



Surveillance Audit Report

Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Standard

October 24, 2009

A. The Conservation Fund North Coast Forest Conservation Program

FRS #: 6R031

B. Scope:

Land management on the North Coast Forest Conservation Program of The Conservation Fund and related sustainable forestry activities in California. The SFI Certificate Number is NSF-SFIS-6R031.

No Change

Changed (see Section H, revised scope statement noted on FRS)

C. NSF Audit Team:

Lead Auditor: Mike Ferrucci

Auditor: Dr. Robert Hrubes

D. Audit Date(s): October 5-6, 2009

E. Reference Documentation:

2005-2009 SFI Standard®;

F. Audit Results: Based on the results at this visit, the auditor concluded

Acceptable with no nonconformances; or

Acceptable with minor nonconformances that should be corrected before the next regularly scheduled surveillance visit;

Not acceptable with one or two major nonconformances - corrective action required;

Several major nonconformances - the certification may be canceled unless immediate action is taken

G. Changes to Operations or to the SFI Standard:

Are there any significant changes in operations, procedures, specifications, FRS, etc. from the previous visit? Yes No

If yes, provide brief description of the changes: Modest updates to procedures; completed management plan for Salmon Creek, Big River, but it follows the pattern of the Garcia River Plan.

H. Other Issues Reviewed:

Yes No Public report from previous audit(s) is posted on SFB web site.

Yes No N.A. SFI and other relevant logos or labels are utilized correctly.
If no, document on CAR forms.

I. Corrective Action Requests: (see also Appendix IV)

Correct Action Requests issued this visit:

Corrective Action Plan is not required.

- Corrective Action Plan is required within sixty days of this visit (for Minor Nonconformances). CARs will be verified during the next Surveillance Audit.
- Corrective Action Plan is required within thirty days of this visit (for Major Nonconformances).

The auditor will make arrangements to verify the corrective action has been effectively implemented. All major nonconformance(s) must be closed by the auditor prior to the next scheduled surveillance audit by a special verification visit or by desk review, if possible.

Any Corrective Action Plans should be provided to Mike Ferrucci: mferrucci@iforest.com

At the conclusion of this Surveillance Audit visit, no Minor CARs remain open, nor were any Opportunities for Improvement (OFIs) identified.

Appendices:

Appendix I: Surveillance Notification Letter

Appendix II: Corrective Action Requests

Appendix III: Public Surveillance Audit Report

Appendix IV: Audit Matrix

Appendix I



Surveillance Notification Letter and Audit Schedule

Note: Plans described below were finalized by verbal confirmation during several phone calls.

From: Michael Ferrucci [mailto:mferrucci@iforest.com]

Sent: Monday, September 21, 2009 9:37 AM

To: 'Evan Smith'; 'Robert Hrubes'

Cc: 'Kelly, Scott'; 'Griffin, Jenny'

Subject: RE: TCF prep docs for Oct. 5-7 audit

Evan, Jenny:

Thanks for the information, including the details provided by Jenny earlier. I'm hoping to look it all over, talk to Robert, and then one of us will get back to you with a response regarding selections of sites and other decisions he and I need to make.

Mike Ferrucci

mferrucci@iforest.com

Office and Cell: 203-887-9248

From: Evan Smith [mailto:esmith@conservationfund.org]

Sent: Monday, September 21, 2009 1:51 AM

To: 'Robert Hrubes'; mferrucci@iforest.com

Cc: 'Kelly, Scott'; 'Griffin, Jenny'

Subject: RE: TCF prep docs for Oct. 5-7 audit

Robert and Mike: I wanted to flag a couple of things for discussion during our audit—these are our self-identified opportunities for improvement. Nothing that in my opinion is earth-shattering, but we like to be upfront about our disappointments.

1. The Management Plan for Big River and Salmon Creek was late. An extension was approved, the plan was completed and approved by the agencies, but we did not meet our original deadline.
2. Herbicide was applied to native plants (primarily ceanothus and tanoak) this summer as part of roadside clearing on Big River. As discussed, this is counter to our internal herbicide policy, which we have since clarified and strengthened.
3. The Pullen Gulch (Salmon Creek THP) roads were used when wet last fall (in a rush to finish the job prior to the season closure) and consequently looked like crap. Structurally they were fine and no sediment transport was observed, but we ordered the operator to blade off and re-stabilize several sections of road. We have since clarified roles for LTO supervision at the end of the season.
4. Just last month, two TCF personnel (Scott Kelly and Rick Cooper) assisted Department of Fish and Game wardens with a major marijuana plantation eradication on Salmon Creek (which was completed safely and successfully). Per our safety policy, we are not supposed to participate in eradications, but in this case the Sheriff's Office declined to act, and the ambitious DFG wardens decided to turn a recon mission into a destroy mission. We have no plans to change our policy but will be more explicit in the future about the intent of any outings and the limitations of our staff participation.

Let me know if you have any questions about these events. Our staff and programs continue to enjoy widespread support in the local community—both from the environmental and business interests, including positive participation in the public field tours. We received our first (and only) official public comment on a THP submittal—it was a form letter from a Siskiyou County activist that CalFire declined to address.

Let me know if you have any questions—looking forward to seeing you in a few weeks.

-Evan

Evan Smith

Vice President, Forestland Acquisition & Finance

The Conservation Fund

8664 NW Springville Ct

Portland, OR 97231

(503)407-0301 office/cell

(866)426-4496 fax

From: Jenny Griffin [mailto:jgriffin@conservationfund.org]
Sent: Wednesday, September 16, 2009 12:19 PM
To: 'Robert Hrubes'; mferrucci@iforest.com
Cc: Smith, Evan; Kelly, Scott; Kelly, Chris; Newberger, Holly; Thomson, Madison
Subject: TCF prep docs for Oct. 5-7 audit

Greetings,

Hope this finds you all well. In preparation for our audit meeting Oct. 5-7 attached please find a summary of activities since the 2008 audit, last year's management review meeting memo, TCF's herbicide policy for Big River and Salmon Creek, summaries of 4 new THPs, and 3 press clippings. Also, I'm happy to direct you to TCF's website for a link to our Big River and Salmon Creek Integrated Resource Management Plan:
http://www.conservationfund.org/north_coast_forests.

Tentative plans for the meeting are as follows:

Monday Oct. 5. Meet at 9:30 in Boonville (at Mosswood Market Cafe & Bakery 14111 Highway 128 unless people prefer otherwise). Proceed to Olsen Gulch on Garcia River Forest to view/discuss road improvement work, reserve and non-reserve areas, and silviculture. Proceed to Salmon Creek in the afternoon to view/discuss active operations on the Lower Salmon Creek or Pullen Gulch THP. Working dinner (Viraporn's? Mendo Bistro?).

Tuesday Oct. 6. Start time TBD, Big River, Wheel Gulch THP active operations and/or North of 20 THP post completion. Closing meeting at TCF Caspar office.

Please let us know if you have any questions, suggestions, etc., or need any additional information prior to our meeting. We look forward to seeing you!

Best,
Jenny

Jenny Griffin
North Coast Program Manager
The Conservation Fund
14951 "A" Caspar Road, Box 50
Caspar, CA 95420
Phone: (707) 962-0712
Fax: (866) 426-4496

Appendix II



Corrective Action Requests

Corrective and Preventive Action Request (CAR)

Company/Location: <u>The Conservation Fund</u>	Date: August 27, 2008 FRS # 6R031
Auditor: <u>Mike Ferrucci</u>	CAR Number: <u>SFI-2008-01</u>
Location of Finding: <u>Administrative</u>	Previous CAR Number/Date: <u>N.A.</u>
Discussed with: <u>Evan Smith</u>	Nonconformance Type (underline): Major <u>Minor</u>

AUDITOR FINDING: Standard Number and Clause: 2005-2009 Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard® Indicator 13.1.3: “Annual review of progress by management and determination of changes and improvements necessary to continually improve SFI conformance.”

Description: Objective (written) evidence for management review not provided; the review was focused on the overall program and did not thoroughly address SFI.

IF NECESSARY, PLEASE ATTACH A SEPARATE REPORT ADDRESSING THE FOLLOWING THREE ITEMS:

1) ROOT CAUSE ANALYSIS BY COMPANY–Include potential causes & assurance problem does not exist in other areas.
Organization was busy; forest fires and other events took precedence.

2) CORRECTIVE ACTION BY COMPANY – Based on the Root Cause Analysis, the following action has been planned/taken to correct the problem. Please include expected completion date.
Notes will be provided to the auditor

3) PREVENTIVE ACTION BY COMPANY – Based on the Root Cause Analysis, the following action has been planned/taken to correct the problem. Please include expected completion date.
Future management review will be documented.

AUDITOR REVIEW OF COMPANY’S PLAN:
Plan approved. Notes of management review were provided. CAR will be kept open to maintain focus on this issue.

STATUS: Open AUDITOR/DATE: March 2, 2009

AUDITOR REVIEW OF COMPANY’S COMPLETED ACTION:
Confirmed that TCF conducted an appropriate management review on 1.15.2009 and has provisions for doing another each year.
STATUS: Closed AUDITOR/DATE: Mike Ferrucci October 6, 2009

STATUS LEGEND:

OPEN = CA Plan Accepted

CLOSED = CA implemented, verified & accepted

REJECTED = C/A Plan or Implementation rejected

Appendix III



SFI Public Audit Report

The SFI Program of The Conservation Fund on its North Coast Forest Conservation Program has achieved continuing conformance with the SFI Standard®, 2005-2009 Edition, according to the NSF-ISR SFIS Certification Audit Process.

NSF-ISR initially certified the North Coast Forest Conservation Program to the SFIS on July 1, 2007. This report describes the second annual follow-up Surveillance Audit designed to focus on changes in the standard, changes in operations, the management review system, and efforts at continuous improvement. In addition, a subset of SFI requirements were selected for detailed review.

Overview of the certified program

According to The Conservation Fund website <http://www.conservationfund.org/> :

The Conservation Fund is the nation's foremost environmental nonprofit dedicated to protecting America's most important landscapes and waterways for future generations. The Conservation Fund pioneers a balanced, non-advocacy, non-membership approach to conservation, one that blends environmental and economic goals and objectives. Since its founding in 1985, the Fund has helped its partners safeguard wildlife habitat, working farms and forests, community greenspace, and historic sites totaling nearly 6 million acres nationwide.

