDIT CONCLUSION.....	3
2.2. CHANGES IN FMEs' FOREST MANAGEMENT AND ASSOCIATED EFFECTS ON CONFORMANCE TO STANDARD REQUIREMENTS:.....	4
2.3. EXCISION OF AREAS FROM THE SCOPE OF CERTIFICATE.....	4
2.4. STAKEHOLDER ISSUES (<i>COMPLAINTS/DISPUTES RAISED BY STAKEHOLDERS TO FME OR RAINFOREST ALLIANCE SINCE PREVIOUS EVALUATION</i>):.....	4
2.5. CONFORMANCE WITH APPLICABLE NONCONFORMITY REPORTS	8
2.6. NEW NONCONFORMITY REPORTS ISSUED AS A RESULT OF THIS AUDIT	11
2.7. AUDIT OBSERVATIONS	14
3. AUDIT PROCESS	16
3.1. AUDITORS AND QUALIFICATIONS:.....	16
3.2. AUDIT SCHEDULE	17
3.3. SAMPLING METHODOLOGY:.....	17
3.4. STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION PROCESS	18
3.5. CHANGES TO CERTIFICATION STANDARDS.....	18
3.6. REVIEW OF FME DOCUMENTATION AND REQUIRED RECORDS	18
APPENDIX I: FSC Annual Audit Reporting Form:.....	20
APPENDIX II: List of visited sites (confidential)	22
APPENDIX III: List of stakeholders consulted (confidential)	24
APPENDIX IV: Forest management standard conformance (confidential)	27
APPENDIX V: Chain-of-Custody Conformance (confidential)	44
APPENDIX VI: Rainforest Alliance Database Update Form	49

Standard Conversions
1 mbf = 5.1 m ³
1 cord = 2.55 m ³
1 gallon (US) = 3.78541 liters
1 inch = 2.54 cm
1 foot = 0.3048 m
1 yard = 0.9144 m
1 mile = 1.60934 km
1 acre = 0.404687 hectares
1 pound = 0.4536 kg
1 US ton = 907.185 kg
1 UK ton = 1016.047 kg

1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to document annual audit conformance of Humbolt Redwood Company, LLC, hereafter referred to as Forest Management Enterprise (FME) or HRC. The report presents the findings of Rainforest Alliance auditors who have evaluated company systems and performance against the Forest Stewardship Council™ (FSC®) forest management standards and policies. Section 2 of this report provides the audit conclusions and any necessary follow-up actions by the company through nonconformity reports.

The Rainforest Alliance founded its previous SmartWood program in 1989 to certify responsible forestry practices and has grown to provide a variety of auditing services. Rainforest Alliance certification and auditing services are managed and implemented within its RA-Cert Division. All related personnel responsible for audit design, evaluation, and certification/verification/validation decisions are under the purview of the RA-Cert Division, hereafter referred to as Rainforest Alliance or RA.

This report includes information which will become public information. Sections 1-3 and Appendix I will be posted on the FSC website according to FSC requirements. All other appendices will remain confidential. A copy of the public summary of this report can be obtained on the FSC website at <http://info.fsc.org/>.

Dispute resolution: If Rainforest Alliance clients encounter organizations or individuals having concerns or comments about Rainforest Alliance and our services, these parties are strongly encouraged to contact Rainforest Alliance regional or Headquarters offices directly (see contact information on report cover). Formal complaints or concerns should be sent in writing.

2. AUDIT FINDINGS AND RESULTS

2.1. Audit conclusion

Based on Company's conformance with FSC and Rainforest Alliance requirements, the audit team makes the following recommendation:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Certification requirements <u>met</u>, certificate maintenance recommended Upon acceptance of NCR(s) issued below
<input type="checkbox"/>	Certification requirements <u>not met</u>:
Additional comments:	
Issues identified as controversial or hard to evaluate.	The Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) specifies a requirement to maintain 10% late seral habitat per watershed. State regulators have express concern that there are THPs submitted in the same watershed where late seral habitat was quantified differently, albeit during different years. HRC claims to have a new timber inventory to support these different methods. One agency initially approved the THP, while another questioned it. HRC remains in discussion with these agencies and specifically how to quantify and/or qualify late seral habitat, as well as its functionality and connectivity to other late seral and old growth stands. This issue was difficult to audit this year for the following reasons:1) HRC is still working to

gain a common understanding and interpretation from all the state agencies; 2) HRC is waiting on the results of a new inventory for the entire land base; and 3) Access to the specific THP under discussion was limited due to inclement weather and hazardous road conditions during this year's audit. Thus, it is recommended that the audit team revisit this issue in 2013.

2.2. Changes in FMEs' forest management and associated effects on conformance to standard requirements:

There was a reorganization at the executive level of the company and there is now a President of Operations as well as a President of Communications, Policy, and Planning. No other changes to forest management or the land base were made.

2.3 Excision of areas from the scope of certificate

Not applicable. Check this box if the FME has not excised areas from the FMU(s) included in the certificate scope as defined by FSC-POL-20-003. *(delete the rows below if not applicable)*

2.4. Stakeholder issues *(complaints/disputes raised by stakeholders to FME or Rainforest Alliance since previous evaluation):*

There were no official complaints or disputes (as per the FSC definition) received. However, some stakeholders, specifically the residents and HRC neighbors in Humboldt County are very active in forestry issues both collectively as members of various environmental associations as well as individuals such as owners of land neighboring HRC lands. During stakeholder consultation the following concerns were highlighted:

1. Flooding and sedimentation on the Elk River.
2. Stakeholder Engagement/Relations
3. Planting of redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens*) on sites that currently do not have redwood.
4. Potential harvesting of old-growth
5. Use of Herbicides to control hardwoods
6. Road Maintenance
7. Meeting the HCP requirements for the maintenance of late seral habitat
8. Potential for increased timber harvesting prior to decommissioning roads
9. HCP should be updated to reflect the current and best science

1. Flooding and sedimentation on the Elk River

The HRC lands include five watersheds that were declared environmentally impacted during the time that PALCO owned the property. Prior to HCR taking ownership, a Clean-up and Abatement Order (CAO) was issued by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) for Elk River and neighbors pursued litigation and obtained compensation for damage to their property from flooding and sediment deposition resulting from the management from the previous owner (PALCO). Consultation with neighbors, regulatory agencies, and HRC employees highlighted the on-going concerns regarding flooding that impedes access to homes every 1-2 years and the resulting deposition of sediment and impacts to the stream channel. The audit team interviewed stakeholders and visited the Elk River Watershed to better understand the complexities of the concerns.

