



# Surveillance Audit Report

Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Standard

September 30, 2010

**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

**C. NSF Audit Team:**

Lead Auditor: Mike Ferrucci

Auditor (FSC): Wally Mark

**D. Audit Dates:**      September 26-28, 2010

**E. Reference Documentation:**

2010-2014 SFI Standard®

TCF North Coast Forest Conservation Program Policy Digest

Draft Invasive Plant Management Plan for the Salmon Creek Forest (July 2010)

**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 Most changes were modest:

- Updated program to meet SFI 2010-2014 Standard requirements.
- Overall policy digest was compiled
- See annual activity description (Sept 2010)
- Final approval by agencies (Coastal Conservancy, State [WCB] and Regional Water Boards of the Big River and Salmon Creek Management Plans
- New “Northern Spotted Owl Management Plan, Big River and Salmon Creek Forestland” incorporating the new California regulations for NSO; the plan documents measures taken to protect the NSO and avoid a take
- Invasive management plans
- Escalating problems with marijuana gardens; working with law enforcement; coordinating with other large landowners; are mapping locations and providing to sheriff’s office
- Increased emphasis on LWD projects in the creeks and rivers; considering Big River and Salmon Creek projects
- Road upgrade work continues, with funding from an EPA settlement for mitigation
- Pilot stewardship pedestrian access project on BR and SC (continuing the Equestrian Access pilot project)

**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: None**

Corrective Action Plan is not required; no CARs remain open at the conclusion of this Surveillance Audit. One Opportunity for Improvement (OFI) was identified.

**Appendices:**

- Appendix I: Surveillance Notification Letter and Audit Schedule
- Appendix II: Public Surveillance Audit Report
- Appendix III: Audit Matrix
- Appendix IV: SFI Reporting Form (no changes)

## Appendix I



# Surveillance Notification Letter and Audit Schedule



September 20, 2010

Evan Smith, Vice President  
The Conservation Fund  
8664 NW Springville Ct  
Portland, OR 97231

Jenny Griffin, North Coast Program Manager  
The Conservation Fund  
14951 "A" Caspar Road, Box 50  
Caspar, CA 95420

Dear Evan and Jenny,

I am scheduled to conduct the Surveillance Audit on September 27-28. This is a partial review of your program to confirm that it continues to be in conformance with certification requirements, that it meets the additional requirements of the SFI 2010-2014 Standard, and that continual improvement is being made. I'll be joined by Walter Mark who will focus on FSC.

During the audit I will:

1. Review progress on achieving SFI objectives and performance measures and the results of the management review of your SFI Program;
2. Review selected components of your SFI program;
3. Verify your progress towards complying with the SFI 2010-2014 Standard by 12.31.10;
4. Review logo and/or label use; and
5. Confirm public availability of public reports.

The enclosed tentative schedule outlines the topics I expect to review during this visit. The schedule can be adapted either in advance or on-site to accommodate any special circumstances. As during the certification audit we should plan to have lunch on site to expedite the visit.

If you have any questions regarding this planned audit, please contact me.

Best Regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Mike Ferrucci".

Mike Ferrucci, Lead Auditor, NSF-ISR, Ltd.  
Enclosure: Agenda for Surveillance Audit

Copy: Walter Mark, Dave Wager

**Agenda for Surveillance Audit**  
**The Conservation Fund – Facility # 6R301**  
**Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard (2010-2014)**

**Monday September 27**

8:30 am Opening Meeting/Agenda Review

- Review changes to the Facility Record Sheet (contact information, billing information, etc.)
- Discuss changes/improvements to the SFI Program, changes in operations, or changes in scope since the certification audit
- Review NSF SFI Audit Procedures
- Discuss field site visit provisions and other logistical issues
- Verify effective implementation of any corrective action plans from the previous NSF certification audit or surveillance audit
- Review SFI Survey forms and confirm public report is available to public
- Review minutes of Management meetings
- Review Logo or Label use issues

9-10:00 am SFI Program Review

**Objectives 1 to 7: Requirements for Land Management**

- New or changed requirement as determined by the NSF Lead Auditor

**Objectives 14 to 20 Requirements for All Program Participants**

- 14.1 Forestry Law/Reg. Compliance System
- 14.2 Social Law Compliance (including ILO)
- 15.1 Support or Funding for Research
- 15.2 Develop or Use Regional Analyses
- 15.3 Broaden Awareness of Climate Change Impacts
- 16.1 Training of Contractors and Personnel
- 16.2 Improved Wood Producer Professionalism
- 20.1 Management Review System

10-11:00 am FSC Program Review

11 to 5:30 pm Field Visits, Big River

**Tuesday September 28**

8:00 to 3:00 Field Visits, Garcia River

3- 4:00 Auditors review findings and issues, prepare for closing meeting (in field)

4:00 Closing Meeting

## Original Audit Notification

**From:** Michael Ferrucci [mailto:mferrucci@iforest.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 20, 2010 7:22 AM  
**To:** 'Evan Smith'; 'Amy Hsu'; 'Dave Wager'  
**Subject:** RE: audit dates

Evan,  
Robert can't make either week, so SCS is planning on substituting someone else either way. Let's keep the dates as originally planned.

