

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

Humboldt Redwood Company, LLC

Northern California, USA

SCS-FM/COC-00120N

P.O. Box 712

Scotia, California 95565 – United States of America

Sarah Billig, Director, Stewardship

sbillig@mendoco.com

<http://www.hrcllc.com/>

CERTIFIED	EXPIRATION
01/Dec/2014	30/Nov/2019

DATE OF FIELD AUDIT
17-18 October 2016
DATE OF LAST UPDATE
7/Oct/2017

SCS Contact:

Brendan Grady | Director
Forest Management Certification
+1.510.452.8000

bgrady@scsglobalservices.com

SCS global
SERVICES
Setting the standard for sustainability™

Foreword

Cycle in annual surveillance audits			
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 st annual audit	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2 nd annual audit	<input 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:			
Humboldt Redwood Company, LLC (HRC)			

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

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

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

Organization of the Report

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

Table of Contents

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY	4
1. GENERAL INFORMATION	4
1.1 Annual Audit Team.....	4
1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation	4
1.3 Standards Employed	4
2 ANNUAL AUDIT DATES AND ACTIVITIES	5
2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities	5
2.2 Evaluation of Management Systems	6
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	Error! Bookmark not defined.
5. STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS	11
5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted	11
5.2 Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Responses from the Team, Where Applicable	12
6. CERTIFICATION DECISION	12
7. CHANGES IN CERTIFICATION SCOPE	12
8. ANNUAL DATA UPDATE	16
8.1 Social Information	16
8.2 Annual Summary of Pesticide and Other Chemical Use	16
SECTION B – APPENDICES (CONFIDENTIAL)	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
Appendix 1 – List of FMUs Selected For Evaluation.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Appendix 2 – List of Stakeholders Consulted.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Appendix 3 – Additional Audit Techniques Employed.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Appendix 4 – Pesticide Derogations	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Appendix 5 – Detailed Observations.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Appendix 6 – Chain of Custody Indicators for FMEs.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY

1. General Information

1.1 Annual Audit Team

Auditor Name	Dr. Robert J. Hrubes	Auditor Role:	Lead auditor
Qualifications:	Mr. Grady is the Director, 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 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.		
Auditor Name:	Richard B. Standiford, Ph.D.	Auditor role:	Team auditor
Qualifications:	Dr. Standiford has served as Cooperative Extension Forest Management Specialist at UC Berkeley for 35 years. He is a registered professional forester in California (#2015). He has a BS in forestry from North Carolina State University, an MS in Silviculture from UC Berkeley, and a PhD in Agricultural Economics from UC Davis. He teaches forest management at Berkeley, and conducts extension education programs for a broad array forest and oak woodland management topics. He has been involved in over 170 published peer reviewed articles, publications, book chapters, technical reports and articles, and leaflets in the areas of forest management, silviculture, forest economics, and forest policy. He has served as Associate Dean for Forestry at the Berkeley Campus, Associate Vice President and Acting Vice President for the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources at the UC Office of the President in the Oakland office of UC.		

1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation

A. Number of days spent on-site assessing the applicant:	2
B. Number of auditors participating in on-site evaluation:	2
C. Additional days spent on preparation, stakeholder consultation, and post-site follow-up:	3
D. Total number of person days used in evaluation:	7.0

1.3 Standards Employed

1.3.1. Applicable FSC-Accredited Standards

Title	Version	Date of Finalization
FSC-US Forest Management Standard	1.0	July 8, 2010
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

October 17, 2016	
FMU/Location/ sites visited	Activities/Notes
HRC Offices	Opening Meeting: Introductions, client update, review audit scope, audit plan, intro/update to FSC and SCS standards and protocols, review of open CARs/OBS, final site selection
Field visits (PM)	<p>Yager Lager THP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Active harvest operations, Steve Wells Logging side review of safety equipment and spill kits Selection harvest goal of 120 basal area post harvest <p>Lawrence Creek off-channel restoration area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> off channel habitat enhancement project consisting of a small pond acting as a refuge for fish during high water flows 2015 construction, site visited after its first winter, surveys conducted demonstrated the pond was successfully being used as a fish refuge. <p>Square Root THP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Active harvest operations, Chambers Logging side review of safety equipment and spill kits Selection harvest following HRC's standard prescriptions <p>Beargate road culvert replacement, discussion of HCP monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">
HRC Offices	Document and record review
October 18, 2016	
FMU/Location/ sites visited	Activities/Notes
Field visits (Grady)	<p>Chasing Brush Unit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pre-commercial thinning unit, stand was even-aged resulting from clearcut under prior ownership circa 2001. Ridgetop unit with primarily Doug-fir planted, HRC is dealing with a large age class of even-aged stands that are gradually being transitioned to their desired uneven aged <p>Chase Ranch Unit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PCT in 20 year old pure Doug-fir stand. Steeper ground required use of a yarder. Post treatment monitoring for disease and bear damage All sites entered in vegetation management tracking system as part of their GIS