HRC has attempted to address the overall concerns within the watershed by implementing the requirements of the CAO (i.e. decommissioning roads and storm proofing the remaining road network) and emphasizing uneven-aged management rather than the clear-cutting that was practiced by PALCO.

All interested parties (i.e. HRC, agencies, neighbors, ENGO) recognize that there are many challenges created by past management and current land uses in the Elk River Watershed. Moreover, the management prescribed by the CAO was based on analysis prior to HRC taking ownership. The assessment of potential short term and long-term impacts of implementing the CAO (as required by Criterion 6.1) were addressed in several documents, including the CAO, 2005 Report of Water Discharge, and in individual Timber Harvest Plans (THP). The audit team found that given the large scale of the implementation of the CAO projects and the resulting monitoring that HRC has completed, it is now time to analyze the monitoring results and ensure that the best available information is used to assess and document the potential short-term and long-term impacts of implementing future projects (i.e. road work, timber harvests) in the watershed. The audit team issued **NCR 02/12** and **OBS 05/12** to address the need to revisit the assessment of the impacts of management on the Elk River and incorporate the results of monitoring into the methodology and timing of implementing the projects. It is noteworthy that prior to the annual audit, HRC also recognized the need to incorporate the results of recently compiled monitoring and already began taking steps toward ensuring future conformance to both Criteria 6.1 and 8.4.

2. Stakeholder Engagement

Several stakeholders representing different interests noted that the company is willing to meet with them, but actions discussed are not always followed up on. Indicator 8.2.d.4 of the Standard requires that the manager monitors and records stakeholder responses to management plans as necessary. Interviews with HRC employees and a review of HRC documents shows that HRC maintains a good record of responses provided via the website, email or through feedback forms filled in by stakeholders at meetings. However, stakeholder responses provided during one-on-one meetings, field tours and phone conversations are not consistently recorded by employees. Further, in some cases HRC employees are taking actions to directly address stakeholder comments; however there is limited follow up with these stakeholders to make them aware of the action or to receive feedback on whether the actions addressed the impact reported by the stakeholder. This follow-up and feedback mechanism is not prescribed by the Standard, but it is a common aspect of monitoring and adaptive management that is built into its framework. **NCR 03/12** has been issued to ensure that stakeholder responses to management activities are monitored and recorded.

3. Planting of Redwood

Stakeholders expressed concern that HRC may be planting redwood on sites where redwood does not naturally occur. At the request of stakeholders, the audit team visited the Long Ridge Cable THP. Interviews with HRC staff and field observations indicated the intent to plant redwood on sites that currently and likely historically did not include redwood. The Long Ridge THP has not yet been approved by the state; so no management activity has occurred on the site. HRC has a procedure to complete an "Ecological Risk Assessment Checklist," which is intended to identify micro sites suitable for planting redwood. However, the checklist was not completed prior to submitting the Long Ridge Cable THP to the state. While use of the checklist tool does not necessarily

guarantee conformance to indicator 6.3.d, it is designed to help identify sites that may be suitable for redwood regeneration. **OBS 03/12** is issued since there is a potential for a future non-conformance if management practices do not maintain or enhance plant species composition, distribution and frequency of occurrences similar to those that would naturally occur on the site.

4. Management of Old-Growth

FME's old growth policies are described in detail in the 2012 update of the FMP for Type 1, Type 2, and individual old growth trees. Old growth trees are those that have been established on or before 1800 C.E. Interviews indicate that FME trains its staff on how to identify old growth trees and also uses an increment borer on larger trees that appear to have old growth characteristics.

The audit team visited the Long Ridge Cable THP in response to stakeholder concerns over the option to harvest in areas that may contain old-growth. Field observations indicated that the older trees within the units proposed for harvest do not meet HRC's definition of old-growth (established on or before 1800). However, many of these older trees do qualify as legacy trees. These legacy trees, which are reserved from harvest, are estimated to be 150-160 years old and were the seed source for most of the current stand. It is understandable that stakeholders could view these trees as old-growth because many of these legacy trees do exhibit morphology commonly associated with old-growth Douglas-fir. Additionally, while small portions of the THP have been previously harvested with patch or strip clear cuts, the majority of the acres in the THP have not been previously entered for timber harvest. Thus, the lack of clear evidence of past management, as well as the presence of the legacy trees, led the stakeholders to conclude that the stands may qualify as Type I old-growth. Additionally, the stakeholders considered the stands to be uneven-aged which would further substantiate the stakeholder's interpretation of these stands as potential Type I old-growth. However, the audit team concluded that the stands are predominately even-aged conifers overtopping hardwoods of the same age-class with scattered older legacy seed trees. These legacy trees are predominately located in riparian areas reserved entirely from harvest and scattered individual upland trees that are intended to be retained for wildlife value.

The audit team concluded that based on the HRC definition of old-growth, the sites visited do not meet the FSC definition of Type 1 or Type 2 old-growth. While the legacy trees on Long Ridge Cable THP are 150-160 years old and thus fall outside of the FME's old-growth definition conformance with indicator 6.3.f. does require that legacy trees are not harvested. Interviews and field observations indicate that HRC does intend to reserve all the legacy trees on the Long Ridge Cable THP. However, given the current HRC policies to reserve a minimum of four trees per acre of legacy trees for wildlife habitat there may be some stands where the FME's retention policies may not take into account the FSC requirement to reserve legacy trees that were established after 1800 (**See OBS 04/12**).