Amy, Dave,  
Please inform Evan of the substitute auditor.

Mike Ferrucci [mferrucci@iforest.com](mailto:mferrucci@iforest.com) Office and Cell: 203-887-9248

**From:** Evan Smith [mailto:esmith@conservationfund.org]  
**Sent:** Monday, July 19, 2010 10:54 PM  
**To:** 'Michael Ferrucci'  
**Subject:** RE: audit dates

Actually the original dates work pretty well for me since I have to be in Mendo later that week and the following week, so was thinking of dragging the family down to mendo for an extended trip. But if need be, I can switch. Haven't asked Scott or Jenny, but I believe they're free. New dates work for Robert?  
Cheers

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:** Michael Ferrucci [mailto:mferrucci@iforest.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, July 19, 2010 10:56 AM  
**To:** Smith, Evan  
**Subject:** audit dates

Evan:

Would it be a problem to change the audit dates to September 20-21, 2010?

I had originally asked for Sept 27-28. I can still do those dates too, but 20-21 would be a bit better for me.

Mike Ferrucci  
[mferrucci@iforest.com](mailto:mferrucci@iforest.com)  
Office and Cell: 203-887-9248

## Additional Audit Planning Considerations:

**From:** Jenny Griffin [mailto:jgriffin@conservationfund.org]

**Sent:** Tuesday, September 14, 2010 7:24 PM

**To:** 'Michael Ferrucci'; 'Amy Hsu'

**Cc:** 'Smith, Evan'

**Subject:** audit 9/27-28

The location of our opening meeting will likely be determined by your starting point(s). If that's the Bay Area, we can meet the morning of the 27th in Boonville and go from there to the Garcia River Forest. If you're staying on the Mendocino Coast Sunday night, we can meet at our Caspar office and go from there to Big River, leaving the Garcia for Tuesday and a closing meeting in the field or in Boonville to save you some driving time on the other end. I'm attaching a locator map in case that's helpful – our Caspar office is on the coast between Mendocino and Fort Bragg. Let me know when you get a chance your starting points and preferences.

Suggested features for field review include, on the Garcia, the North Fork road upgrade project (active operation), the Olsen Gulch THP area (planned, not yet submitted), the Upper North Fork THP area (group harvests, initiated this year and to be resumed next year), and possibly the Inman Creek LWD project (completed). On Big River: Wheel Gulch THP (active), and Laguna Pass THP (likely completed by 9/17) (Coombs Gulch THP, likely completed 9/27, is another options). All is pretty quiet on Salmon Creek but if there's anything there you'd like to see, we can do that, too. JG

**From:** Jenny Griffin [mailto:jgriffin@conservationfund.org]

**Sent:** Monday, September 20, 2010 8:17 PM

**To:** 'Walter Mark'; 'Michael Ferrucci'

**Cc:** 'Evan Smith'

**Subject:** TCF Audit Material

Walter and Mike,

Attached for your reference and review please find the following:

- Summary of activities since the 2009 audit Oct. 5-7
- Individual summaries of new THPs and of some completed or in-progress THPs we may visit next week
- THP summary table
- Spreadsheet summarizing annual harvest volumes
- New Policy Digest (stand-alone policy document governing all three forests)
- Draft invasive plant management plan, and
- Press clippings.

I hope and trust that you can handle the ~ 3 megs of attachments but please let me know if you need them re-sent or in any other format and I apologize in advance if I've clogged up anyone's server!

I believe you're already familiar with references available on our website:

[http://www.conservationfund.org/north\\_coast\\_forests/documents](http://www.conservationfund.org/north_coast_forests/documents)

In preparation for this audit along with our annual review, we've identified three topics which while not inconsistent with our policies or protocols, merit additional discussion and provide opportunities for improvement:

1) Marijuana growing on north coast forestlands has escalated into an enormous and potentially very dangerous problem. Our contractors and staff are increasingly running into growers, gardens, and evidence. Despite self-funded helicopter surveys, repeated calls to the Sheriff's office, and strong cautions relayed to our staff and contractors, risks are high and remedies are short. Looking ahead to

2011, we hope to deter growers via a stronger security presence on our properties and with more effective coordination with and response by local authorities.