The North Coast Forest Conservation Program include 23,780 acres of working forestland along the Garcia River purchased in 2004 and approximately 16,000 acres of Big River and Salmon Creek forests purchased in 2006. All of these lands are located in an area of California's most vulnerable forestland— the coastal portion of Mendocino County. These forests support second and third-growth stands of coastal redwood, Douglas-fir, pine, and related species, with some areas of oak prairie or pygmy cypress trees. The forests are generally well-roaded, well-blocked in, and comprise an excellent location for demonstrating the conservation of aquatic and upland resources in a working-forest context.

The Garcia River Management Plan describes the overall goals for these tracts:

The 23,780-acre Garcia River Forest (GRF) was acquired in February 2004 by The Conservation Fund (TCF) in partnership with The Nature Conservancy, the State Coastal Conservancy and the Wildlife Conservation Board. The project seeks to demonstrate that a large, under stocked tract of coastal forest can be returned to ecological and economic viability through patient, adaptive management by a non-profit organization in partnership with private and public entities and community stakeholders.

SFIS Surveillance Audit Process

The scope of the SFIS Audit included timberland operations; there is no mill and thus no procurement of timber. A formal scope statement was developed for use on the certificate:

Land management on the North Coast Forest Conservation Program of The Conservation Fund

and related sustainable forestry activities in California. The SFI Certificate number is NSF-SFIS-6R031.

The review was performed by NSF-ISR on August 25-27, 2008 by an audit team headed by Mike Ferrucci, Lead Auditor supported by Dr. Robert Hrubes. The audit was conducted in conjunction with an FSC Annual Audit of the same lands led by Dr. Hrubes. Audit team members fulfill the qualification criteria for conducting SFIS Certification Audits contained in the Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Audit Procedures and Qualifications (SFI APQ) 2005–2009 Edition. The objective of the audit was to assess continuing conformance of the firm’s SFI Program to the requirements of the Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Standard, 2005-2009. The SFI requirements as published were used; none of the indicators were modified.

As with the initial certification, several of the SFI requirements, including Performance Measures or Indicators, were outside of the scope of The Conservation Fund’s SFI program:

Indicator 2.1.3	Minimized plantings of exotic tree species and research documentation that exotic tree species, planted operationally, pose minimal risk.
Performance Measure 2.5	Program Participants that utilize genetically improved planting stock including those derived through biotechnology shall use sound scientific methods and follow all applicable laws and other internationally applicable protocols.
Indicator 2.5.1	Program for appropriate research, testing, evaluation and deployment of genetically improved planting stock including trees derived through biotechnology.
Indicator 3.2.5	Where regulations or BMPs do not currently exist to protect riparian areas, use of experts to identify appropriate protection measures.
Performance Measure 5.2	Program Participants shall manage the size, shape, and placement of clearcut harvests.
Indicator 5.2.1	Average size of clearcut harvest areas does not exceed 120 acres, except when necessary to respond to forest health emergencies or other natural catastrophes.
Indicator 5.2.2	Documentation through internal records of clearcut size and the process for calculating average size.
Objective 8:	To broaden the practice of sustainable forestry through procurement programs.
Indicator 11.1.4	Adherence to all applicable federal, state, & provincial regulations and international protocols for research & deployment of trees derived from improved planting stock & biotechnology.
Performance Measure 12.3	Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall participate in the development of public land planning and management processes.
Indicator 12.3.1	Involvement in public land planning and management activities with appropriate governmental entities and the public.

With respect to these requirements, The Conservation Fund does not engage in the relevant activity and thus the requirement is not applicable.

The NSF-ISR SFI Surveillance Audit was governed by an audit plan designed to enable the audit team to determine conformance with the applicable SFI requirements. The team reviewed a sample of the written

documentation assembled to provide objective evidence of SFIS Conformance. The lead auditor selected field sites for inspection based upon the risk of environmental impact, likelihood of occurrence, special features, and other criteria outlined in the NSF-ISR SFI-SOP. The audit team also selected and interviewed contract loggers and employees within the organization to confirm that the SFI Standard was understood and actively implemented. Forest practices that were the focus of field inspections included those that have been conducted since the previous field audit was conducted. Use of the SFI logo and the requirement to provide a public of audit reports were also reviewed.

The possible findings of the audit included Full Conformance, Major Non-conformance, Minor Non-conformance, Opportunities for Improvement, and Practices that Exceeded the Basic Requirements of the SFIS. During surveillance audits the final category, exceeds requirements, is not emphasized; many of the areas that earned this finding during the 2007 certification audit were not reviewed during the 2008 audit.

Overview of Audit Findings

The Conservation Fund's SFI Program was found to be in full conformance with the SFIS Standard. The NSF-ISR Audit team reviewed the corrective action plans implemented by TCF for the previous minor non-conformance:

Indicator 13.1.3 requires "Annual review of progress by management and determination of changes and improvements necessary to continually improve SFI conformance."

Past management reviews had not been well-documented, and were focused on the overall program without thoroughly addressing SFI. The Conservation Fund provided documentation showing how it has increased the attention to its SFI program during management review. This non-conformance is now closed.

There were no new non-conformances identified. As such, the team recommended continuing certification.

The SFI Audit Team also confirmed that forestry practices and operations on The Conservation Fund's lands continue to exceed the basic requirements of the SFI Standard in the following areas:

- The management plans and supporting ecological analyses comprise an exemplary approach to management planning.
(Indicator 1.1.1: A long-term resource analysis to guide forest management planning at a level appropriate to the size and scale of the operation, including: a periodic or ongoing forest inventory; b. a land classification system; c. soils inventory and maps, where available; d. access to growth-and-yield modeling capabilities; e. up-to-date maps or a geographic information system (GIS); f. recommended sustainable harvest levels; and g. a review of nontimber issues.)
- Retention of trees during partial harvests is superb.
(Indicator 2.3.5: "Retention of vigorous trees during partial harvesting, consistent with silvicultural norms for the area.")
- The Conservation Fund and its partner organizations are embarked on an exemplary program of river and stream protection and improvement.
(Performance Measure 3.2 and associated Indicators: "Program Participant shall have or develop, implement, and document, riparian protection measures based on soil type, terrain, vegetation and other applicable factors.")
- The Conservation Fund exceeds the requirements for application of knowledge gained through research, science, technology, and field experience to manage wildlife habitat and contribute to the conservation of biological diversity.
(Performance Measure 4.2 and associated Indicators: "Program Participants shall apply knowledge gained through research, science, technology, and field experience to manage wildlife habitat and contribute to the conservation of biological diversity.")
- The Conservation Fund exceeds the requirements for the protection of special sites of ecological, historic, or cultural importance by making sustained and detailed efforts to locate all such sites, including previously unknown sites, and to manage them with cutting edge science.

(Performance Measure 6.1 and associated Indicators: “Program Participants shall identify special sites and manage them in a manner appropriate for their unique features.”)

- The Conservation Fund exceeds the standard in development and use of regional conservation planning and priority-setting efforts that include a broad range of stakeholders.
(SFI Indicator 12.1.5: “Program Participants are knowledgeable about credible regional conservation planning and priority-setting efforts that include a broad range of stakeholders. Consider the results of these efforts in planning where practical and consistent with management objectives.”)
- The Conservation Fund exceeds the requirements for providing opportunities for stakeholder input on management decisions by consistently seeking and using input from a wide range of local and regional stakeholders.
(SFI Indicator 12.3.2: “Appropriate contact with local stakeholders over forest management issues through state, provincial, federal, or independent collaboration.”)

Once again, the program demonstrated its commitment to continuous improvement. California’s forestry requirements are quite complex; the Fund’s blend of environmental and economic goals is unique. TCF’s staff and contractors work well together to innovate and adapt to implement good forestry practices on important, sensitive, and often steep forested lands. One notable change was the development of more detailed guidelines for recruitment and retention of snags, coarse woody debris, and green trees.

This program is being audited under the continuous surveillance audit option provided in the SFI program. The next surveillance audit is scheduled for October, 2010.

Relevance of Forestry Certification

Third-party certification provides assurance that forests are being managed under the principles of sustainable forestry, which are described in the Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard as:

1. Sustainable Forestry

To practice sustainable forestry to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs by practicing a land stewardship ethic that integrates reforestation and the managing, growing, nurturing, and harvesting of trees for useful products with the conservation of soil, air and water quality, biological diversity, wildlife and aquatic habitat, recreation, and aesthetics.

2. Responsible Practices

To use and to promote among other forest landowners sustainable forestry practices that are both scientifically credible and economically, environmentally, and socially responsible.

3. Reforestation and Productive Capacity

To provide for regeneration after harvest and maintain the productive capacity of the forestland base.

4. Forest Health and Productivity

To protect forests from uncharacteristic and economically or environmentally undesirable wildfire, pests, diseases, and other damaging agents and thus maintain and improve long-term forest health and productivity.

5. Long-Term Forest and Soil Productivity

To protect and maintain long-term forest and soil productivity.

6. Protection of Water Resources

To protect water bodies and riparian zones.

7. Protection of Special Sites and Biological Diversity

To manage forests and lands of special significance (biologically, geologically, historically or culturally important) in a manner that takes into account their unique qualities and to promote a diversity of wildlife habitats, forest types, and ecological or natural community types.

8. Legal Compliance

To comply with applicable federal, provincial, state, and local forestry and related environmental laws, statutes, and regulations.

9. Continual Improvement

To continually improve the practice of forest management and also to monitor, measure and report performance in achieving the commitment to sustainable forestry.

Source: Sustainable Forestry Initiative® (SFI) Standard, 2005–2009 Edition

For More Information Contact:

Evan Smith, Director of Forestry Projects, NW Field Representative
The Conservation Fund, Portland, OR 97209

esmith@conservationfund.org

Appendix IV



Audit Matrix

NSF-ISR auditors use this document to record their findings for each SFIS Performance Measure and Indicator. If a non-conformance is found the auditor shall fully document the reasons on the Corrective Action Request (CAR) form. The first portion of the matrix provides an overall record of audit findings over time. This ensures that all requirements are audited within the five-year life of the certificate. The “Audit Notes” portion provides the detailed findings.

- NA in the Auditor column indicates that the associated Performance Measure or Indicator does not apply; otherwise the Auditor column is optional.
- Findings codes: C=Conformance; EXR=Exceeds the SFI requirement; Maj= Major Non-conformance; Min=Minor Non-conformance; OFI= Opportunity for Improvement (OFI may be combined with other findings)
- Findings are indicated by a date code: Audit Date - 2007 Code = 7 ; Audit Date August, 2008 Code = 8; Audit Date October, 2009 Code = 9
- Auditors: MF - Mike Ferrucci; RH – Robert Hrubes
- Abbreviations:
 TCF - The Conservation Fund NCT - North Coast Forest Conservation Program
 RPF – California Registered Professional Forester LTO – Licensed Timber Operator
 THP - Timber Harvest Plan (mandated for all harvests in California)
 CDF – California Department of Forestry

Objective 1: To broaden the implementation of sustainable forestry by ensuring long-term harvest levels based on the use of the best scientific information available.