One stakeholder expressed concern regarding HRC defining old-growth as stands originating prior to 1800 rather than specifying a specific age (i.e. 200 years). HRC has included stakeholder consultation during the development of their old-growth definition and page 42 of the Forest Management Plan revised May 2012 states, "We have not yet located and mapped all of the smaller stands of old growth and we are still accepting stakeholder inputs to better define old growth on a species-specific basis." Thus, stakeholders with specific interest in old-growth management and definitions are encouraged to contact HRC.

5. Use of Herbicides to control hardwood such as tan oak
Stakeholders' concerns about the use of herbicides to control hardwoods range from a belief that there should be no use of herbicides due to a perceived impact on both vegetation, as well as aquatic fish habitat to just wanting to ensure that hardwoods and particularly larger tanoaks are maintained across the landscape for their wildlife value. Review of HRC's hardwood management policies and observations in the field indicate that HRC is managing to maintain all hardwood species across the landscape as well as within individual stands with a specific emphasis on the retention of larger diameter hardwoods. Both the use of herbicides and the retention of hardwoods conform to the FSC Standard and specifically to Criteria 6.3 and 6.6. Therefore, no nonconformance has been identified related to this issue.
6. Road Maintenance
One stakeholder expressed concern about the condition of roads; specifically that roads are getting very washboarded and that dust is bad. It is recognized that gravel forest roads are at times rough and dusty. However, field observations indicated that the road network was very well maintained and the condition of the road was well within that expected of forest roads. The audit team found conformance with Criterion 6.5 with regard to road maintenance.
7. Meeting the HCP requirements for late seral habitat:
The HCP specifies a requirement to maintain 10% late seral habitat per watershed. State regulators have express concern that there are THPs submitted in the same watershed where late seral habitat was quantified differently, albeit during different years. HRC claims to have a new timber inventory to support these different methods. One agency initially approved the THP, while another questioned it. HRC remains in discussion with these agencies and specifically on how to quantify and/or qualify late seral habitat, as well as its functionality and connectivity to other late seral and old growth stands. This issue was difficult to audit this year for the following reasons: 1) HRC is still working to gain a common understanding and interpretation from all the state agencies; 2) HRC is waiting on the results of a new inventory for the entire land base; 3.) Access to the specific THP under discussion was limited due inclement weather and hazardous road conditions during this year's audit. Thus, it is recommended that the audit team revisit this issue in 2013.
8. Concern about potential for increased cut prior to decommissioning roads
While HRC has invested significant resources into decommissioning roads as specified under the CAO, there is no indication that HRC is harvesting beyond the levels established under its Option A. Conformance was found to Criterion 5.6. Criterion 5.6 is required to be evaluated every year it will be important to re-evaluate conformance after the new forest wide inventory is completed.
9. HCP should be updated to reflect the current and best science
One stakeholder commented that the HCP is from PALCO days and is not based on the best science anymore. The stakeholder suggested that an update to the HCP is needed. For the purposes of determining conformance to FSC Principle 7 regarding the completion of a Forest Management Plan (FMP), all management planning documents (e.g., HCP, Public FMP, THPs) are reviewed collectively as the documentation guiding forest management activities and thus are considered "the Forest Management Plan" per FSC guidelines. HRC recently updated the FMP in 2012; however, updating the HCP requires collaboration with the regulatory agencies and thus is not solely within HRC's control.

Interviews with both HRC staff and state regulatory agencies indicate that they are interested in collaborating to improve and update the current HCP. HRC's process to complete the HCP, monitor its implementation, and collaborate with state agencies to update the HCP is in conformance with Criterion 7.2.

2.5. Conformance with applicable nonconformity reports

The section below describes the activities of the certificate holder to address each applicable non-conformity report (NCR) issued during previous evaluations. For each NCR a finding is presented along with a description of its current status using the following categories. Failure to meet NCRs will result in nonconformances being upgraded from minor to major status with conformance required within 3 months with risk of suspension or termination of the Rainforest Alliance certificate if Major NCRs are not met. The following classification is used to indicate the status of the NCR:

Status Categories	Explanation
Closed	Operation has successfully met the NCR.
Open	Operation has either <u>not met</u> or has <u>partially met</u> the NCR.

Check if N/A (there are no open NCRs to review)

NCR#:	01/11	NC Classification:	Major	Minor X
Standard & Requirement:	FSC-US Forest Management Standard (v1.0) July 8, 2012 Indicator 1.1.a Forest management plans and operations demonstrate compliance with all applicable federal, state, county, municipal, and tribal laws, and <i>administrative requirements</i> (e.g., regulations). Violations, outstanding complaints or investigations are provided to the <i>Certifying Body</i> (CB) during the annual audit.			
Report Section:	N/A			
Description of Nonconformance and Related Evidence:				
<p>During the course of the 2011 surveillance audit, two violations were revealed by HRC personnel in the course of conversation with the auditors concerning violations on the part of the FME. One involved the Dyersville Bridge on the Eel River which was not pulled out, as required in the DFG 1600 permit by October 15, 2010. Second, the State Water Resources Quality Control Board permit for the use of the bridge had expired and was not renewed in time. In addition, there was the detection of some potential non-compliances related to the FME's HCP during the course of the periodic monitoring performed by a third party. This related to sediments on road dips.</p> <p>During the closing meeting, HRC personnel were asked if there were other violations since the last audit. It was revealed that there were two. One concerned the use of a haul road, not initially outlined in an original THP as a road the FME would be using, but eventually did. The other concerned a California Department of Forestry (CAL FIRE) noting of a 1600 permit violation that related to the digging of a ditch deeper into the ground, in conjunction with an adjacent landowner to realign culvert flows between ownerships. A CAL FIRE inspector found that this work had resulted in a violation concerning the pooling of water during rainfall on a public road.</p> <p>In light of these discoveries, the auditors reminded the FME that violations, outstanding complaints or investigations need to be provided to the Certifying Body (CB) during the annual audit, and preferably at the start of the audit.</p>				
Corrective Action Request:	Organization shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above. Note: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific			

	occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the nonconformance.
Timeline for Conformance:	Prior to the next annual audit.
Evidence Provided by Organization:	See below.
Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:	HRC provided the Certifying Bodies (CBs) with details of all ongoing violations, outstanding complaints or investigations that have occurred since the last annual audit. FME should keep in mind that it must report these to the CBs at each audit. HCP non-compliances remain as "potential" until either finalized or dismissed by the HCP agencies.
NCR Status:	CLOSED
Comments (optional):	None