2) The use of Dust-off was proposed as an alternative to time-consuming and expensive watering of a long stretch of mainline road on our Big River property. Dust abatement is required during log hauling to protect air quality, and all methods have various trade-offs and environmental concerns. Responses from members of our Advisory Group to the Dust-off proposal indicated that all methods should be researched and presented to the AG for thorough discussion prior to implementation; in the meanwhile, we are continuing to employ a local watering truck. We plan to address the topic at the next AG meeting so that the issue is resolved well in advance of 2011 operations.

3) We had plans to utilize an established contractor for a package job in the Garcia River Forest consisting of the Pulte-funded road upgrade project on Blue Waterhole and the Upper North Fork THP. Due to the contractor's unresponsiveness, communication issues, and the contractor's inability to perform the logging job until late in the season, the contract for roadwork was canceled and alternate contractors were identified. We will continue to emphasize communications between contractors and job supervisors as plans develop early in the 2011 season.

Let us know if you have any questions about these topics. Our staff and programs continue to enjoy widespread support in the local community, both from environmentalists and business interests, including positive (if declining – which we take as a sign of comfort!) participation in the public field tours.

Also, please let us know if you would like any additional information in advance of 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

We'll have all our staff (Jenny, Scott, Holly, Madison, Chris, and I) participating in at least some portion of the audit but if there's anybody from our broad circle of partners and friends that you know you'd like to be able to visit with in person, let us know so we can check schedules. Right now we should have someone from TNC along for at least one day and also Lee Susan (consulting forester on Big River). Likely also someone from the California State Conservancy. We'll meet representatives from Philbrick Logging and Piper Logging (road projects) on their respective jobs. But if you want to visit with other contractors or representatives from the Water Board, CalFire, DFG, neighbors, etc, let us know so we can get them lined up. Amazingly, we do have a three year audit history of running into Charlie Martin on site—he's the lead CalFire inspector for this area—and given the time of year (closing out jobs) there's a good chance again this year. From Evan Smith

## Appendix II



# SFI Summary Surveillance Audit Report North Coast Forest Conservation Program of The Conservation Fund

The SFI Program of The Conservation Fund on its North Coast Forest Conservation Program has achieved conformance with the SFI Standard®, 2010-2014 Edition, according to the NSF-ISR SFIS Certification Audit Process.

NSF-ISR initially certified the North Coast Forest Conservation Program to the SFI Standard®, 2005-2009 Edition on July 1, 2007. This report describes the third annual follow-up Surveillance Audit which focused on changes in the standard, all of which were confirmed. This audit was thus an “update audit” with no change in the certificate expiration date. In addition the audit reviewed any changes in operations, the management review system, and efforts at continuous improvement. In addition, a subset of SFI requirements associated with land management (Objectives 1 through 7) were selected for detailed review.

### Overview of the certified program

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

#### ***“We Are America's Partner in Conservation***

*Americans care deeply about saving land. Year after year, people across the country vote to protect the places where they live, work and play. And year after year, they ask us to save these places. From Northeast to Southwest, we work with our partners, to conserve land, train leaders and invest in conservation at home. From our headquarters in Arlington, Virginia, and our field offices across the country, we've saved land in all 50 states—more than 6.5 million acres of wild havens, working lands, vibrant communities and more.*

*The Conservation Fund started in 1985 as a smart solution to an old problem: how to balance environmental and economic goals. For decades, environmentalists and business or development leaders had been at odds, with each group favoring its own use of the landscape. Conservationist Pat Noonan, former head of The Nature Conservancy, decided to found a small, savvy nonprofit organization that would bring economics and the environment together—providing a win for all of America. That idea became the Fund—a business of conservation, staffed by a skilled team with real estate, finance, legal, investment and science expertise. Rather than pursue our own conservation agenda and membership, we partner with community, government and corporate organizations—fulfilling their conservation priorities. Everything we do has environmental and economic value, from protecting "working" forests and recreation destinations that provide local revenue to helping communities grow thoughtfully.*

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 surveillance audit was performed by NSF-ISR from September 26 through September 28 by an audit team headed by Mike Ferrucci, Lead Auditor who meets the qualification criteria for conducting SFIS Certification Audits of “Section 9. SFI 2010-2014 Audit Procedures and Auditor Qualifications and Accreditation” contained in Requirements for the SFI 2010-2014 Program: Standards, Rules for Label Use, Procedures, and Guidance. It was conducted concurrently with the FSC Annual Audit of the same ownership by Scientific Certification Systems.