Performance Measure/ Indicator		Audit- or	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				OFI
			<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
1.1	<i>Program Participants shall ensure that long-term harvest levels are sustainable and consistent with appropriate growth and-yield models and written plans.</i>	MF	7,8				
1.1.1	A long-term resource analysis to guide forest management planning at a level appropriate to the size and scale of the operation, including: a. a periodic or ongoing forest inventory; b. a land classification system; c. soils inventory and maps, where available; d. access to growth-and-yield modeling capabilities; e. up-to-date maps or a geographic information system (GIS); f. recommended sustainable harvest levels; and g. a review of nontimber issues (e.g., pilot projects and economic incentive programs to promote water protection, carbon storage, or biological diversity conservation).	MF		7, 8, 9			
1.1.2	Documentation of annual harvest trends in relation to the sustainable forest management plan.	MF	7,8, 9				
1.1.3	A forest inventory system and a method to calculate growth.	MF	7,8				
1.1.4	Periodic updates of inventory and recalculation of planned harvests.	MF	7,8				
1.1.5	Documentation of forest practices (e.g., planting, fertilization, and thinning) consistent with assumptions in harvest plans.	MF	7, 8, 9				

Objective 2: To ensure long-term forest productivity and conservation of forest resources through prompt reforestation, soil conservation, afforestation and other measures.

Performance Measure/ Indicator		Audit -or	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				OFI
			<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
2.1	<i>Program Participants shall reforest after final harvest, unless delayed for site-specific environmental or forest health considerations, through artificial regeneration within two years or two planting seasons, or by planned natural regeneration methods within five years.</i>	MF	7, 8				
2.1.1	Designation of all management units for either natural or artificial regeneration.	MF	7, 8, 9				
2.1.2	Clear Requirements to judge adequate regeneration and appropriate actions to correct under-stocked areas and achieve desired species composition and stocking rates for both artificial and natural regeneration	MF	7, 8, 9				
2.1.3	Minimized plantings of exotic tree species and research documentation that exotic tree species, planted operationally, pose minimal risk.	NA					
2.1.4	Protection of desirable or planned advanced natural regeneration during harvest.	MF	7, 8, 9				
2.1.5	Artificial reforestation programs that consider potential ecological impacts of a different species or species mix from that which was harvested.	MF	7, 8				
2.2	<i>Program Participants shall minimize chemical use required to achieve management objectives while protecting employees, neighbors, the public and the forest environment.</i>	MF	7, 8				
2.2.1	Minimized chemical use required to achieve management objectives.	MF	7, 8, 9				
2.2.2	Use of least toxic and narrowest spectrum pesticide narrowest spectrum and least toxic pesticides necessary to achieve management objective.	MF	7, 8, 9				
2.2.3	Use of pesticides registered for the intended use and applied in accordance with the label requirements.	MF	7				
2.2.4	Use of Integrated Pest Management where feasible.	MF	7, 8				
2.2.5	Supervision of forest chemical applications by state-trained or certified applicators.	MF	7				
2.2.6	Use of best management practices appropriate to the situation; for example: adjoining landowners or nearby residents notified of applications and chemicals used; appropriate multi-lingual signs or oral warnings used; public road access controlled during and after applications; streamside and other needed buffer strips appropriately designated; positive shut-off and minimal drift spray valves used; drift minimized by aerially applying forest chemicals parallel to buffer zones; water quality monitored or other methods used to assure proper ...	MF	7				
2.2.6	...equipment use and stream protection of streams, lakes and other waterbodies; chemicals stored at appropriate locations; state reports filed as required; or methods used to ensure protection of federally listed threatened & endangered species		7				

Performance Measure/ Indicator		<u>Audit</u> <u>-or</u>	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				<u>OFI</u>
			<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
2.3	<i>Program Participants shall implement management practices to protect and maintain forest and soil productivity.</i>	MF	7, 8				
2.3.1	Use of soils maps where available.	MF	7, 8				
2.3.2	Process to identify soils vulnerable to compaction and use of appropriate methods to avoid excessive soil disturbance.	CA	7, 8				
2.3.3	Use of erosion control measures to minimize the loss of soil and site productivity.	CA	7, 8, 9				
2.3.4	Post-harvest conditions conducive to maintaining site productivity (e.g., limited rutting, retained down woody debris, minimized skid trails).	CA	7, 8, 9				
2.3.5	Retention of vigorous trees during partial harvesting, consistent with silvicultural norms for the area.	MF		7, 8, 9			
2.3.6	Criteria that address harvesting and site preparation to protect soil productivity.	MF	8, 9			7	
2.3.7	Minimized road construction to meet management objectives efficiently.	MF	7, 8				
2.4	<i>Program Participants shall manage so as to protect forests from damaging agents such as environmentally or economically undesirable wildfire, pests and diseases to maintain and improve long-term forest health, productivity and economic viability.</i>	MF	7, 8, 9				
2.4.1	Program to protect forests from damaging agents.	MF	7, 8, 9				
2.4.2	Management to promote healthy and productive forest conditions to minimize susceptibility to damaging agents.	MF	7, 8, 9				
2.4.3	Participation in, and support of, fire and pest prevention and control programs.	MF	7, 9	8			
2.5	<i>Program Participants that utilize genetically improved planting stock including those derived through biotechnology shall use sound scientific methods and follow all applicable laws and other internationally applicable protocols.</i>	N.A.					
2.5.1	Program for appropriate research, testing, evaluation and deployment of genetically improved planting stock including trees derived through biotechnology.	N.A.					

Objective 3: To protect water quality in streams, lakes and other water bodies.

Performance Measure/ Indicator		<u>Audit</u> <u>-or</u>	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				<u>OFI</u>
			<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
3.1	<i>Program Participants shall meet or exceed all applicable federal, provincial, state and local water quality laws and meet or exceed Best Management Practices developed under Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)-approved state water quality programs other applicable federal, provincial, state or local programs.</i>	CA	7, 9				
3.1.1	Program to implement state or provincial equivalent BMPs during all phases of management activities.	CA, MF	7, 9				
3.1.2	Contract provisions that specify BMP compliance.	MF	7, 8, 9				
3.1.3	Plans that address wet weather events (e.g., inventory systems, wet weather tracts, defining acceptable operational conditions, etc.).	MF	7, 8, 9				
3.1.4	Monitoring of overall BMP implementation.	MF	7, 8, 9				
3.2	<i>Program Participant shall have or develop, implement, and document, riparian protection measures based on soil type, terrain, vegetation and other applicable factors.</i>	CA, MF	7, 8	9			
3.2.1	Program addressing management and protection of streams, lakes and other water bodies and riparian zones.	CA, MF		7, 8, 9			
3.2.2	Mapping of streams, lakes and other water bodies and riparian zones, and where appropriate, identification on the ground.	MF	7, 8, 9				
3.2.3	Implementation of plans to manage or protect streams, lakes and other water bodies.	CA, MF	7, 8	9			
3.2.4	Identification and protection of nonforested wetlands, including bogs, fens, vernal pools and marshes of significant size.	MF		7, 8, 9			
3.2.5	Where regulations or BMPs do not currently exist to protect riparian areas, use of experts to identify appropriate protection measures.	N.A.					

Objective 4: Manage the quality and distribution of wildlife habitats and contribute to the conservation of biological diversity by developing and implementing stand- and landscape- level measures that promote habitat diversity and the conservation of forest plants and animals including aquatic fauna.

Performance Measure/ Indicator		Audit -or	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				OFI
			C	EXR	Maj	Min	
4.1	<i>Program participants shall have programs to promote biological diversity at stand- and landscape- scales.</i>	Team	7				
4.1.1	Program to promote the conservation of native biological diversity, including species, wildlife habitats, and ecological or natural community types, at stand and landscape levels.	Team		7, 9			
4.1.2	Program to protect threatened and endangered species.	Team		7, 9			
4.1.3	Plans to locate and protect known sites associated with viable occurrences of critically imperiled and imperiled species and communities. Plans for protection may be developed independently or collaboratively and may include Program Participant management, cooperation with other stakeholders, or use of easements, conservation land sales, exchanges, or other conservation strategies	Team		7			
4.1.4	Development and implementation of criteria, as guided by regionally appropriate science, for retention of stand-level wildlife habitat elements (e.g., snags, mast trees, down woody debris, den trees, nest trees).	Team	7				7
4.1.5	Assessment, conducted individually or collaboratively, of forest cover types and habitats at the individual ownership level and, where credible data are available, across the landscape, and incorporation of findings into planning and management activities, where practical and when consistent with management objectives.	Team		7			
4.1.6	Support of and participation in plans or programs for the conservation of old-growth forests in the region of ownership.	Team	7				
4.1.7	Participation in programs and demonstration of activities as appropriate to limit the introduction, impact, and spread of invasive exotic plants and animals that directly threaten or are likely to threaten native plant and animal communities.	Team	7	9			
4.1.8	Program to incorporate the role of prescribed or natural fire where appropriate.	Team	7				
4.2	<i>Program Participants shall apply knowledge gained through research, science, technology, and field experience to manage wildlife habitat and contribute to the conservation of biological diversity.</i>	Team		7, 8, 9			
4.2.1	Collection of information on critically imperiled and imperiled species and communities and other biodiversity-related data through forest inventory processes, mapping, or participation in external programs, such as NatureServe, state or provincial heritage programs, or other credible systems. Such participation may include providing nonproprietary scientific information, time, and assistance by staff, or in-kind or direct financial support.	Team		7, 8, 9			
4.2.2	A methodology to incorporate research results and field applications of biodiversity and ecosystem research into forest management decisions.	Team		7, 8, 9			

Objective 5: To manage the visual impact of harvesting and other forest operations.