NCR#:	02/11	NC Classification:	Major	Minor X
Standard & Requirement:	FSC-US Forest Management Standard (v1.0, July 8, 2010), Indicator 4.4.a The forest owner or manager understands the likely social impacts of management activities, and incorporates this understanding into management planning and operations. Social impacts include effects on: Archeological sites and sites of cultural, historical and community significance (on and off the FMU; Public resources, including air, water and food (hunting, fishing, collecting); Aesthetics; Community goals for forest and natural resource use and protection such as employment, subsistence, recreation and health; Community economic opportunities; Other people who may be affected by management operations.			
Report Section:	Appendix IV 4.4			
Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:				
The CB was provided with the FME's latest FMP which contained a summary of the social impact assessment process, concentrating on community and archaeological, cultural, and historical sites. However, it was the assessment of the auditors that some activities the FME is known to engage in were not mentioned in this summary, and a more detailed analysis is needed of how social impact information is thereby incorporated back into forest management planning and operations. While an annual social monitoring report that summarizes the public inputs for the year will be made available on the FME's web site (hrcllc.com) starting 2011 year end and material changes to management policies developed from public inputs will be placed on the web site (www.hrcllc.com/Key Policies) and incorporated into future revisions of the FMP, both actions, while planned, are not implemented.				
Corrective Action Request:	Organization shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above. Note: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the non-conformance.			
Timeline for Conformance:	By the next annual audit			
Evidence Provided by Organization:	Refer to Management Plan pg. 80			
Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:	Indicator 4.4a of the Standard requires that the "manager understands the likely social impacts of management activities, and incorporates this understanding into management planning and operations..." On page 61 of the Forest Management Plan (FMP), HRC has summarized a list of issues known to be important to the community. This list includes environmental (e.g. over-harvesting, clearcutting, old growth, herbicide use), social (e.g. viewsheds, access, donations), cultural (e.g. traditional and customary rights of use, archaeological sites) and economic (e.g. employment, yield taxes) issues and is consistent with the bulleted list of social impacts in Indicator 4.4a. Within each THP, a cumulative impacts assessment is also			

	<p>prepared, which includes social impacts such as recreational resources, visual resource, vehicular traffic, and helicopter noise.</p> <p>During audit interviews, HRC employees were able to discuss each community issue in depth and were aware of how the issues related to specific stakeholders or areas of the property. Interviews with stakeholders confirmed that the list of issues identified by HRC was consistent with the issues raised by the stakeholders. Based on this, the audit team concludes that HRC has a good understanding of the likely social impacts of their management activities.</p> <p>In terms of HRC incorporating their understanding of social impacts into management planning, examples include utilization of local Licensed Timber Operators, protection of archaeological sites (cultural impacts), allowing certain activities to take place on the property (e.g. education, recreation, access), assisting with road and bridge maintenance, not harvesting old growth, and adjusting operation hours to address noise concerns. This evidence sufficiently demonstrated conformance with the Indicator.</p> <p>Indicator 4.4a does not prescribe that a manager makes a summary of material changes to management policies public; therefore this aspect of the non-conformance has not been addressed. Further, the “management plan” in the FSC context is not just the FMP, but refers to all planning documents of the manager. Since there is evidence of social impacts being addressed within Timber Harvest Plans, changes to the FMP specifically is not required by the FSC Standard.</p> <p>Therefore this NCR is closed.</p>
NCR Status:	CLOSED
Comments (optional):	The audit team did hear concerns from multiple stakeholders about a lack of follow through on comments that stakeholders provided to HRC employees. See NCR 03/12.

NCR#:	03/11	NC Classification:	Major	Minor X
Standard & Requirement:	FSC-US Forest Management Standard (v1.0, July 8, 2010), 7.1.r.			
Report Section:	Section 3			
Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:				
The audit team was provided with the FME’s latest FMP, which contained a summary of the social impact assessment process, concentrating on community and archaeological, cultural, and historical sites. However, it was the opinion of the auditors that some stakeholder outreach activities the FME is known to engage in were not mentioned in this summary.				
Corrective Action Request:	<p>Organization shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above.</p> <p>Note: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the non-conformance.</p>			
Timeline for Conformance:	By the next annual audit			
Evidence Provided by Organization:	Management Plan (Final 2012)			
Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:	Indicator 7.1r requires that “the management plan describe the stakeholder consultation process”. Pg. 61 of the plan summarizes that annual stakeholder meetings are “the primary method to facilitate stakeholder consultation”, and that HRC also meets with special interest groups for			

	<p>dialogue and field tours. As described on Page 62, the THP process is used to solicit and evaluate community concerns.</p> <p>Pages 80 and 81 of the management plan elaborates on the consultation process, and adds that input can also be provided through the web site, one-on-one discussions, and when HRC is conducting watershed analyses. Monitoring-reporting forms are used to track community inputs. The management plan further describes that management reviews analyze inputs to determine how inputs will be incorporated into final prescriptions.</p> <p>Discussions with HRC employees and stakeholders confirm that the consultation process as described in the management plan is current and comprehensive. Therefore, this NCR is closed.</p>
NCR Status:	CLOSED
Comments (optional):	None