The main objective of the audit was to assess conformance of the firm's SFI Program to the additional requirements of the Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Standard, 2010-2014 Edition. The scope of the SFIS Audit included land management operations. Forest practices that were the focus of field inspections included those that have been conducted since the previous field audit conducted one year previously. In addition practices conducted earlier were also reviewed as appropriate (regeneration and BMP issues, for example). In addition, a subset of SFI obligations to promote sustainable forestry practices, to seek legal compliance, and to incorporate continual improvement systems were reexamined during the audit. The requirement to provide a public audit report was also reviewed.

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 2.1.4	Minimized plantings of exotic tree species and research documentation that exotic tree species, planted operationally, pose minimal risk.
-----------------	---

Indicator 2.1.7	Afforestation programs that consider potential ecological impacts of the selection and planting of tree species in non-forested landscapes.
Performance Measure 2.5	Program Participants that deploy improved planting stock, including varietal seedlings, shall use sound scientific methods.
Indicator 2.5.1	Program for appropriate research, testing, evaluation and deployment of improved planting stock, <u>including varietal seedlings</u> .
Indicator 3.2.5	Where regulations or best management practices 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 (50 hectares), except when necessary <u>to meet regulatory requirements</u> or 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.
Indicator 5.3.3	Trees in clearcut harvest areas are at least 3 years old or 5 feet (1.5 meters) 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.
Objectives 8-13:	To broaden the practice of sustainable forestry through procurement programs.
Indicator 15.1.2	Research on genetically engineered trees via forest tree biotechnology shall adhere to all applicable federal, state, and provincial regulations and international protocols.
Objective 18	Public Land Management Responsibilities. To promote and implement sustainable forest management on public lands.

The Conservation Fund does not engage in the relevant activities and thus the requirements are 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.

### **Overview of Audit Findings**

The Conservation Fund's SFI Program was found to be in full conformance with the SFIS Standard. There were no new non-conformances identified. As such, the team recommended continuing certification.

One opportunity Improvement was identified. SFI Indicator 17.3.2 requires a "Process to receive and respond to public inquiries." There is an opportunity to improve the process for receiving and recording public inquiries.

The SFI Audit Team also confirmed that many of the 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: Forest management planning at a level appropriate to the size and scale of the operation, including:
  - a. a long-term resources analysis;
  - b. a periodic or ongoing forest inventory;
  - c. a land classification system;
  - d. soils inventory and maps, where available;
  - e. access to growth-and-yield modeling capabilities;
  - f. up-to-date maps or a geographic information system;
  - g. recommended sustainable harvest levels for areas available for harvest; and
  - h. a review of non-timber issues (e.g. recreation, tourism, pilot projects and economic incentive programs to promote water protection, carbon storage, bioenergy feedstock production, or biological diversity conservation, or to address climate-induced ecosystem change).
- Retention of trees during partial harvests is superb.  
(Indicator 2.3.5: "Retention of vigorous trees during partial harvesting, consistent with scientific silvicultural standards 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: "Program Participants shall have or develop, implement and document riparian protection measures based on soil type, terrain, vegetation, ecological function, harvesting system and other applicable factors.")
- The program for protection of rivers, streams, and riparian zones is exemplary.

(Indicator 3.2.1: “Program addressing management and protection of rivers, streams, lakes, and other water bodies and riparian zones.”)

- Implementation of plans to protect rivers, streams, lakes and other water bodies is exemplary.  
(Indicator 3.2.3: “Implementation of plans to manage or protect rivers, streams, lakes, and other water bodies.”)
- The Conservation Fund’s programs to protect threatened and endangered species on the North Coast Forests are exemplary.  
(Indicator 4.1.2: Program to protect threatened and endangered species.)
- The Conservation Fund exceeds the standard by surveying for previously unknown threatened and endangered species within its North Coast Forests.  
(Indicator 4.1.3: Program to locate and protect known sites associated with viable occurrences of critically imperiled and imperiled species and communities also known as Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value. 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.)
- The Conservation Fund’s efforts to support and manage on the basis of landscape-level analysis is exemplary.  
(Indicator 4.1.5 Program for assessment, conducted either individually or collaboratively, of forest cover types, age or size classes, and habitats at the individual ownership level and, where credible data are available, across the landscape, and take into account findings in planning and management activities.)
- The Conservation Fund’s efforts to understand the extent and impacts of invasive exotic plants and to develop and implement control strategies are exemplary.  
(Indicator 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.)
- 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: “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 17.1.5: “Program Participants are knowledgeable about credible regional conservation planning and priority-setting efforts that include a broad range of stakeholders and have a program to take into account the results of these efforts in planning.”)