Performance Measure/ Indicator		<u>Audit</u> <u>-or</u>	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				<u>OFI</u>
			<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
5.1	<i>Program Participants shall manage the impact of harvesting on visual quality.</i>	MF	7, 9				
5.1.1	Program to address visual quality management.	MF	7, 9				
5.1.2	Incorporation of aesthetic considerations in harvesting, road, landing design and management, and other management activities where visual impacts are a concern.	MF	7, 9				
5.2	<i>Program Participants shall manage the size, shape, and placement of clearcut harvests.</i>	N.A.					
5.2.1	Average size of clearcut harvest areas does not exceed 120 acres, except when necessary to respond to forest health emergencies or other natural catastrophes.	N.A.					
5.2.2	Documentation through internal records of clearcut size and the process for calculating average size.	N.A.					
5.3	<i>Program Participants shall adopt a green-up requirement or alternative methods that provide for visual quality.</i>	MF	7, 9				
5.3.1	Program implementing the green-up requirement or alternative methods.	MF	7, 9				
5.3.2	Harvest area tracking system to demonstrate compliance with the green-up requirement or alternative methods.	MF	7, 9				
5.3.3	Trees in clearcut harvest areas are at least 3 years old or 5 feet high at the desired level of stocking before adjacent areas are clearcut, or as appropriate to address operational and economic considerations, alternative methods to reach the performance measure are utilized by the Program Participant.	MF	7, 9				

Objective 6: To manage Program Participant lands that are ecologically, geologically, historically, or culturally important in a manner that recognizes their special qualities.

Performance Measure/ Indicator		<u>Audit</u> <u>-or</u>	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				<u>OFI</u>
			<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
6.1.	<i>Program Participants shall identify special sites and manage them in a manner appropriate for their unique features.</i>	MF		7, 8, 9			
6.1.1	Use of existing natural heritage data and expert advice in identifying or selecting sites for protection because of their ecologically, geologically, historically, or culturally important qualities.	MF		7, 8, 9			
6.1.2	Appropriate mapping, cataloging, and management of identified special sites.	MF		7, 8, 9			

Objective 7: To promote the efficient use of forest resources.

Performance Measure/ Indicator		<u>Audit</u> <u>-or</u>	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				<u>OFI</u>
			<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
7.1	<i>Program Participants shall employ appropriate forest harvesting technology and “in-woods” manufacturing processes and practices to minimize waste and ensure efficient utilization of harvested trees, where consistent with other SFI Standard objectives.</i>	MF	7, 8, 9				
7.1.1	Program or monitoring system to ensure efficient utilization, which may include provisions to ensure a. landings left clean with little waste; b. residues distributed to add organic and nutrient value to future forests; c. training or incentives to encourage loggers to enhance utilization; d. cooperation with mill managers for better utilization of species and low-grade material; e. merchandizing of harvested material to ensure use for its most beneficial purpose; f. development of markets for underutilized species and low-grade wood; g. periodic inspections and reports noting utilization and product separation; or h. exploration of alternative markets (e.g., energy markets).	MF	7, 8, 9				

N.A.: Objective 8: To broaden the practice of sustainable forestry through procurement programs.

Objective 9: To improve forestry research, science, and technology, upon which sound forest management decisions are based.

Performance Measure/ Indicator		Audit -or	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				OFI
			C	EXR	Maj	Min	
9.1	<i>Program Participants shall individually, through cooperative efforts, or through associations provide in-kind support or funding, in addition to that generated through taxes, for forest research to improve the health, productivity, and management of forest resources.</i>	MF	7, 8				
9.1.1	Current financial or in-kind support of research to address questions of relevance in the region of operations. The research will include some or all of the following issues: a. forest health, productivity, and ecosystem functions; b. chemical efficiency, use rate, and integrated pest management; c. water quality; d. wildlife management at stand or landscape levels; e. conservation of biological diversity; and f. effectiveness of BMPs.	MF	7, 8, 9				
9.2	<i>Program Participants shall individually, through cooperative efforts, or through associations develop or use state, provincial, or regional analyses in support of their sustainable forestry programs.</i>	MF	7, 8				
9.2.1	Participation, individually or through cooperative efforts or associations at the state, provincial, or regional level, in the development or use of a. regeneration assessments; b. growth-and-drain assessments; c. BMP implementation and compliance; and d. biodiversity conservation information for family forest owners.	MF	7, 8				

Objective 10: To improve the practice of sustainable forest management by resource professionals, logging professionals, and contractors through appropriate training and education programs.

Performance Measure/ Indicator		Audit -or	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				OFI
			C	EXR	Maj	Min	
10.1	<i>Program Participants shall require appropriate training of personnel and contractors so that they are competent to fulfill their responsibilities under the SFI Standard.</i>	MF	7, 9				
10.1.1	Written statement of commitment to the SFI Standard communicated throughout the organization, particularly to mill and woodland managers, wood procurement staff, and field foresters.	MF	7, 9				
10.1.2	Assignment and understanding of roles and responsibilities for achieving SFI Standard objectives.	MF	7, 9				7
10.1.3	Staff education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities.	Team	7, 8, 9				7, 8
10.1.4	Contractor education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities.	Team	7, 9				
10.2	<i>Program Participants shall work closely with state logging or forestry associations, or appropriate agencies or others in the forestry community, to foster improvement in the professionalism of wood producers.</i>	MF	7, 8, 9				
10.2.1	Participation in or support of SFI Implementation Committees to establish criteria and identify delivery mechanisms for wood producers' training courses that address a. awareness of sustainable forestry principles and the SFI Program; b. BMPs, including streamside management and road construction, maintenance, & retirement; c. regeneration, forest resource conservation, and aesthetics; d. awareness of responsibilities under the U.S. Endangered Species Act, the Canadian Species at Risk Act, and other measures to protect wildlife habitat; e. logging safety; f. U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration regulations, wage and hour rules, and other employment laws; g. transportation issues; h. business management; and i. public policy and outreach.	MF	8, 9			7	

Objective 11: Commitment to comply with applicable federal, provincial, state, or local laws and regulations.

Performance Measure/ Indicator		Audit -or	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				OFI
			C	EXR	Maj	Min	
11.1	<i>Program Participants shall take appropriate steps to comply with applicable federal, provincial, state, and local forestry and related environmental laws and regulations.</i>	MF	7, 9				
11.1.1	Access to relevant laws and regulations in appropriate locations.	MF	7, 9				
11.1.2	System to achieve compliance with applicable federal, provincial, state, or local laws and regulations.	MF	7, 8, 9				
11.1.3	Demonstration of commitment to legal compliance through available regulatory action information.	Team	7, 8, 9				
11.1.4	Adherence to all applicable federal, state, & provincial regulations and international protocols for research & deployment of trees derived from improved planting stock & biotechnology.	N.A.					
11.2	<i>Program Participants shall take appropriate steps to comply with all applicable social laws at the federal, provincial, state, and local levels in the country in which the Program Participant operates.</i>	MF	7, 9				
11.2.1	Written policy demonstrating commitment to comply with social laws, such as those covering civil rights, equal employment opportunities, antidiscrimination and anti-harassment measures, workers' compensation, indigenous peoples' rights, workers' and communities' right to know, prevailing wages, workers' right to organize, and occupational health and safety.	Team	7, 9				

Objective 12: To broaden the practice of sustainable forestry by encouraging the public and forestry community to participate in the commitment to sustainable forestry and publicly report progress.

Performance Measure/ Indicator		Audit -or	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				OFI
			C	EXR	Maj	Min	
12.1	<i>Program Participants shall support and promote efforts by consulting foresters, state and federal agencies, state or local groups, professional societies, and the American Tree Farm System® and other landowner cooperative programs to apply principles of sustainable forest management.</i>	MF	7, 9				
12.1.1	Support for efforts of SFI Implementation Committees.	MF	8, 9			7	
12.1.2	Support for the development and distribution of educational materials, including information packets for use with forest landowners.	MF	9				
12.1.3	Support for the development and distribution of regional or statewide information materials that provide landowners with practical approaches for addressing biological diversity issues, such as specific wildlife habitat, critically imperiled or imperiled species, and threatened and endangered species.	MF	7				
12.1.4	Participation in efforts to support or promote conservation of working forests through voluntary market-based incentive programs (e.g., current-use taxation programs, Forest Legacy, or conservation easements).	MF	7, 8, 9				
12.1.5	Program Participants are knowledgeable about credible regional conservation planning and priority-setting efforts that include a broad range of stakeholders. Consider the results of these efforts in planning where practical and consistent with management objectives.	MF	7, 8	9			
12.2	<i>Program Participants shall support and promote, at the state, provincial or other appropriate levels, mechanisms for public outreach, education, and involvement related to forest management.</i>	MF	7, 8, 9				
12.2.1	Support for the SFI Implementation Committee program to address outreach, education, and technical assistance (e.g., toll-free numbers, public sector technical assistance programs).	MF	8, 9			7	
12.2.2	Periodic educational opportunities promoting sustainable forestry, such as a. field tours, seminars, or workshops; b. educational trips; c. self-guided forest management trails; or d. publication of articles, educational pamphlets, or newsletters; or e. support for state, provincial, and local forestry organizations and soil and water conservation districts.	Team	7, 8, 9				
12.2.3	Recreation opportunities for the public, where consistent with forest management objectives.	Team	7, 8, 9				

Performance Measure/ Indicator		<u>Audit</u> <u>-or-</u>	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				<u>O</u> <u>F</u> <u>I</u>
			<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
12.3	<i>Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall participate in the development of public land planning and management processes.</i>	N.A.					
12.3.1	Involvement in public land planning and management activities with appropriate governmental entities and the public.	N.A.					
12.3.2	Appropriate contact with local stakeholders over forest management issues through state, provincial, federal, or independent collaboration.	MF		7, 8, 9			
12.4	<i>Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall confer with affected indigenous peoples.</i>			7			
12.4.1	Program that includes communicating with affected indigenous peoples to enable Program Participants to a. understand and respect traditional forest related knowledge; b. identify and protect spiritually, historically, or culturally important sites; and c. address the sustainable use of nontimber forest products of value to indigenous peoples in areas where Program Participants have management responsibilities on public lands.			7			
12.5	<i>Program Participants shall establish, at the state, provincial, or other appropriate levels, procedures to address concerns raised by loggers, consulting foresters, employees, the public, or Program Participants regarding practices that appear inconsistent with the SFI Standard principles and objectives.</i>	MF	7, 8, 9				
12.5.1	Support for SFI Implementation Committee efforts (toll-free numbers and other efforts) to address concerns about apparent nonconforming practices.	MF	8, 9			7	
12.5.2	Process to receive and respond to public inquiries.	MF	7, 9				
12.6	<i>Program Participants shall report annually to the SFI Program on their compliance with the SFI Standard.</i>	MF	7, 8, 9				
12.6.1*	Prompt response to the SFI annual progress report. (*Note: This indicator will be reviewed in all audits.)	MF	7, 8, 9				
12.6.2	Recordkeeping for all the categories of information needed for SFI annual progress reports.	MF	7, 8, 9				
12.6.3	Maintenance of copies of past reports to document progress and improvements to demonstrate conformance to the SFI Standard	MF	7, 8, 9				

Objective 13: To promote continual improvement in the practice of sustainable forestry and monitor, measure, and report performance in achieving the commitment to sustainable forestry.