2.6. New nonconformity reports issued as a result of this audit

NCR#:	01/12	NC Classification:	Major	Minor X
Standard & Requirement:	FSC-US Forest Management Standard (v1.0) July 8, 2012 Indicator 1.6.a The forest owner or manager demonstrates a long-term commitment to adhere to the FSC Principles and Criteria and FSC and FSC-US policies, including the FSC-US Land Sales Policy, and has a publicly available statement of commitment to manage the FMU in conformance with FSC standards and policies			
Report Section:	Appendix IV section 1.6.			
Description of Nonconformance and Related Evidence:				
FME demonstrates long-term commitment in multiple ways – 100% of the ownership is FSC certified, HRC recently began a forest carbon project under the Climate Action Reserve (which requires a 100 year project timeline), and there is a significant effort to create customer relationships that value FSC certified products. The FME does have a public statement of commitment to the FSC however; the language of the public statement does not specifically declare a commitment to manage the FMU in conformance with FSC “Standards and Policies”.				
Corrective Action Request:	Organization shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above. Note: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the nonconformance.			
Timeline for Conformance:	Prior to the next annual audit.			
Evidence Provided by Organization:	PENDING			
Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:	PENDING			
NCR Status:	OPEN			
Comments (optional):				

NCR#:	02/12	NC Classification:	Major	Minor X
Standard & Requirement:	FSC-US Forest Management Standard (v1.0) July 8, 2012 Indicator 6.1.b: Prior to commencing site-disturbing activities, the forest owner or manager assesses and documents the potential short and long-term impacts of planned management activities on elements 1-5 listed in Criterion 6.1.a.			

	The assessment must incorporate the best available information, drawing from scientific literature and experts. The impact assessment will at minimum include identifying resources that may be impacted by management (e.g., streams, habitats of management concern, soil nutrients). Additional detail (i.e., detailed description or quantification of impacts) will vary depending on the uniqueness of the resource, potential risks, and steps that will be taken to avoid and minimize risks.
Report Section:	Appendix IV section 6.1
Description of Nonconformance and Related Evidence:	
<p>Interviews with the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and HRC employees indicate that now that a significant amount of the work required by the Clean-up and Abatement Order (CAO) has been implemented and monitored, it is time to reconsider the analysis of the potential long-term and short-term impacts of future projects required by the CAO, including the specific methodology and timing of the projects.</p> <p>Previous assessment of the short-term impacts has primarily been associated with individual THPs and thus has not assessed the potential impacts of implementing such a large project across an entire watershed over a relatively short time span.</p> <p>Given the new information that may be gleaned from the monitoring of the CAO projects over the past several years and the fact that the documented assessment of the CAO's potential impacts is primarily conducted on an individual THP basis rather than considering the cumulative impacts of the road abatement projects throughout the entire watershed, a new assessment of the short-term and long-term impacts of completing the CAO is needed to demonstrate conformance with indicator 6.1.b.</p>	
Corrective Action Request:	Organization shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above. Note: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the nonconformance.
Timeline for Conformance:	Prior to the next annual audit.
Evidence Provided by Organization:	PENDING
Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:	PENDING
NCR Status:	OPEN
Comments (optional):	

NCR#:	03/12	NC Classification:	Major	Minor X
Standard & Requirement:	FSC-US Forest Management Standard (v1.0, July 8, 2010), Indicator 8.2.d.4 Stakeholder responses to management activities are monitored and recorded as necessary.			
Report Section:	Appendix IV section 8.2			
Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:				
<p>Stakeholder input can be provided through many means, including: one-on-one meetings, groups meetings, the website, email, or phone conversations. To facilitate an ongoing review of stakeholder responses, a Social Monitoring Form has been developed. Employees are instructed to provide the completed forms to the stewardship manager.</p> <p>There is a clear recording of responses provided via the website, email or through feedback forms filled in by stakeholders at meetings. However, stakeholder responses provided during one-on-one meetings, field tours and phone conversations are not consistently recorded by employees. Employees are also not consistently using the Social Monitoring Forms. Where records have been kept, they have not consistently been organized in a way that can be easily accessed or monitored.</p>				

<p>During audit interviews, several stakeholders expressed concern that during discussions with company employees, notes were not taken, and that actions discussed had not been followed up on by the company. Interviews with employees revealed that in some cases actions were in fact taken. However, the stakeholder was not made aware of that action, nor was there follow-up to obtain feedback from the stakeholder and thus monitor the effectiveness of the action taken. This situation may in part be a result of inadequate recording of stakeholder responses.</p>	
Corrective Action Request:	<p>Organization shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above.</p> <p>Note: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the non-conformance.</p>
Timeline for Conformance:	By the next annual audit
Evidence Provided by Organization:	PENDING
Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:	PENDING
NCR Status:	OPEN
Comments (optional):	None

NCR#:	04/12	NC Classification:	Major	Minor X
Standard & Requirement:	<p>FSC-US Forest Management Standard (v1.0) July 8, 2012 <i>FM-35 Rainforest Alliance Chain-of-Custody Standard for Forest Management Enterprises (FMEs)</i> CoC 1.3: FME procedures/work instructions shall provide effective control of FSC certified forest products (including NTFPs) from standing timber until ownership is transferred at the forest gate. <i>Note: For large scale operations (>10,000ha) and Group Entities, CoC procedures covering all relevant CoC criteria shall be documented.</i> Including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Procedures for physical segregation and identification of FSC certified from non-FSC certified material. (If applicable) b) Procedures to ensure that non-FSC certified material is not represented as FSC certified on sales and shipping documentation. (If applicable) c) Procedures to include the FME's FSC certificate registration code and FSC claim (FSC 100%) on all sales and shipping documentation for sales of FSC certified products. d) Recordkeeping procedures to ensure that all applicable records related to the production and sales of FSC certified products (e.g. harvest summaries, sales summaries, invoices, bills of lading) are maintained for a minimum of 5 years. e) Procedures to ensure compliance with all applicable FSC/Rainforest Alliance trademark use requirements. 			
Report Section:	Appendix V Chain-of-Custody Conformance			
Description of Nonconformance and Related Evidence:				
<p>While the FME does include the FSC certificate registration code and the FSC claim on all sales shipping documents and the shipping and sales documents are clearly linked, however, the documented procedures do not describe this requirement as specified in item c of indicator CoC 1.3 above.</p>				
Corrective Action Request:	<p>Organization shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above.</p> <p>Note: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the nonconformance.</p>			