- The Conservation Fund’s outreach activities on its North Coast Forest Conservation Program exceed the requirements for opportunities to promote sustainable, conservation-oriented forestry.

SFI Indicator 17.2.1 requires, in part “Periodic educational opportunities promoting sustainable forestry, such as a. field tours, seminars, websites, webinars or workshops; b. educational trips; ...”

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 September, 2011.



### **General Description of Evidence of Conformity**

NSF’s audit team used a variety of evidence to determine conformance. A general description of this evidence is provided below, organized by SFI Objective.

**Objective 1. Forest Management Planning** - To broaden the implementation of sustainable forestry by ensuring long-term forest productivity and yield based on the use of the best scientific information available.

**Summary of Evidence** – The forest management plans and supporting documentation and the associated inventory data and growth models were the key evidence of conformance.

**Objective 2. Forest Productivity** - To ensure long-term forest productivity, carbon storage and conservation of forest resources through prompt reforestation, soil conservation, afforestation and other measures.

**Summary of Evidence** – Field observations and associated records were used to confirm practices. The Conservation Fund has programs for reforestation, for protection against insects diseases and wildfire, and for careful management of activities which could potentially impact soil and long-term productivity.

**Objective 3. Protection and Maintenance of Water Resources** - To protect water quality in streams, lakes and other water bodies.

**Summary of Evidence** – Field observations of a range of sites were the key evidence. Auditors visited portions of selected field sites that were closest to water resources.

**Objective 4. Conservation of Biological Diversity including Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value** To 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 species.

**Summary of Evidence** – Field observations, written plans and policies, particularly those focusing resources on stream restoration, the significant level of involvement by college-

trained field biologists and scientists, and regular staff involvement in conferences and workshops that cover scientific advances were the evidence used to assess the requirements involved biodiversity conservation.

**Objective 5. Management of Visual Quality and Recreational Benefits -** To manage the visual impact of forest operations and provide recreational opportunities for the public.

**Summary of Evidence** – Field observations of completed operations and policies/procedures for visual quality were assessed during the evaluation. Interviews helped confirm a growing recreation program that includes equestrian and pedestrian access by permit.

**Objective 6. Protection of Special Sites -** To manage lands that are ecologically, geologically, or culturally important in a manner that takes into account their unique qualities.

**Summary of Evidence** – Field observations of completed operations, records of special sites, training records, and written protection plans were all assessed during the evaluation.

**Objective 7. Efficient Use of Forest Resources -** To promote the efficient use of forest resources.

**Summary of Evidence** – Field observations of completed operations, contract clauses, and discussions with supervising field foresters provided the key evidence.]

**Objectives 8 to 13. Not Applicable**

**Objective 14. Legal and Regulatory Compliance -**

Compliance with applicable federal, provincial, state and local laws and regulations.

**Summary of Evidence** – Field reviews of ongoing and completed operations were the most critical evidence. Regulatory organizations contacted included California Fire and Forestry and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.

**Objective 15. Forestry Research, Science, and Technology -** To support forestry research, science, and technology, upon which sustainable forest management decisions are based.

**Summary of Evidence** – Support for science was confirmed by interviewing scientists and by visiting the field site for a project exploring an alternative approach to the restoration of in stream woody structure.

**Objective 16. Training and Education -**To improve the implementation of sustainable forestry practices through appropriate training and education programs.

**Summary of Evidence** –Records associated with harvest sites audited, and interviews of staff and contractors were the key evidence for this objective.

**Objective 17. Community Involvement in the Practice of Sustainable Forestry -**

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.

**Summary of Evidence** – An impressive lists of public involvement activities was sufficient to assess the requirements.

**Objective 18: Public Land Management Responsibilities – N.A.**

To support and implement sustainable forest management on public lands.

**Objective 19. Communications and Public Reporting** - To broaden the practice of sustainable forestry by documenting progress and opportunities for improvement.

**Summary of Evidence** – Reports filed with SFI Inc. and the SFI Inc. website provided the key evidence.

**Objective 20. Management Review and Continual Improvement** - To promote continual improvement in the practice of sustainable forestry, and to monitor, measure, and report performance in achieving the commitment to sustainable forestry.