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sites receive botany review, standard seasonal restrictions for operating for owl and murrelet habitat. <p>Brushy Monument Unit 6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PCT of legacy clearcut 2015 Release of tanoak required control with herbicide (foliar and frill) after the PCT Interspersed planting <p>Purview Unit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2016 PCT of legacy clearcut, required frilling <p>Chasing Brush Unit 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PCT unit, made challenging by high density of ceanothus cover <p>Logger interview – Lewis Logging</p> <p>BR 15 THP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Active logging site Combination of Dispersed Variable Retention harvest and selection harvests, choice of silvicultural method primarily based on existing basal area of pre-harvest stand (e.g. lower basal area receive VR) <ul style="list-style-type: none">
Field Visit (Standiford)	Elk River Watershed tour, review of water quality control measures, active timber operations.
HRC Offices (PM)	Review of GIS system and vegetation management tracking
HRC Offices (PM)	<p>Closing Meeting Preparation: Auditor team takes time to consolidate and compare notes and confirm audit findings</p> <p>Closing Meeting and Review of Findings: Convened with all relevant staff to summarize audit findings, potential non-conformities and next steps</p>

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 significant changes in HRC’s management practices occurred since the last audit.

4. Results of the Evaluation

4.1 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations

Finding Number: 2015.1	
Select one: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU): N/A	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	5.6.a
<p>Non-Conformity: From Minor CAR 2014.5: HRC has demonstrated that it is harvesting at levels at or below maximum sustained yield through an “Option A” analysis/document that is appended to all Timber Harvest Plans (THPs). Though HRC has owned and operated this forest estate for over 5 years, it is still operating under an Option A that was developed by the previous owner, Pacific Lumber Company. The Pacific Lumber Option A was developed on the premise of even-aged management, extensive clearcutting and long-term harvest patterns that collectively are irrelevant to HRC’s management intent, plans and practices.</p> <p>In conflict with the requirements of the FSC US National Standard, HRC’s sustained yield harvest level calculation is not based on silvicultural practices that it is employing on the forest estate; nor is the sustained yield harvest level calculation based on HRC’s (rather than PL’s) management objectives and desired future conditions.</p>	
<p>Corrective Action Request: Formerly Minor CAR 2014.5: Be it through a new Option A analysis or through another process separate from the California Forest Practice Regulations, HRC must develop and make publicly available a sustained yield harvest level calculation that is based on current inventory data as well as silvicultural systems and prescriptions that HRC is utilizing or intends to utilize. The sustained yield analysis must be based on HRC’s management practices and HRC’s desired future conditions for the certified forest.</p>	
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	<p><i>March 29, 2016 update</i></p> <p><i>HRC has completed a thorough Option A analysis document detailing the updated forest inventory and landscape objectives and plan, as well as sustained production projections based on current management objectives and silvicultural practices. HRC’s Option A document was made publically</i></p>