Timeline for Conformance:	Prior to the next annual audit.
Evidence Provided by Organization:	PENDING
Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:	PENDING
NCR Status:	OPEN
Comments (optional):	

2.7. Audit observations

Observations can be raised when issues or the early stages of a problem are identified which does not of itself constitute a nonconformance, but which the auditor considers may lead to a future nonconformance if not addressed by the client. An observation may be a warning signal on a particular issue that, if not addressed, could turn into a NCR in the future (or a pre-condition or condition during a 5 year re-assessment).

OBS 01/12	Reference Standard & Requirement: FSC-US Forest Management Standard (v1.0, July 8, 2010), Indicator 2.3.b The forest owner or manager documents any significant disputes over tenure and use rights.
Description of findings leading to observation: HRC employees demonstrated that they maintain some documentation related to disagreements, concerns, and potential disputes (e.g. title searches), and also maintain a record of emails (both internal and external). However, discussions with stakeholders are often conducted by phone or face-to-face. Employees could not demonstrate that they consistently document these types of discussions. In the event that an issue escalated to become a formal dispute, these communications could be important evidence.	
Observation: FME should ensure future conformance with indicator 2.3.b.	

OBS 02/12	Reference Standard & Requirement: FSC-US Forest Management Standard (v1.0, July 8, 2010), Indicator 4.1.a Employee compensation and hiring practices meet or exceed the prevailing local norms within the forestry industry.
Description of findings leading to observation: With the switch from PALCO to HRC, some concerns have been expressed that jobs were not adequately reviewed and classified, which has affected rates of remuneration. Similarly, there has not been a job review since some employees have left and other employees have assumed new responsibilities. Human Resources began a market survey and wage review, but the review has not yet been completed for forest operations employees at the time of the audit.	
Observation: FME should ensure future conformance with indicator 4.1.a.	

OBS 03/12	Reference Standard & Requirement: FSC-US Forest Management Standard (v1.0, July 8, 2010) Indicator 6.3.d Management practices maintain or enhance plant species composition, distribution and frequency of occurrence similar to those that would naturally occur on the site.
Review of the Long Ridge Cable THP and interviews with HRC staff indicated the intent to plant redwood (<i>Sequoia sempervirens</i>) on sites that, based on field observation and stakeholder interviews, currently and likely historically did not include redwood. The Long Ridge THP has not yet been approved by the state; so no management activity has occurred on the site. Interviews indicated that the previous landowner (PALCO) planted redwood on a similar site approximately 8 years ago and the success of the redwood regeneration on this site was provided as evidence to support the proposed planting of redwood in the Long Ridge THP. HRC does have a procedure to complete an "Ecological Risk Assessment Checklist," which is intended to identify micro sites suitable for planting redwood. However, the checklist was not completed prior to submitting the Long Ridge Cable THP to the state. While use of the checklist tool does not necessarily guarantee conformance to indicator 6.3.d, it is designed to help	

identify sites that may be appropriate for redwood regeneration. An observation is written since there is a potential for a future non-conformance if management practices do not maintain or enhance plant species composition, distribution and frequency of occurrences similar to those that would naturally occur on the site.

Observation: FME should ensure future conformance to indicator 6.3.d.

OBS 04/12

Reference Standard & Requirement: FSC-US Forest Management Standard (v1.0, July 8, 2010) **Indicator 6.3.f** Management maintains, enhances, or restores habitat components and associated stand structures, in abundance and distribution that could be expected from naturally occurring processes.

These components include:

a) large live trees, live trees with decay or declining health, **snags**, and well-distributed coarse down and dead woody material. **Legacy trees** where present are not harvested; and

b) vertical and horizontal complexity.

Trees selected for **retention** are generally representative of the dominant species found on the site.

The audit team visited the Long Ridge Cable THP in response to stakeholder concerns that the harvest areas may contain old-growth. Field observations indicated that the older trees within the units proposed for harvest do not meet HRC's definition of old-growth (established on or before 1800 C.E.). However, many of these older trees qualify as legacy trees. These protected legacy trees are estimated to be 150-160 years old and were the seed source for most of the current stand. It is understandable that some stakeholders could view these trees as old-growth because many of these legacy trees do exhibit morphology commonly associated with old-growth Douglas-fir. Additionally, while small portions of the THP have been previously harvested with patch or strip clear cuts, the majority of the acres in the THP have not been previously entered for timber harvest. Thus, the lack of clear evidence of past management, as well as the presence of the legacy trees, led the stakeholders to conclude that the stands may qualify as Type I old-growth. Additionally, the stakeholders considered the stands to be uneven-age which would further substantiate the stakeholder's interpretation of these stands as potential Type I old-growth. However, the audit team concluded that the stands are predominately even-aged conifers overtopping hardwoods of the same age-class with scattered older legacy seed trees. These legacy trees are predominately located in riparian areas reserved entirely from harvest and scattered individual upland trees that are intended to be retained for wildlife value.

The audit team concluded that based on the HRC definition of old-growth, the sites visited do not meet the FSC definition of Type 1 or Type 2 old-growth. HRC's old-growth and hardwood retention policies serve to protect trees established on or prior to 1800 C.E. on the FMU. However, the legacy trees on Long Ridge Cable THP, which are 150-160 years old and thus fall outside of the FME's old-growth definition, are being protected for wildlife habitat and riparian protection. Conformance with indicator 6.3.f. requires that legacy trees are not harvested. However, HRC's wildlife tree retention policy targets legacy trees for retention at a stocking of 4 trees per acre and thus does not guarantee the protection of all individual trees that meet the legacy tree definition within a harvest unit if the trees were established after 1800 C.E. and not considered old-growth. Thus, there may be some stands where HRC's retention policies may not ensure the retention of all legacy trees established after 1800 C.E.