**Summary of Evidence** – Records of program reviews, agendas and notes from management review meetings, and interviews with personnel within the organization were assessed.



**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 and ecosystem services such as the conservation of soil, air and water quality, carbon, biological diversity, wildlife and aquatic habitats, recreation, and aesthetics.

**2. Forest Productivity and Health**

To provide for regeneration after harvest and maintain the productive capacity of the forest land base, and to protect and maintain long-term forest and soil productivity. In addition, to protect forests from economically or environmentally undesirable levels of wildfire, pests, diseases, invasive exotic plants and animals and other damaging agents and thus maintain and improve long-term forest health and productivity.

**3. Protection of Water Resources**

To protect water bodies and riparian zones, and to conform with best management practices to protect water quality.

**4. Protection of Biological Diversity**

To manage forests in ways that protect and promote biological diversity, including animal and plant species, wildlife habitats, and ecological or natural community types.

**5. Aesthetics and Recreation**

To manage the visual impacts of forest operations, and to provide recreational opportunities for the public.

**6. Protection of Special Sites**

To manage forests and lands of special significance (ecologically, geologically or culturally important) in a manner that protects their integrity and takes into account their unique qualities.

## **7. Responsible Fiber Sourcing Practices in North America**

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

## **8. Avoidance of Controversial Sources including Illegal Logging in Offshore Fiber Sourcing**

To avoid wood fiber from illegally logged forests when procuring fiber outside of North America, and to avoid sourcing fiber from countries without effective social laws.

## **9. Legal Compliance**

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

## **10. Research**

To support advances in sustainable forest management through forestry research, science and technology.

## **11. Training and Education**

To improve the practice of sustainable forestry through training and education programs.

## **12. Public Involvement**

To broaden the practice of sustainable forestry on public lands through community involvement.

## **13. Transparency**

To broaden the understanding of forest certification to the SFI 2010-2014 Standard by documenting certification audits and making the findings publicly available.

## **14. Continual Improvement**

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

*Source: Sustainable Forestry Initiative® (SFI) Standard, 2010-2014 Edition*



### **For More Information Contact:**

Evan Smith, Vice President, Forestland Acquisition & Finance  
The Conservation Fund, Portland, OR 97209  
[esmith@conservationfund.org](mailto:esmith@conservationfund.org)

or

Jenny Griffin, North Coast Program Manager  
The Conservation Fund  
(707) 962-0712  
[jgriffin@conservationfund.org](mailto:jgriffin@conservationfund.org)

**Appendix III**



**Audit Matrix**

## NSF-ISR SFI 2010-2014 MATRIX INCLUDING GUIDANCE FOR TRANSITION REQUIREMENTS

The “transition rules” outlined in Section 9 of “Requirements for the SFI 2010-2014 Program: Standards, Rules for Label Use, Procedures, and Guidance” have been considered in the design of this checklist. During 2010 the option exists of remaining under the 2005-2009 Standard. NSF will maintain a separate “2005-2009” checklist through 2010; the following checklist is used for audits against the SFI 2010-2014 Standard.

- Between April 1 and December 31, 2010 auditors conducting surveillance audits for customers choosing **not to transition yet** should complete the old checklist for all applicable requirements and the new checklist only for those items that are additional. Additional requirements have been underlined; most have additional comments attached (seek technical support if you don’t know how to set your version of MSWord so that the comments are visible).
- Between April 1 and December 31, 2010 auditors conducting recertification audits should use the new checklist, but shall not issue “real” non-conformances for those items that are additional. Instead “transitional gaps” are identified; these are tracked in the NSF OASIS / NSF On-line database system, but do not count against the customer in the overall determination of conformance with the standard.

### Findings and Instructions:

<b>C</b>	Conformance
<b>Exr</b>	Exceeds the Requirements
<b>Maj</b>	Major Non-conformance
<b>Min</b>	Minor Non-conformance
<b>OFI</b>	Opportunity for Improvement (can also be in Conformance)
<b>N.A.</b>	Not Applicable
<b>Likely Gap *</b>	Likely GAP Against 2010-2014 SFIS*
<b>Likely Conf. *</b>	Likely Conformance With 2010-2014 SFIS*
	* for programs evaluated against 2005-2009 SFIS, likely conformance is assessed against the new requirements with SFIS 2010-2014; where there is a “Likely Gap” a “transitional non-conformance is issued; the program’s transition action plan (aka corrective plan) must be assessed.
<b>Auditor</b>	Optional; may be used for audit planning.
10, 11	Date Codes, for example: 10= July 2010; 11=Aug. 2011
Other	Words in <i>italics</i> are defined in the standard.
	Portions that are underlined are modified (and may be subject to transition rules); non-conformances against these for re-certifications will <b>not</b> adversely affect re-registration until after December 31, 2010. New certifications must be against the entire 2010-2014 SFI Standard.