Performance Measure/ Indicator		<u>Audit</u> <u>-or</u>	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				<u>O</u> <u>F</u> <u>I</u>
			<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
<i>13.1*</i>	<i>Program Participants shall establish a management review system to examine findings and progress in implementing the SFI Standard, to make appropriate improvements in programs, and to inform their employees of changes. (*This Performance Measure will be reviewed in all audits.)</i>	MF	7, 8, 9				
13.1.1	System to review commitments, programs, and procedures to evaluate effectiveness.	MF	7, 8, 9				
13.1.2	System for collecting, reviewing, and reporting information to management regarding progress in achieving SFI Standard objectives and performance measures.	MF	7, 8, 9				
13.1.3	Annual review of progress by management and determination of changes and improvements necessary to continually improve SFI conformance.	MF	7, 9			8	7

2009 Audit Notes and Findings – this portion of the matrix will be deleted following each audit, but the above portion is maintained from audit to audit as a running record of requirements audited.

Requirement	Auditor	Notes
1.1		<i>“Program Participants shall ensure that long-term harvest levels are sustainable and consistent with appropriate growth and-yield models and written plans.”</i>
1.1.1	EXR	<p>“A long-term resource analysis to guide forest management planning at a level appropriate to the size and scale of the operation, including: a periodic or ongoing forest inventory; b. a land classification system; c. soils inventory and maps, where available; d. access to growth-and-yield modeling capabilities; e. up-to-date maps or a geographic information system (GIS); f. recommended sustainable harvest levels; and g. a review of nontimber issues (e.g., pilot projects and economic incentive programs to promote water protection, carbon storage, or biological diversity conservation).”</p> <p><u>The management plans and supporting ecological analyses comprise an exemplary approach to management planning.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The <i>Garcia River Forest Integrated Resource Management Plan</i> (2006) includes all of the required items for SFI forest management planning. • The <i>Big River and Salmon Creek Forests: Integrated Resource Management Plan</i> (2009) includes all of the required items for SFI forest management planning. • The review of non-timber issues is superb; timber management is covered, but the main goals of the plan are non-timber and include protection and enhancement of biodiversity and restoration of habitat for endangered species, particularly coho and steelhead salmon. • In conjunction with the acquisition of the first property (Garcia River Forest) TCF wrote “Conservation Prospects for the North Coast: a review and analysis of existing conservation plans, land use trends, and strategies for conservation on the North Coast of California.” This document is one key pillar of the resource analysis and management planning for the overall program.
1.1.2	C	<p>“Documentation of annual harvest trends in relation to the sustainable forest management plan.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary provided by TCF “Harvest Levels 2008 2009” and information contained in “REVIEW DRAFT October 4, 2009 FOREST MANAGEMENT POLICIES For The Conservation Fund’s North Coast Forest Conservation Program— Garcia River, Big River, and Salmon Creek, Mendocino County, CA, Principal author: Evan Smith show harvest targets and trends. • Harvests have been below targets and significantly below growth, particularly recently.
1.1.5	C	<p>“Documentation of forest practices (e.g., planting, fertilization, and thinning) consistent with assumptions in harvest plans.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • California Forest Practices act, required Timber Harvest Plans, and discussion with CDF regulator confirmed that THP practices are implemented. Although not required, TCF includes non-commercial vegetation management (e.g. Tanoak “hack and squirt” treatments to kill undesirable trees and release valuable, fast-growing conifer) in THPs, ensuring an open planning process and practices consistent with harvest plan assumptions.
2.1		<i>“Program Participants shall reforest after final harvest, unless delayed for site-specific environmental or forest health considerations, through artificial regeneration within two years or two planting seasons, or by planned natural regeneration methods within five years.”</i>
2.1.1	C	<p>“Designation of all management units for either natural or artificial regeneration.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmed in THPs reviewed (those visited during this audit)
2.1.2	C	<p>“Clear Requirements to judge adequate regeneration and appropriate actions to correct under-stocked areas and achieve desired species composition and stocking rates for both artificial and natural regeneration.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These requirements are provided in the California Forest Practices Rules
2.1.4	C	<p>“Protection of desirable or planned advanced natural regeneration during harvest.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmed by field observations at the completed THPs visited (North of 20 on Big River, Lower Salmon Creek THP on Salmon Creek).

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Also confirmed careful attention to this issue by review of marking on other THPs visited and by discussions with RPFs responsible for planning and/or marking these harvests. All trees to be harvested are marked by RPFs. • Challenges in protecting desirable advanced regeneration are inherent in the use of the selection system on steep ground with large trees; North Coast Forest Conservation Program’s policies, procedures, and use of very experienced RPFs appear likely to meet this challenge, and are doing so on the harvests that have been completed to date. This issue will be a focus during all Surveillance Audits.
2.2		<i>“Program Participants shall minimize chemical use required to achieve management objectives while protecting employees, neighbors, the public and the forest environment.”</i>
2.2.1	C	<p>“Minimized chemical use required to achieve management objectives.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TCF policy provides a “preference for mechanical (including manual) control measures where they will be effective.” • The “Final Big River Salmon Creek Herbicide Policy 08.14.09” states: In addition to the current under-stocked condition of these forests, past land use practices have also resulted in the introduction of invasive non-native species and an unnaturally high abundance of native tanoak in many areas that historically were dominated by conifers. Restoring these forestlands to a healthy ecological balance will require many years plus the dedication of financial and personnel resources to thoughtfully and patiently develop long-term solutions. Like other conservation organizations including The Nature Conservancy, the California Native Plant Society, and the California Pest Plant Council, The Conservation Fund recognizes herbicides as one of many tools for managing invasive plants, each with its own advantages and disadvantages. Reduction in the use of herbicides is an important objective of the Fund and alternatives to herbicide treatment have been and will continue to be evaluated on a periodic basis. The Fund will use herbicides only to control invasive, non-native plants and tanoak on a plant-by-plant basis. To ensure that herbicide use conforms to our policy, the following operational guidelines for herbicide application are to be followed by TCF staff in addition to the more detailed management measures described below: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All applications must be by a licensed pesticide applicator with a good safety track record and in compliance with EPA-approved label recommendations. 2. Work orders will include detailed contract specifications (to minimize risk of over-application or misapplication). 3. Indicator dye will be used to enable better monitoring, and applications areas will be flagged in advance, 4. No herbicides will be applied within 50’ of neighborhood property lines. 5. Work will be closely supervised by TCF staff or consulting foresters. 6. Notification signs will be posted in logical locations. 7. Records on all applications will be compiled by TCF staff and available upon request. 8. The effectiveness of treatments will be monitored by TCF staff. <p>All policies are to be reviewed on a regular basis and adapted as needed in order to best meet the project goals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The <i>Big River and Salmon Creek Forests: Integrated Resource Management Plan</i> section on Tanoak Management states: Priority for rehabilitation treatments will be given to high site, tractor-operable ground, with existing desirable redwood growing stock. Herbicide treatments will be less than 100 acres annually (on a rolling average basis).
2.2.2	C	<p>“Use of least toxic and narrowest spectrum pesticide narrowest spectrum and least toxic pesticides necessary to achieve management objective.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The only herbicide to be used in hardwood control treatments currently is imazapyr (trade name Arsenal). Only licensed and insured contractors with a good track record for safety and compliance may apply herbicides. All herbicide application must be in conformance with label guidelines and applicable laws. Additional herbicides may be considered in the future as they are developed and tested and reviewed with respect to Forest Stewardship Council and Sustainable Forestry Initiative standards.”

2.3		<i>“Program Participants shall implement management practices to protect and maintain forest and soil productivity.”</i>
2.3.3	C	<p>“Use of erosion control measures to minimize the loss of soil and site productivity.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Observed extensive use of water bars and broad-based dips.
2.3.4	C	<p>“Post-harvest conditions conducive to maintaining site productivity (e.g., limited rutting, retained down woody debris, minimized skid trails).”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmed by observations on completed harvest units inspected. • Deep rutting is generally avoided by not tractor logging in winter.
2.3.5	EXR	<p>“Retention of vigorous trees during partial harvesting, consistent with silvicultural norms for the area.”</p> <p><u>Retention of trees during partial harvests is superb.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residual trees in the completed THPs were healthy, well-formed, and free-to-grow. Residual trees were generally protected during felling and yarding operations. • Reviewed several THPs with marked trees for pending partial harvests; careful review of marked vs. unmarked trees allowed the audit team to conclude that the treatments being planned are superb examples of conservative, stand-improvement oriented selection silviculture. These treatments are difficult to apply here due to steep terrain and the conditions of the stands based on past high-grading practices.
2.3.6	C	<p>“Criteria that address harvesting and site preparation to protect soil productivity.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Criteria are provided in the California regulations, and then customized for each THP, which becomes a legally enforceable document; these include seasonal-specific criteria as well as actions following significant rain events. • Protecting soil productivity is explicitly covered in policy documents and management plans; this is accomplished in part by retaining 70+% of overstory and understory vegetation in most harvest areas, including nitrogen fixers alder and ceanothus. • Slash left on site and mostly evenly distributed to help maintain soil productivity.
2.4	C	<i>“Program Participants shall manage so as to protect forests from damaging agents such as environmentally or economically undesirable wildfire, pests and diseases to maintain and improve long-term forest health, productivity and economic viability.”</i>
2.4.1	C	<p>“Program to protect forests from damaging agents.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Field observations and review of documents confirmed the successful expansion of an extensive silvicultural program to ensure vigorous, properly stocked stands
2.4.2	C	<p>“Management to promote healthy and productive forest conditions to minimize susceptibility to damaging agents.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmed by field observations that forests are quite healthy
2.4.3	C	<p>“Participation in, and support of, fire and pest prevention and control programs.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Conservation Fund funds a local fire cooperative which supports flights to scout for fires during peak risk times. • Northern California experienced an unprecedented number of fires sparked by a dry lightning storm in May, 2008. CDF Fire confirmed that TCF staff and contractors took needed actions to pro-actively deal with fires on TCF and neighboring lands. CDF Fire was overwhelmed; absent such a strong and well-considered effort from TCF many more acres would have been lost. TCF has incorporated the lessons learned from this experience into plans for future emergencies.
3.1	C	<i>“Program Participants shall meet or exceed all applicable federal, provincial, state and local water quality laws and meet or exceed Best Management Practices developed under Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)-approved state water quality programs other applicable federal, provincial, state or local programs.”</i>
3.1.1	C	<p>“Program to implement state or provincial equivalent BMPs during all phases of management activities.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The program includes the use of very experienced California Registered Professional Foresters and carefully selected Licensed Timber Operators (LTO). Further, CDF