Observation: FME should ensure future conformance to indicator 6.3.f.

OBS 05/12	Reference Standard & Requirement: FSC-US Forest Management Standard (v1.0, July 8, 2010) Indicator 8.4.b: Where monitoring indicates that management objectives and guidelines, including those necessary for conformance with this Standard, are not being met or if changing conditions indicate that a change in management strategy is necessary, the management plan, operational plans, and/or other plan implementation measures are revised to ensure the objectives and guidelines will be met. If monitoring shows that the management objectives and guidelines themselves are not sufficient to ensure conformance with this Standard, then the objectives and guidelines are modified.
Description of findings leading to observation: Interviews with HRC staff and the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) indicate that the data collected to monitor the impacts of the implementation of the CAO (i.e. TMDL data) may show a need to revise the future implementation (i.e. rate, methodology) of the CAO projects in order to meet management objectives and mitigate short-term and long-term cumulative impacts. HRC has compiled monitoring data and plans to meet with the RWQCB this summer to present the monitoring information. Based on the review of the monitoring information, HRC should ensure future conformance with 8.4.b by incorporating the results of monitoring into the implementation of the CAO.	
Observation: FME should ensure future conformance to indicator 8.4.b.	

3. AUDIT PROCESS

3.1. Auditors and qualifications:

Auditor Name:	Karen Brenner	Auditor role:	Lead auditor (RA)
Qualifications: Over the past 12 years, Karen Brenner (B.S. Forestry) has conducted numerous CoC audits and assessments as well as 24 forest management audits and assessments for the SmartWood Program of the Rainforest Alliance. Karen attended CoC and FM lead assessor training conducted by SmartWood and also successfully completed ISO-9001 Lead Auditor Training in Dec 2010. In addition to consulting with SmartWood, Karen has over a decade of experience as a field forester implementing and managing timber sales, developing silvicultural prescriptions, suppressing forest fires, and managing pre-commercial timber and reforestation programs for the US Forest Service and Nez Perce Tribe.			
Auditor Name:	Kyle Meister	Auditor role:	Lead auditor (SCS)
Qualifications: Kyle Meister is a Certification Forester with Scientific Certification Systems. He has been with SCS since 2008 and has conducted FSC pre-assessments, evaluations, and surveillance audits in Brazil, Panama, Mexico, Costa Rica, Bolivia, Indonesia, India, Japan, New Zealand, and all major forest producing regions of the United States. Mr. Meister has successfully completed CAR Lead Verifier, ISO 9001:2008 Lead Auditor, and SA8000 Social Systems Introduction and Basic Auditor Training Courses. He holds a B.S. in Natural Resource Ecology and Management and a B.A. in Spanish from the University of Michigan; and a Master of Forestry from the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies. Mr. Meister has experience as an environmental educator and natural resource consultant in the U.S., Mexico, Ecuador, Costa Rica, Colombia, and Brazil. He is responsible for reviewing all of SCS' forest management reports from Latin America. He is a member of the Forest Guild, Society of American Foresters, and Cascadia Green Building Council.			
Auditor Name:	Tawney Lem	Auditor role:	Social impact assessor (RA)
Tawney Lem is an assessor focused on Aboriginal and socio-economic issues with B.A. Political			

Science. Since 2003 she has been contracted by Rainforest Alliance on 31 assessments, reassessments, annual audits and gap analyses in BC, Alberta, Manitoba, Ontario, Oregon, Pennsylvania and California. She has also conducted a certifying body accreditation audit with Accreditation Services International. Tawney is an independent consultant providing policy development and analysis services in the areas of governance and land use. The current focus of her work is assisting First Nations with treaty land selection, and as a LEED Accredited Professional is also working on the development of an eco-resort on the West Coast of BC. Ms. Lem's bachelor's degree in Political Science is from the University of British Columbia, and she has taken Rainforest Alliance's Assessor training course. Tawney was a member of the AIPac annual audit teams in 2007 and 2008.

3.2. Audit schedule

Date	Location /Main sites	Principal Activities
May 1-18	Auditors Offices	Stakeholder Consultation, Employee phone interviews, and Document review
May 24	HRC Scotia Office	Opening Meeting
May 24	Field Tour (Meister) VanDuzen Eel/Shively Sustainability Units:	Visited Above Elenor 10 THP, Fiedler Rodeo THP, and Rooute Creek West THP. Interviews with contractors, visit active and closed timber harvest units and review road decommissioning work.
	Field Tour (Brenner) Elk Sustainability Unit:	Visited Dunlap Brown THP, Moss Elk THP, Road Decommissioning. Contractor Interview, Active and Closed timber harvest units.
May 24	Stakeholder meetings (Lem, Brenner, Meister)	Stakeholder consultation regarding: Elk River, Mattole, and tribal relations
May 24	HRC Offices	Review of property records system, Mattole information, monitoring activities, and invasive species.
May 25	HRC Offices	Employee Interviews
May 25	Field Tour: Mattole	Visit proposed Long Ridge Cable THP
May 25	HRC Office	Closing Meeting
May 28-Jun 1	Auditor Offices	Additional Stakeholder consultation via phone interviews & Document Review
June 19	Closing Meeting Continued via phone	Discuss findings after review of additional stakeholder consultation and evidence provided to audit team.
Total number of person days used for the audit:12 = number of auditors participating 3 X average number of days spent in preparation, on site and post site visit follow-up including stakeholder consultation 4		

3.3. Sampling methodology:

HRC holds a single FMU Certificate of 84,703 hectares. The sampling strategy of the audit team was specifically designed to address both the individual criteria selected for the 2012, items raised during stakeholder consultation, and other elements required annually or of large landowners. Stakeholder consultation and active timber harvesting, were two primary factors selected by auditors to determine field sites inspected during the 2012 audit.