**Objective 1. Forest Management Planning**

To broaden the implementation of *sustainable forestry* by ensuring *long-term forest productivity and yield* based on the use of the *best scientific information* available.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
1.1	<b>Program Participants shall ensure that forest management plans include long-term harvest levels that are sustainable and consistent with appropriate growth-and-yield models.</b>	MF	10						
Notes	<p>Source: North Coast Forest Conservation Program Policy Digest, August 2010</p> <p>In the GRF IRMP, we committed to harvesting not more than 35% of growth on the working forest (non-reserve) portion of the Garcia River Forest (GRF) for each of the first two decades (measured on a rolling ten-year basis). The net harvest level calculations are based on conservative growth assumptions and result in an annual allowable harvest of 1.5 mmbf (million board feet) for the first decade (2006-2015). [To compensate for no harvest in 2006, the harvest levels will likely average slightly over 1.5 mmbf for the following nine years.] Over the next two decades this should result in an increase in standing timber volume on the non-reserve portion of the property from 5.6 mbf (thousand board feet) per acre to 10.41 mbf per acre (reaching 20 mbf per acre around 2065). Actual harvest volumes in 2007 were 1.4 mmbf; 0 in 2008 and 2009.</p> <p>In the BR/SC IRMP we committed to an annual net harvest level for each of the first two decades of 4.65 million board feet (the MOU restriction is for not greater than 5.1 million board feet and the appraisal estimated that the FPR would allow harvest of 8.5 million board feet). Actual harvest volumes in 2007 were 3.3 mmbf; in 2008 3.5 mmbf; and in 2009 1.48 mmbf. An average annual harvest level of 4.65 million board feet on the Forests is projected to result in overall inventory increases of 34 percent over the next two decades, consistent with the objective of increasing the average size and overall stocking of the forest. More recent modeling done for the purposes of carbon sequestration projections indicates that an annual allowable cut of 4.65 million board feet (net) represents about 1.3 percent of the inventory, or 23 percent of the annual growth, which should allow for a significant increase in the size and stocking of the forest in the next two decades. Ultimately, however, the goal is not to achieve a specific number (forest inventory is an inexact science) but to achieve a more natural species balance (i.e., less tanoak), with greater stocking and greater average tree size.</p>								
	2010-2014 Requirement (Performance Measures bold)	Audit or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>

1.1.1	<p>Forest management planning at a level appropriate to the size and scale of the operation, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. <u>a long-term resources analysis;</u></li> <li>j. <u>a periodic or ongoing forest inventory;</u></li> <li>k. <u>a land classification system;</u></li> <li>l. <u>soils inventory and maps, where available;</u></li> <li>m. <u>access to growth-and-yield modeling capabilities;</u></li> <li>n. <u>up-to-date maps or a geographic information system;</u></li> <li>o. <u>recommended sustainable harvest levels for areas available for harvest; and</u></li> <li>p. <u>a review of non-timber issues (e.g. recreation, tourism, pilot projects and economic incentive programs to promote water protection, carbon storage, bioenergy feedstock production, or biological diversity conservation, or to address climate-induced ecosystem change).</u></li> </ul>	MF		10						
<i>Notes</i>	<p><b>The management plans and supporting ecological analyses comprise an exemplary approach to management planning.</b></p> <p>Planning documents continue to be updated and quite comprehensive.</p>									
1.1.2	<p>Documentation of annual harvest trends in relation to the sustainable forest management plan <u>in a manner appropriate to document past and future activities.</u></p>	MF	10							
<i>Notes</i>	<p>Harvest level documentation was reviewed (see PM 1 above for summary). Forest management plan provides a description of the planned harvest levels.</p>									