	<i>available on the 29th of March 2016 via the company website (http://www.hrcllc.com/plans-reports/option-a/). This document will be submitted with a future Timber Harvest Plan and reviewed by CAL FIRE during the THP review process.</i>
SCS review	HRC submitted evidence that the revised sustained yield analysis was posted to their website, thus making the document publicly available. Thus the finding is closed.
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: 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): N/A	
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:	6.4.d.
Issue: In CAR 2014.8, a revision of HRC’s RSA gap assessment was required as part of a proposed RSA classification in the Mattole watershed. This proposal was ultimately not pursued, removing the immediate need for a revision of HRC’s RSA classifications. However, regardless of whether HRC chooses to designate additional RSAs, a review and update of the RSA gap assessment is required no less frequently than every 10 years by the standard. HRC’s own plans indicate that it should be done more frequently than this.	
Observation: To avoid a future non-conformity, HRC managers should be aware that the company’s RSA gap assessment will need to be updated within 10 years of its most recent assessment, completed in preparation for HRC’s initial certification evaluation in 2009.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	
SCS review	No response required since this was a non-binding observation. HRC is aware that the RSA assessment will need to be reviewed and updated in accordance with the requirement of the standard.
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: 2015.3	
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): N/A	
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:	6.5.d.
Issue: To avoid or reduce short and long-term environmental impacts such as habitat fragmentation and soil disturbance, managers of certified forests are expected to minimize road density, including closing and rehabilitating unneeded roads.	
Observation: Conformity to this Indicator could be more readily demonstrated if HRC compiled and maintained up-to-date and spatially-specific records of miles of new roads and miles of decommissioned roads.	
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	
SCS review	Road density data had been available and was reviewed during the 2016 audit. Road density by watershed sub-basin is tracked as part of HRC's watershed analysis required under their Habitat Conservation Plan.
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: 2015.4	
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): N/A	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify): 4 months from receipt of audit report.
FSC Indicator:	6.7.b.
Non-Conformity: At one of the logging sites inspected during the 2015 audit, it was observed that there was not a spill kit in reasonable proximity to the yarder. As such, that operation was not in compliance with the requirement that, in the event of a spill of hazardous material, the spill is "immediately contained."	
Corrective Action Request: HRC must work with its contractors to assure that spill kits are maintained in close proximity to every logging/yarding/hauling site so as to be able to immediately contain any spills of hazardous materials that may occur.	
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	Use of spill kits were made the focus of HRC's annual logger training.
SCS review	Field review during the audit found that all logging sides had spill kits readily

	available. Thus the finding is closed.
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i>

Finding Number: 2015.5	
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): N/A	
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:	8.5.a.
Issue: An up-to-date summary of the results of the company’s monitoring activities, covering the requisite subject matters, must be made publicly available.	
Observation: Ongoing conformity to this Indicator would be better assured if the company adopted a written policy regarding the frequency of updates to its publicly available summary of monitoring results. Annual updates would best demonstrate conformity.	
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	Additions were made to the summary of monitoring activities on the HRC website.
SCS review	HRC maintains a dedicated portion of their website to providing a summary of monitoring activities. While the update period is not specified, in practice most monitoring data sets are updated annually, e.g. harvest and inventory, road maintenance and restoration, rare plant monitoring.
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i>

4.2 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations from the 2015 Audit

Finding Number: 2016.1	
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): N/A	

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:	1.6.a
Issue: Interviews with contract loggers did not generally show an understanding or awareness of FSC certification and the role it played in HRC’s forest management. While not rising to a non-conformity, this was surprising given the company’s longstanding commitment to FSC.	
Observation: Ongoing conformity to this Indicator could be better demonstrated by increased awareness of FSC certification amongst forest workers.	
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

5. Stakeholder Comments

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

- To solicit input from affected parties as to the strengths and weaknesses of the FME’s management, relative to the standard, and the nature of the interaction between the 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

Logging contractors	
---------------------	--

--	--

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

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

Humboldt Redwood Company Stakeholder Summary and Team Response

Stakeholder Comments	SCS Response
Economic Concerns	
Recruiting younger loggers has been a challenge. Not sure where the next generation is going to come from.	This is noted as being a challenge across the redwood region, which HRC is aware of and concerned about. No current evidence of non-conformance, as HRC was still able to accomplish its harvesting and land management goals.
Social Concerns	
None received as part of this audit	
Environmental Concerns	
None received as part of this audit	

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	Humboldt Redwood Company, LLC
-------------------	-------------------------------

Contact person	Sarah Billig, Director, Stewardship		
Address Scotia, CA 95565	P.O. Box 712	Telephone	(707) 764-4199
	Telephone	Fax	(707) 764-4400
		e-mail	sbillig@mendoco.com
		Website	hrcllc.com

FSC Sales Information

<input type="checkbox"/> FSC Sales contact information same as above.			
FSC salesperson	Adam Steinbuck, Director, Asset Management		
Address	P.O. Box 712 Scotia, CA 95565	Telephone	707-485-6720
		Fax	707-485-7918
		e-mail	asteinbuck@mendoco.com
		Website	mrc.com

Scope of Certificate

Certificate Type	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Single FMU		<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple FMU	
	<input 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)				
Number of FMU's in scope of certificate	1			
Geographic location of non-SLIMF FMU(s)	Latitude: 40°50'25" - 40°08'16"degrees North Longitude: 124°12'44" - 123°42'36" degrees West			
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	209,661 ac			
state managed	0			
community managed	0			
Number of FMUs in scope that are:				
less than 100 ha in area	0	100 - 1000 ha in area	0	
1000 - 10 000 ha in area	0	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 type="checkbox"/> ac
are less than 100 ha in area	0			
are between 100 ha and 1000 ha in area	0			
meet the eligibility criteria as low intensity SLIMF FMUs	0			
Division of FMUs into manageable units:				