		and other agencies review all project prior to, during, and after all operations that might affect soil or water.
3.1.2	C	<p>“Contract provisions that specify BMP compliance.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BMPs are embedded in THP requirements; logger is a LTO.
3.1.3	C	<p>“Plans that address wet weather events (e.g., inventory systems, wet weather tracts, defining acceptable operational conditions, etc).”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Criteria are specific to each THP, including seasonal-specific criteria as well as actions following significant rain events. • Wet season shut down of yarding and hauling (as is common in region) helps avoid many wet weather water quality issues.
3.1.4	C	<p>“Monitoring of overall BMP implementation.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RPF consultants; CDF regulators, and TCF staff review all harvests • Commitment to long-term water quality monitoring by the Nature Conservancy part of Garcia tract strategy.
3.2	EXR	<p><i>“Program Participant shall have or develop, implement, and document, riparian protection measures based on soil type, terrain, vegetation and other applicable factors.”</i></p> <p><u>TCF and its partner organizations are embarked on an exemplary program of river and stream protection and improvement.</u></p>
3.2.1	EXR	<p>“Program addressing management and protection of streams, lakes and other water bodies and riparian zones.”</p> <p><u>The program for protection of streams, lakes and other water bodies and riparian zones is exemplary.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From Plan, page 12: “AQUATIC RESTORATION <i>To achieve watershed restoration and address sediment delivery problems, sub-basin plans for comprehensive treatment of controllable sediment sources will be developed and implemented. Sub-basins will be prioritized as suggested by Bradbury et al. (1995), with those streams with high habitat quality for steelhead and Coho salmon given highest priority for assessment and restoration activities. Detailed efforts currently scheduled and/or underway include: tributary and main stem habitat typing; property-wide road sediment source assessment; treatment of identified high priority sediment sites; assessment of instream structure sites and barriers; instream habitat enhancement; and implementation of monitoring plans.</i>” • TCF has adopted measures (described in policies and management plans) to retain trees and limit machinery operation in riparian areas that exceed Forest Practices Rules. • TCF is currently implementing a significant project to reconstruct, to modern standards, a significant number of culvert stream crossings on a major road system in the Garcia River Forest. The project involves careful removal of old culverts and installation of new, often larger, culverts as well as regarding the roads and installing broad-based dips and other cross-drains. The work follows from a thorough analysis and plan, approved by the NCRWQCB and other agencies to ensure that it meets the goal of reducing sediment loads over time.
3.2.2	C	<p>“Mapping of streams, lakes and other water bodies and riparian zones, and where appropriate, identification on the ground.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All such features are mapped, and are identified on the ground prior to harvests.
3.2.3	EXR	<p>“Implementation of plans to manage or protect streams, lakes and other water bodies.”</p> <p><u>Implementation of plans to manage or protect streams, lakes and other water bodies is exemplary.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmed by review of policies, plans, and project documents that TCF continues to implement an extensive and superb aquatic habitat restoration strategy. • From the Lower Salmon Creek THP Amendment Summary: “Fisheries: Salmon Creek is known for its good steelhead and coho salmon populations and habitat. Ketty Gulch and Donnelly Gulch are also fish-bearing streams. In order to encourage the further recovery of Salmon Creek and its tributaries, TCF has a no-harvest policy within 50' of fish streams. In this proposed harvest, only a few trees have been marked for harvest within the Ketty Gulch stream zone, and these are adjacent to the existing mainline road.”
3.2.4	EXR	<p>“Identification and protection of nonforested wetlands, including bogs, fens, vernal pools and marshes of significant size.”</p>

		<p><u>Identification and protection of nonforested wetlands is exemplary.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Springs and seeps are located, mapped, flagged to identify, and protected from entry by logging equipment (EEZ flagging); the botanist is provided locations and conducts survey for rare plants.
4.1	C	<p><i>“Program participants shall have programs to promote biological diversity at stand- and landscape- scales.”</i></p>
4.1.1	C	<p>“Program to promote the conservation of native biological diversity, including species, wildlife habitats, and ecological or natural community types, at stand and landscape levels.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews, review of documents, and observations confirmed that TCF’s entire program for these forests is primarily directed to the conservation of biodiversity. • Reviewed memo: “High Conservation Value Features Program - The Conservation Fund’s North Coast Forest Conservation Program, Garcia River, Big River, and Salmon Creek, Mendocino County, CA, Original version May 24, 2007; expanded December 28, 2008, Distribution: Auditors, field staff, interested public, Primary author: Evan Smith” This memo summarizes the analyses of conservation opportunities and needs in North-Coastal California and within the Mendocino Coast Hydrological Unit (containing all three properties). • The program employs professional foresters and biologists, both staff and consultants, with deep knowledge and broad experience in biodiversity conservation; specialists employed by partner organizations (TNC) as well as regulatory agencies bring an additional extraordinary level of skill and knowledge to bear. TCF managers and staff are keen on, and quite good at, using the available expertise to build their knowledge and ensure that best-practices are developed and employed.
4.1.2	C	<p>“Program to protect threatened and endangered species.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T&E species are the focus of the program and overall TCF project in northern California. • From the Lower Salmon Creek THP Amendment Summary: “Wildlife: Three Northern Spotted Owl territories (MD 538, 393, and 486) are within .7 mile of the remaining harvest areas; however, none are currently known to be located within 1000’. During the owl survey season of 2008, the owl territories for MD 393 and 486 were found in their historical areas; however, MD 538 was located in a new territory in Donnelly Gulch. No harvesting will occur in this THP until the 2009 territories have been located by biologist Mike Stephens and approval has been received from the US Fish and Wildlife Service. <p>It is expected that post harvest owl habitat will remain unchanged from current conditions. To promote the development of wildlife habitat, existing snags will be retained wherever possible; and trees with structure or high defect are retained for wildlife or snag recruitment throughout the harvest area.”</p>
4.1.7	C	<p>“Participation in programs and demonstration of activities as appropriate to limit the introduction, impact, and spread of invasive exotic plants and animals that directly threaten or are likely to threaten native plant and animal communities.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The <i>Big River and Salmon Creek Forests: Integrated Resource Management Plan</i> has sections on Invasive Weed Management and Invasive Weed Monitoring: <p><u>Invasive Weed Management</u></p> <p>In their field surveys of the Forests, consulting botanists Geri Hulse-Stephens and Kerry Heise have identified two invasive plants that are the highest priority for treatment: jubata or pampas grass (<i>Cortaderia jubata</i>) and French broom (<i>Cytisus</i> spp.), both of which can have a severe ecological impact and are commonly found on both Forests in natural and manmade openings. Both have airborne seeds but are commonly spread through road grading and other vehicle use. Invasive species management will initially focus on the control of these two species.</p> <p>The Fund will employ chemical and mechanical control techniques to reverse the spread of invasive species, with a preference for mechanical (including manual) control measures where they will be effective. Only licensed and insured contractors with a good track record for safety and compliance may apply herbicides. All herbicide application must be in conformance with label guidelines and applicable laws. The Fund has used Roundup to control invasive species on the Big River Forest and manual control techniques on Salmon</p>

		<p>Creek; additionally, Mendocino Land Trust volunteers have manually removed invasives on the west end of the Big River Forest. Due to the small size of the Salmon Creek Forest, our preference for mechanical treatments, and the availability of volunteers, the Fund does not expect to use herbicides on Salmon Creek.</p> <p>The highest priority for treatment will be areas planned for upcoming timber harvest or road improvement projects so as to discourage the further spread of invasives. If done prior to flowering, the physical removal of plants during road grading can reduce the spread of invasive species. However, this generally does not permanently remove the plant from a site once established and subsequent treatments to reduce the population will be required. General road maintenance such as grading and roadside brushing will be the second line of defense to prevent invasives from re-invading a site once the initial treatment has occurred.</p> <p>Addressing the high priority invasives promptly is a high priority because climate change is expected to make these species more competitive at occupying openings and roadsides. Ultimately, forest management which promotes dense forest cover to shade out invasive plants like jubata grass and French broom will have the greatest and most long-lasting impact on controlling invasive species.</p>
4.2	EXR	<p><i>“Program Participants shall apply knowledge gained through research, science, technology, and field experience to manage wildlife habitat and contribute to the conservation of biological diversity.”</i></p> <p><u>The Conservation Fund exceeds the requirements for application of knowledge gained through research, science, technology, and field experience to manage wildlife habitat and contribute to the conservation of biological diversity.</u></p>
4.2.1	EXR	<p>“Collection of information on critically imperiled and imperiled species and communities and other biodiversity-related data through forest inventory processes, mapping, or participation in external programs, such as NatureServe, state or provincial heritage programs, or other credible systems. Such participation may include providing nonproprietary scientific information, time, and assistance by staff, or in-kind or direct financial support.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive surveying of owl locations and understanding of their behavior on the Salmon River and Big River tracts provides an example of effective information gathering to manage wildlife habitat. • The aquatic inventory and monitoring efforts by The Nature Conservancy represents an effective strategy to manage salmonid habitat on the Garcia Tract. • Confirmed continuation of the research and monitoring programs.
4.2.2	EXR	<p>“A methodology to incorporate research results and field applications of biodiversity and ecosystem research into forest management decisions.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In partnership with The Nature Conservancy and other partners, TCF has developed and begun to implement an array of monitoring and research efforts designed to learn, over time, the best ways to manage for biodiversity concurrent with other social and economic objectives on these lands. This provides identification of high priority areas for restoration, and improved methods for their protection.
5.1	C	<p><i>“Program Participants shall manage the impact of harvesting on visual quality.”</i></p>
5.1.1	C	<p>“Program to address visual quality management.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All harvests are prepared by trained California Registered Professional Foresters (RPF) who are trained in visual management. • Proposed harvests are reviewed by Senior Forester, by VP for Forest Acquisition and Finance, and by several involved regulatory agencies. CDF requires esthetics considerations in plans.
5.1.2	C	<p>“Incorporation of aesthetic considerations in harvesting, road, landing design and management, and other management activities where visual impacts are a concern.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmed by review of several completed or active THPs and by traveling through significant portions of the land base (approximately 25%) that aesthetic considerations are in place and functioning well. • North of 20 THP adjacent to California Highway 20.
5.2	N.A.	<p><i>“Program Participants shall manage the size, shape, and placement of clearcut harvests.”</i></p> <p>TCF does not use clearcuts.</p>
5.3	C	<p><i>“Program Participants shall adopt a green-up requirement or alternative methods that provide for visual quality.”</i></p>