The individual sites selected facilitated the review and observation of: active timber harvesting; recently completed timber harvest units; harvest units completed 2 years ago; road improvement and decommissioning; harvesting near or adjacent to FSC category A, B, C, & D streams; complex stakeholder issues in the Elk River Watershed; management of legacy trees and old-growth within timber harvest plans; reforestation prescriptions; and a range of silvicultural harvest prescriptions.

3.4. Stakeholder consultation process

The stakeholder consultation process began with a public notification being sent via email on April 20, 2012. Individuals, ENGOs, companies, and agencies were notified of the audit and encouraged to participate by contacting either Rainforest Alliance or SCS. Significant effort was made to reach out to a variety of stakeholders. The audit team made numerous phone calls, attended a stakeholder meeting of neighbors and an ENGO and attended a dinner meeting with local activists.

Stakeholder type (i.e. NGO, government, local inhabitant etc.)	Stakeholders notified (#)	Stakeholders consulted or providing input (#)
HRC Employees	0	13
Government Agencies	39	12
Local Neighbors and Activists	18	17
ENGO	10	5
Contractors	26	2
Academic	10	0
Tribal	6	2

3.5. Changes to Certification Standards

Forest stewardship standard used in audit:	FSC-US Forest Management Standard (v1.0)
Revisions to the standard since the last audit:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No changes to standard. <input type="checkbox"/> Standard was changed (detail changes below)
Changes in standard:	
Implications for FME:	Not applicable - no new requirements

3.6. Review of FME Documentation and required records

a) All certificate types

Required Records	Reviewed
Complaints received by FME from stakeholders, actions taken, follow up communication	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Comments: No formal complaints were recorded.	
Accident records	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments: Accident records are maintained by the Safety Manager a summary of the records were provided.	
Training records	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>

Comments: HRC provided a matrix of the training provided to each employee during the past year.	
Operational plan(s) for next twelve months	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments: The operational plans and proposed harvest volumes by area was provided.	
Inventory records	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments: Inventory records were observed and summarized in the forest management plan.	
Harvesting records	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments: The harvest volumes from the past year were reviewed.	

APPENDIX I: FSC Annual Audit Reporting Form:

Forest management enterprise information:			
FME legal name:	Humboldt Redwood Company, LLC		
FME Certificate Code:	SW-FM/COC – 004551		
Reporting period	Previous 12 month period	Dates	July 1, 2011 – July 1, 2012

1. Scope Of Certificate			
Type of certificate: single FMU	SLIMF Certificate: not applicable		
New FMUs added since previous evaluation	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Group Certificate: Updated of FMU and group member list provided in Appendix VII-a:			
Multi-FMU Certificate: List of new FMUs added to the certificate scope:			
FMU Name/Description	Area	Forest Type	Location Latitude/Longitude
	ha		
	ha		
	ha		

2. FME Information	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No changes since previous report (if no changes since previous report leave section blank)	
Forest zone	
Certified Area under Forest Type	
- Natural	hectares
- Plantation	hectares
Stream sides and water bodies	Linear Kilometers

4. Forest Area Classification	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No changes since previous report (if no changes since previous report leave section blank)	
Total certified area	hectares
Total forest area in scope of certificate	hectares
Ownership Tenure	
Management tenure:	
Forest area that is:	
Privately managed	hectares
State/Public managed	hectares
Community managed	hectares
Area of production forests (areas where timber may be harvested)	hectares
Area without <u>any</u> harvesting or management activities: strict forest reserves	hectares

5. High Conservation Values identified via formal HCV assessment by the FME and respective areas			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No changes since previous report (if no changes since previous report leave section blank)			
Code	HCV TYPES ¹	Description:	Area
HCV1	Forest areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of		ha

¹ The HCV classification and numbering follows the ProForest HCVF toolkit. The toolkit also provides additional explanation regarding the categories. Toolkit is available at <http://hcvnetwork.org/library/global-hcv-toolkits>.

	biodiversity values (e.g. endemism, endangered species, refugia).		
HCV2	Forest 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.		ha
HCV3	Forest areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems.		ha
HCV4	Forest areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g. watershed protection, erosion control).		ha
HCV5	Forest areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g. subsistence, health).		ha
HCV6	Forest areas critical to local communities' traditional cultural identity (areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in cooperation with such local communities).		ha
TOTAL HCVF AREA			ha
Number of sites significant to indigenous people and communities			

3. Workers

Number of workers including employees, part-time and seasonal workers:		
Total number of workers	61 workers	
- Of total workers listed above	55 Male	6 Female
Number of serious accidents	0	
Number of fatalities	0	

6. Pesticide Use

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FME does not use pesticides. (delete rows below)
--

APPENDIX VI: Rainforest Alliance Database Update Form

Instructions: For each FSC certificate, Rainforest Alliance is required to upload important summary information about each certificate to the FSC database (FSC-Info). During each annual audit RA auditors should work with the certificate holder to verify that the information posted on FSC-Info is up to date as follows:

1. Print out current Fact Sheet prior to audit from FSC-Info website or direct link to fact sheets (<http://www.fsc-info.org>)
2. Review information with the FME to verify all fields are accurate.
3. If changes are required (corrections, additions or deletions), **note only the changes** to the database information in the section below.
4. The changes identified to this form will be used by the RA office to update the FSC database.

Is the FSC database accurate and up-to-date? YES NO
(if yes, leave section below blank)

Client Information (contact info for FSC website listings)

Organization name			
Primary Contact		Title	
Primary Address		Telephone	
Address		Fax	
Email		Webpage	

Forests

Change to Group Certificate	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Change in # of parcels in group	total members
Total certified area		Hectares (or)	Acres

Species (note if item to be added or deleted)

Scientific name	Common name	Add/Delete

Products

FSC Product categories added to the FM/CoC scope (FSC-STD-40-004a)		
Level 1	Level 2	Species