--

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)	172,238
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	49,780
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by natural regeneration, or by a combination of natural regeneration and coppicing of the naturally regenerated stems	122,548
Silvicultural system(s)	Area under type of management
Even-aged management	
Clearcut (clearcut size range)	0
Shelterwood	0
Other:	12,194
Uneven-aged management	
Individual tree selection	52,102
Group selection	107,942
Other:	
<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)	55 mmbf averaged annually from 2008-2017
Non-timber Forest Products (NTFPs)	
Area of forest protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for the production of NTFPs or services	28,415
Other areas managed for NTFPs or services	
Approximate annual commercial production of non-timber forest products included in the scope of the certificate, by product type	N/A
Explanation of the assumptions and reference to the data source upon which AAH and NTFP harvest rates estimates are based:	
<p>The company is committed to an average annual harvest rate of 55MMBF through the year 2017. Thereafter it is expected that the rate of harvest will increase. This increase will be based on landscape planning using the FORSEE growth-and-yield model. HRC is in the final stages of preparing a new Option A with updated landscape planning information and harvest rates.</p>	
Species in scope of joint FM/COC certificate: <i>Scientific/ Latin Name (Common/ Trade Name)</i>	
<p>Coastal redwood (<i>Sequoia sempervirens</i>), Douglas-fir (<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>), Grand fir (<i>Abies grandis</i>), Tanoak (<i>Notholithocarpus densiflorus</i>)</p>	

FSC Product Classification

Timber products		
Product Level 1	Product Level 2	Species
W1 Rough Wood	W1.1 Roundwood (logs)	All
W1 Rough Wood	W1.2 Fuel wood	All
W3 Wood in chips or particles	W3.1 Wood chips	All
Non-Timber Forest Products		
Product Level 1	Product Level 2	Product Level 3 and Species
NA		

Conservation Areas

Total area of forest and non-forest land protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for conservation objectives		28,637 ac		
High Conservation Value Forest/ Areas				
High Conservation Values present and respective areas:		Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac		
	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).	Refugia forest stands containing Type 1 and Type 2 old growth redwood and Douglas-fir not included in HCV2	1,198 ac
<input checked="" 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.	Larger scale refugia redwood forests containing Type 1 and Type 2 old growth along with second growth preserved in marbled murrelet conservation areas (MMCAs)	6,515 ac
<input type="checkbox"/>	HCV3	Forests or areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems.		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV4	Forests or areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g. watershed protection, erosion control).	Riparian Management Zones (RMZs)	35,830 ac
<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'	43,543 ac
--	-----------

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>N/A – All forestland owned or managed by the applicant is included in the scope.</i>		
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Applicant owns and/or manages other FMUs not under evaluation.</i>		
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Applicant wishes to excise portions of the FMU(s) under evaluation from the scope of certification.</i>		
Explanation for exclusion of FMUs and/or excision:		
Control measures to prevent mixing of certified and non-certified product (C8.3):		
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 type="checkbox"/> ac)

8. Annual Data Update

8.1 Social Information

Number of forest workers (including contractors) working in forest within scope of certificate (differentiated by gender):		
#of male workers 182	# of female workers 10	
Number of accidents in forest work since last audit	Serious: # 0 HRC	Fatal: #1 contractor

8.2 Annual Summary of Pesticide and Other Chemical Use

<input type="checkbox"/> <i>FME does not use pesticides.</i>				
Commercial name of pesticide / herbicide	Active ingredient	Quantity applied annually (lbs)	Size of area treated during previous year	Reason for use
Arsenal	Imazapyr	569	939 ac	Release/establishment conifers. Frill
Element 3A	Triclopyr amine	76.5	55 ac	Foliar, establishment/release conifers
Mad Dog Plus	Glyphosate	68	55 ac	Foliar, establishment/release conifers
Polaris AC	Imazapyr	244	444 ac	Release/establishment conifers. Frill
Ranger Pro	Glyphosate	70	93 ac	Foliar, establishment/release

				conifers
Rodeo	Glyphosate	22	26 ac	Foliar, establishment/release conifers
Rotary 2SL	Imazapyr	222.5	362.5 ac	Foliar, establishment/release conifers
SFM 75	Sulfometuron Methyl	16.4	95 ac	Foliar, establishment/release conifers
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>FME does not use pesticides.</i>				