5.3.1	C	<p>“Program implementing the green-up requirement or alternative methods.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TCF does not use clearcuts. Prompt regeneration is required under California’s forest practices act.
5.3.2	C	<p>“Harvest area tracking system to demonstrate compliance with the green-up requirement or alternative methods.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TCF does not use clearcuts. Prompt regeneration is required under California’s forest practices act.
5.3.3	C	<p>“Trees in clearcut harvest areas are at least 3 years old or 5 feet high at the desired level of stocking before adjacent areas are clearcut, or as appropriate to address operational and economic considerations, alternative methods to reach the performance measure are utilized by the Program Participant.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TCF does not use clearcuts. Prompt regeneration is required under California’s forest practices act.
6.1.	EXR	<p><i>“Program Participants shall identify special sites and manage them in a manner appropriate for their unique features.”</i></p> <p><u>The Conservation Fund exceeds the requirements for the protection of special sites of ecological, historic, or cultural importance by making sustained and detailed efforts to locate all such sites, including previously unknown sites, and to manage them with cutting edge science.</u></p>
6.1.1	EXR	<p>“Use of existing natural heritage data and expert advice in identifying or selecting sites for protection because of their ecologically, geologically, historically, or culturally important qualities.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TCF partners with TNC and others to ensure that they are aware of existing sites, and seek to learn of additional sites. • Working with individuals and groups having deep understanding of the important sites and their protection needs, TCF has developed and is implementing the strongest possible protections for special sites.
6.1.2	EXR	<p>“Appropriate mapping, cataloging, and management of identified special sites.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of memo: “High Conservation Value Features Program - The Conservation Fund’s North Coast Forest Conservation Program, Garcia River, Big River, and Salmon Creek, Mendocino County, CA, Original version May 24, 2007; expanded December 28, 2008, Distribution: Auditors, field staff, interested public, Primary author: Evan Smith”, interviews, review of other documents, and observations confirmed that special sites are mapped, tracked, and managed appropriately.
7.1	C	<p><i>“Program Participants shall employ appropriate forest harvesting technology and “in-woods” manufacturing processes and practices to minimize waste and ensure efficient utilization of harvested trees, where consistent with other SFI Standard objectives.”</i></p>
7.1.1	C	<p>“Program or monitoring system to ensure efficient utilization, which may include...”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmed by interviews that Registered Professional Foresters employed by TCF closely monitor harvesting activities to ensure good utilization including directional feeling to reduce felling breakage, log bucking practices, and full use of logs down to minimum tip diameters for marketable products. • Supervising foresters work with Licensed Timber Operators (LTO) who are very capable and closely regulated and monitored; LTO paid by delivered price • Field observations showed good utilization of redwood, despite poor market conditions.
9.1		<p><i>“Program Participants shall individually, through cooperative efforts, or through associations provide in-kind support or funding, in addition to that generated through taxes, for forest research to improve the health, productivity, & management of forest resources.”</i></p>
9.1.1	C	<p>“Current financial or in-kind support of research to address questions of relevance in the region of operations. The research will include ...”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The <i>Big River and Salmon Creek Forests: Integrated Resource Management Plan</i> section on Tanoak Management states: “Reduction in the use of herbicides is an important objective; alternatives to herbicide treatment have been and will continue to be evaluated on a periodic basis. A

		<p>comparison of herbicide treatment and logging of tanoaks for commercial firewood was evaluated as part of the Jarvis Camp THP. Monumented plots will allow for long-term evaluation of effectiveness but the initial impressions are that the logging method resulted in increased cost and site disturbance (exposed soil and damage to the residual stand). Despite this, a commercial market for tanoak would be pursued if it develops. Areas with well-established and good quality hardwoods will likely be managed for mature hardwoods instead of attempting to re-establish conifer. “</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
10.1	C	<p><i>“Program Participants shall require appropriate training of personnel and contractors so that they are competent to fulfill their responsibilities under the SFI Standard.”</i></p>
10.1.1	C	<p>“Written statement of commitment to the SFI Standard communicated throughout the organization, particularly to mill and woodland managers, wood procurement staff, and field foresters.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This commitment is found in the management plan.
10.1.2	C	<p>“Assignment and understanding of roles and responsibilities for achieving SFI Standard objectives.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good understanding; Scott Kelly is playing a more active role. • Scott Kelly attended the SFI Public Comment event; covered in the next SIC meeting.
10.1.3	C	<p>“Staff education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual performance reviews are conducted; training records are kept. • Use of California RPF for most work.
10.1.4	C	<p>“Contractor education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of California RPF for most work; contract requires knowledge • LTO system and comply with THP; field meetings. • Annual field reviews • Logger training is not required to ProLogger, but about half of the logging is done by ProLogger LTOs. • From Californian SIC meeting minutes: “Mr. Carleson discussed the programs that Associated California Loggers (ACL) has in place for logger training. He noted that the association represents Licensed Timber Operators (LTOs) in California and that there are two levels of advanced training offered by his organization – Pro Logger and Master Logger. The Pro Logger training is the level required to meet the SIC standard. He noted that there has been a doubling of the Pro Logger certifications since it was made clear earlier this year that this is the level expected by the industry under SFI. He is pleased that the SIC has set a higher standard than just the LTO to meet SFI requirements. He mentioned that the Pro Logger requirements go well beyond what is required by the state for LTOs and that the advanced training helps achieve the overall goals of the SFI program and improves worker safety.” •
10.2	C	<p><i>“Program Participants shall work closely with state logging or forestry associations, or appropriate agencies or others in the forestry community, to foster improvement in the professionalism of wood producers.”</i></p>
10.2.1 12.1.1, 12.2.1, and 12.5.1	C	<p>“Participation in or support of SFI Implementation Committees to establish criteria and identify delivery mechanisms for wood producers’ training courses...”</p> <p>Note: Indicators 10.2.1, 12.1.1, 12.2.1, and 12.5.1 all relate to SFI Implementation Committee activities. Description of evidence is included here for all of these indicators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewed minutes of most recent meeting of the “California SFI Implementation Committee” held in Anderson, CA on July 14, 2009. Scott Kelly, Senior Forester TCF attended. Agenda items included: Inconsistent Practices, Logger Training, Green Building, SFI Standard Review, Public Outreach Efforts, New SFIS Standard 2010-2014, and Education Materials.
11.1	C	<p><i>“Program Participants shall take appropriate steps to comply with applicable federal, provincial, state, and local forestry and related environmental laws and regulations.”</i></p>

11.1.1	C	<p>“Access to relevant laws and regulations in appropriate locations.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management plans have lists of relevant laws. • There were three copies of the “Guide to the California Forest Practice Act and Related Laws” in the TCF office in Caspar.
11.1.2	C	<p>“System to achieve compliance with applicable federal, provincial, state, or local laws and regulations.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • California has the most stringent regulatory environment for forestry in the US, and probably the world • Use of experienced RPFs as consultants, and oversight by Senior Forester and Evan Smith.
11.1.3	C	<p>“Demonstration of commitment to legal compliance through available regulatory action information.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interview with Charlie Martin, CDF, who confirmed that there were no violations by TCF and that the organization is striving to meet all rules.
11.2	C	<p><i>“Program Participants shall take appropriate steps to comply with all applicable social laws at the federal, provincial, state, and local levels in the country in which the Program Participant operates.”</i></p>
11.2.1	C	<p>“Written policy demonstrating commitment to comply with social laws, such as those covering civil rights, equal employment opportunities, antidiscrimination and anti-harassment measures, workers’ compensation, indigenous peoples’ rights, workers’ and communities’ right to know, prevailing wages, workers’ right to organize, and occupational health and safety.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Covered in the TCF employee manual. • Review of training materials showed the following topics to be included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ EEO ○ Business Ethics ○ Policy Against Sexual Harassment and Other Workplace Harassment
12.1	C	<p><i>“Program Participants shall support and promote efforts by consulting foresters, state and federal agencies, state or local groups, professional societies, and the American Tree Farm System® and other landowner cooperative programs to apply principles of sustainable forest management.”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmed “Outreach Log” which provides an extensive list of public outreach.
12.1.1	C	<p>“Support for efforts of SFI Implementation Committees.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • California SIC met once in 2009 and 2 times in 2008; Scott Kelly, Senior Forester, attended the last two times. See also 10.2.1
12.1.2	C	<p>“Support for the development and distribution of educational materials, including information packets for use with forest landowners.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Done by California SIC
12.1.4	C	<p>“Participation in efforts to support or promote conservation of working forests through voluntary market-based incentive programs (e.g., current-use taxation programs, Forest Legacy, or conservation easements).”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TCF and TNC support forest easement programs throughout the U.S.; TCF is currently leading the effort to employ a large scale working forest conservation easement on timber industry lands in northern Minnesota, for example.
12.1.5	EXR	<p>“Program Participants are knowledgeable about credible regional conservation planning and priority-setting efforts that include a broad range of stakeholders. Consider the results of these efforts in planning where practical and consistent with management objectives.”</p> <p><u>TCF exceeds the standard in development and use of regional conservation planning and priority-setting efforts that include a broad range of stakeholders.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewed memo: “High Conservation Value Features Program - The Conservation Fund’s North Coast Forest Conservation Program, Garcia River, Big River, and Salmon Creek, Mendocino County, CA, Original version May 24, 2007; expanded December 28, 2008, Distribution: Auditors, field staff, interested public, Primary author: Evan Smith” This memo summarizes the analyses of conservation opportunities and needs in North-Coastal California and within the Mendocino Coast

		<p>Hydrological Unit (containing all three properties).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key content of the memo: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Conservation Prospects</u> <p>In August 2005, after two years of research and review, TCF completed “Conservation Prospects for the North Coast: a review and analysis of existing conservation plans, land use trends, and strategies for conservation on the North Coast of California.” This plan was prepared under a contract for the California State Coastal Conservancy and is available online at: http://www.coastalconservancy.ca.gov/Programs/NorthCoast/CF%20book-web.pdf. The principal author of the plan was Jenny Griffin, then a consultant to TCF and now TCF’s North Coast Program Manager. “Conservation Prospects” systematically identifies the highest conservation values for the region based on a broad set of past conservation plans and develops recommendations for future conservation efforts. The two principal recommendations are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Move quickly to establish “working landscape” conservation management on large, strategically located forest and agricultural properties in resource-rich watersheds in Humboldt, Mendocino and Del Norte counties. • Focus other fee or easement acquisitions on unique resources that are essential to conserving high-priority coastal resources, such as coastal estuaries, old-growth redwood forest stands, coho salmon refugia, floodplains, and California Coastal Trail segments. <p>In addition to these general recommendations, the report reviews and catalogs 154 individual conservation plans for the region and provides a detailed spatial synthesis assessment of the seven plans deemed to be the most broadly relevant and instructive. The seven plans were chosen on the basis of data quality, scientific principles, format, and mandate and consist of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>California North Coast Ecoregion Aquatic Conservation Strategy Recommendations</i>, The Nature Conservancy of California, Fall 2003; 2. <i>California North Coast Ecoregional Plan</i>, The Nature Conservancy of California, June 2001; 3. <i>Completing the California Coastal Trail</i>, California State Coastal Conservancy, January 2003; 4. <i>Mendocino County Coastal Conservation Plan</i>, Mendocino Land Trust, April 2003; 5. <i>A GIS-Based Model for Assessing Conservation Focal Areas for the Redwood Ecoregion</i>, Conservation Biology Institute and Save-the-Redwoods League, 1999; 6. <i>Recovery Strategy for California Coho Salmon</i>, California Department of Fish and Game, 2004; and 7. <i>Strategic Plan Update</i>, Pacific Coast Joint Venture, 2004. <p>The 13-page chapter of <i>Conservation Prospects</i> on the Mendocino Coast Hydrologic Unit (which contains all of three of the TCF properties) draws from 15 local plans in addition to the seven core regional plans. In general, “the Mendocino Coast HU is consistently one of the most highly valued regions of the North Coast” by the conservation plans synthesized. Specific features that are recognized as of high conservation value include pygmy forest, coastal dunes, coastal estuarine wetlands, seabird rookeries, spawning areas for anadromous fish, and old growth forests.</p> <p>The 259 page full report is publicly available for download from www.coastalconservancy.ca.gov or by contacting TCF’s North Coast office. The report was developed over a 24 month period in collaboration with state agencies and conservation groups; 41 organizations or individuals provided technical review for the assessment. The report is frequently cited by newer conservation plans and initiatives on the North Coast.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
12.2	C	<p><i>“Program Participants shall support and promote, at the state, provincial or other appropriate levels, mechanisms for public outreach, education, and involvement related to forest management.”</i></p>
12.2.1	C	<p>“Support for the SFI Implementation Committee program to address outreach, education, and technical assistance (e.g., toll-free numbers, public sector technical assistance programs).”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussed during SIC meeting. See also 10.2.1

12.2.2	C	<p>“Periodic educational opportunities promoting sustainable forestry, such as ...”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmed extensive educational outreach, including work with school groups. • Review of outreach log confirmed that The Conservation Fund conducts regular tours of their lands involving a range of interested parties. These tours are used to inform participants about the project’s sustainable forestry approach.
12.2.3	C	<p>“Recreation opportunities for the public, where consistent with forest management objectives.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedestrian access is allowed on most portions of these lands; a permit system is being rolled out for other uses, with horse-riding the first program thus far. • Organized events are allowed by permit: boy scout hikes, bird-watching or census events, etc.
12.3	N.A.	“Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall participate in the development of public land planning and management processes.”
12.3.1	N.A.	“Involvement in public land planning and management activities with appropriate governmental entities and the public.”
12.3.2	EXR	<p>“Appropriate contact with local stakeholders over forest management issues through state, provincial, federal, or independent collaboration.”</p> <p><u>The Conservation Fund exceeds the requirements for providing opportunities for stakeholder input on management decisions by consistently seeking and using input from a wide range of local and regional stakeholders.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a private owner this SFI requirement is optional; TCF has sought to communicate directly with any interested group or individual, with particular care given to be a good neighbor that is sensitive to the needs and wishes of the local people. • The Conservation Fund has made extensive efforts to involve the general public and particularly water-protection activists in planning decisions on its North Coast Forests. For example, a “stakeholder tour” is held to exchange information on all THPs. • TCF sought input from stakeholders and from public agencies (several of which were also funders) in the development of the recently finalized <i>Big River and Salmon Creek Forests: Integrated Resource Management Plan</i>.
12.5	C	“Program Participants shall establish, at the state, provincial, or other appropriate levels, procedures to address concerns raised by loggers, consulting foresters, employees, the public, or Program Participants regarding practices that appear inconsistent with the SFI Standard principles and objectives.”
12.5.1	C	<p>“Support for SFI Implementation Committee efforts (toll-free numbers and other efforts) to address concerns about apparent nonconforming practices.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussed during SIC meeting. See also 10.2.1
12.5.2	C	<p>“Process to receive and respond to public inquiries.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmed “Incident Log” which includes a list of the actions taken. • Confirmed “Outreach Log” which provides an extensive list of public outreach. • Office manager Holly Newberger is responsible for taking all initial inquiries and connecting the inquiry with the appropriate person.
12.6	C	“Program Participants shall report annually to the SFI Program on their compliance with the SFI Standard.”
12.6.1*	C	<p>“Prompt response to the SFI annual progress report.”</p> <p>(*Note: This indicator will be reviewed in all audits.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmed through SFI, Inc.
12.6.2	C	<p>“Recordkeeping for all the categories of information needed for SFI annual progress reports.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good record-keeping; report categories were all filled out.
12.6.3	C	<p>“Maintenance of copies of past reports to document progress and improvements to demonstrate conformance to the SFI Standard.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmed 2008 report.
13.1*	C	“Program Participants shall establish a management review system to examine findings and progress in implementing the SFI Standard, to make appropriate improvements in programs, and to inform their employees of changes.”

13.1.1	C	<p>“System to review commitments, programs, and procedures to evaluate effectiveness.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • California’s forestry regulations essentially mandate careful systems for ensuring harvests and silvicultural treatments are conducted properly. • TCF is engaged in many monitoring projects, including owl surveys, stream monitoring, and rare plant surveys.
13.1.2	C	<p>“System for collecting, reviewing, and reporting information to management regarding progress in achieving SFI Standard objectives and performance measures.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evan Smith, Vice President, The Conservation Fund visits the lands regularly; he meets with all staff and consultants and receives direct reports. • Evan Smith is a recognized expert on SFI requirements. He works closely with the program on aspects of SFI conformance.
13.1.3	C	<p>“Annual review of progress by management and determination of changes and improvements necessary to continually improve SFI conformance.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmed 2009 “notes from 2009 planning meeting” (aka Planning Meeting Memo) that a management review meeting was held on 1.15.2009 including Evan Smith, Holly Newberger, Office Manager, and Scott Kelly, Senior Forester.

Field Sites and Audit Participants

On October 5-6, 2009, the audit team conducted the annual audit of The Conservation Fund, including on-site inspections of field operations as well as extensive interviews with The Conservation Fund management and field personnel.

On the morning of the first day of the audit, the audit team held an opening meeting at the entrance of the Garcia River forest and discussed the following topics:

- Introductions and Field Audit Itinerary Review
- Overview of The Conservation Fund activities in the past year
- The Nature Conservancy- (TNC)- new projects

The rest of the day was dedicated to the following activities:

- Travel to Salmon Creek Forest
- Stop 1-Meeting at Navaro Ridge, Lunch
 - Admendments to Timber Harvest Plans
- Travel to Fort Bragg, dinner with TCF staff at Fort Bragg
 - Discussed management plan/public access Plan

Day 2 of the surveillance audit was comprised of the following activities:

- Travel to Big River Forest
- Stop 1: North of 20 THP
 - Tour of THP wit Darcie Mahoney, consulting forester
- Stop 2: Wheel Gultch THP
- Stop 3: Lunch at Picolottis Orchard
 - Interview with Charlie Martin, Mendocino CalFire Officer
- Travel to Caspar
- Exit Meeting in Caspar Office
 - General findings of the audit
 - Disposition of the open CAR
 - Closure of the audit

Person interviewed	Position/Organization
Jennifer Carah	Field Scientist TNC
Dan Porter	TNC North Coast Ecologist
Scott Kelly	TCF Chief Forester
Jonathan Warmerdam	Environmental Scientist- North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board
Holly Newberger	TCF office manager
Jenny Griffin	TCF North Coast Program Manager
Darcie Mahoney	Consulting Forester
Tom Duffus	TCF-Upper Midwest
Eric Hontou	Summit Forestry Technician
Lee Susan	Forester
Charlie Martin	Mendocino CalFire Officer

COMPANY CONTACT INFORMATION

Name of Certified Company		The Conservation Fund North Coast Forest Conservation Program		
Address	Street, No.	8664 NW Springville Ct		
	City	Portland	Zip/Postal Code	97231
	State or Province	OR		
Contact person		Evan Smith		
Telephone		(503)407-0301	Fax	
E-mail	esmith@conservationfund.org	Company website	www.conservationfund.org	

CERTIFICATE INFORMATION

Forest Certification achieved (SFI, CSA)		SFI	
Certificate number		NSF-SFIS-6R031	
Certification Date (mm/dd/yy)	07-01-07	Certificate Expiry Date (mm/dd/yy)	06-31-12
Text in Scope Line of Certificate		Land management on the North Coast Forest Conservation Program of The Conservation Fund and related sustainable forestry activities in California.	
Certification Body Name		NSF-ISR	
Accreditation Body Name		ANAB	
Accreditation Number		NSF-ISR 1301672-071107	
Canada Only: Notification Fee Paid		Yes	No

CERTIFIED FOREST INFORMATION

Forest area (to which certification applies)	40,000 ACRES	HECTARES
SFI Certification¹	State/Province CA ac/ha 40,000 acres	State/Province ac/ha
Breakout by State/Province	State/Province ac/ha	State/Province ac/ha
Land ownership	% public	%100 private
Is this same area certified to another forest management standard? (mark with an 'x')	X YES	NO
	If Yes, to which standard: CSA SFI X FSC	
	If Yes, what portion of the acres/hectares (and AAC for certificates in Canada) reported on this form was previously certified?	
	acres OR ha AAC	
CANADA ONLY	% Boreal (acres)	% Boreal (hectares)
Is the certification located in the Boreal?	% Boreal (m3)	% Boreal (m3)
CANADA ONLY	AAC in m ³ (to which certification applies)	
	(For private lands use annual average harvest.)	

¹ SFI certificates may be multi-site and cross state and country borders. For accounting and reporting services, please provide the break-down if the certified forestland is in more than one state/province.

² Please refer to Principle 6 for AAC reporting guidelines