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
1.1.3	A forest inventory system and a method to calculate growth and yield.	MF	10						
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The inventory approach includes the following main elements: conifer and hardwood stocking levels on a periodic basis; area harvested on a periodic basis; forest structure types (habitat) on a periodic basis. harvest volume estimates on a periodic basis; accumulated carbon stocks; and computation of growth/yield.</p> <p>Confirmed ongoing re-inventory of the Garcia River Forest. About 800 plots will be measured using an innovative protocol: Forest was stratified (36 strata) using 4-color infrared and Lidar imagery with 2 meter resolution, forest divided into 66-foot square grids that were recombined into 36 strata.</p>								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
1.1.4	Periodic updates of <u>forest inventory</u> and recalculation of planned harvests <u>to account for changes in growth due to productivity increases or decreases (e.g. improved data, long-term drought, fertilization, climate change, forest land ownership changes, etc.)</u> .	MF	10						
<b>Notes</b>	<p>This forest is enrolled in the CCAR program, and as such is subject to annual inventory updates. The inventory work is ongoing, and growth projections are updated. Recent analysis shows that growth rates on all three forests are slightly higher than originally projected, but AAC has not been adjusted upwards. This is conservative and appropriate in the overall context of this project and its core objectives.</p>								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
1.1.5	Documentation of forest practices (e.g., planting, fertilization, and thinning) consistent with assumptions in harvest plans.	MF	10						
<b>Notes</b>	<p>California Forest Practices act required Timber Harvest Plans, and CDF regulations ensure that THP practices are implemented.</p> <p>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 practices consistent with harvest plan assumptions.</p>								

**Objective 2. Forest Productivity.**

To ensure *long-term forest productivity*, carbon storage, and *conservation* of forest resources through prompt *reforestation*, *soil conservation*, *afforestation* and other measures.

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.1	<b>Program Participants shall promptly reforest after final harvest.</b>	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	See indicators.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.1.1	Designation of all harvest areas for either natural regeneration or by planting.	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	Confirmed in THPs reviewed (those visited during this audit)								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.1.2	Reforestation, unless delayed for site-specific environmental or forest health considerations or legal requirements, through planting within two years or two planting seasons, or by planned natural regeneration methods within five years.	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	This is required by law in California, and is closely regulated. Redwood is a very reliable stump sprouting species, and Douglass-fir regenerates reliably by seed and becomes established unless hardwood trees outcompete it. This owner is controlling hardwoods.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.1.3	Clear criteria to judge adequate regeneration and appropriate actions to correct understocked areas and achieve acceptable species composition and stocking rates for both planting and natural regeneration.	Not reviewed							
<i>Notes</i>									

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.1.4	Minimized plantings of exotic tree species, and research documentation that exotic tree species, planted operationally, pose minimal risk.		N.A.						
<i>Notes</i>	The Conservation Fund does not plant exotic trees.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.1.5	Protection of desirable or planned advanced natural regeneration during harvest.	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	Confirmed by inspections of harvest areas; young redwood is protected during harvests.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.1.6	Planting programs that consider potential ecological impacts of a different species or species mix from that which was harvested.	Not reviewed							
<i>Notes</i>									

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.1.7	<u>Afforestation programs that consider potential ecological impacts of the selection and planting of tree species in non-forested landscapes.</u>	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	N.A.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>

2.2	<b>Program Participants shall minimize chemical use required to achieve management objectives while protecting employees, neighbors, the public and the environment, <u>including wildlife and aquatic habitats.</u></b>	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	Herbicide treatments: none since last audit for either tanoak or invasive plants, but there are 311 acres proposed as part of three THPs. When needed chemicals are applied from the ground, sometimes foliar (for invasive plants), but often by injection: “Hardwood competition is not excessive across most of the harvest area; however several stands are heavily influenced by tanoak. Reduction of hardwoods is required by State regulation so that the proposed harvest does not result in increased hardwood presence in the post harvest stand and allow conifer species to more rapidly regain their recent dominance of these sites. The herbicide Arsenal (imazapyr) will be used to reduce hardwood dominance via basal injection on approximately 37 acres. No hardwood treatment will occur in Watercourse and Lake Protection Zones. For the proposed harvest, hardwoods >10” dbh, will not be targeted for herbicide treatment. Pacific madrone and other trees expressing desirable wildlife habitat characteristics will not be targeted for herbicide treatment as a matter of TCF policy.” Source: Piccolotti THP Summary								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.2.1	Minimized chemical use required to achieve management objectives.	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	Herbicides are used only as a last resort; mechanical methods are employed as needed. 2007: 54 acres (40 hack & squirt)                      2008: 52 acres (all foliar) 2009: 275 acres (198 hack and squirt)                      2010: 311 acres proposed (all hack and squirt)								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.2.2	Use of least-toxic and narrowest-spectrum pesticides necessary to achieve management objectives.	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	Imazapyr for hardwood control (hack and squirt). Triclopyr added to Glyphosate for foliar control of invasive plants (pampas grass).								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.2.3	Use of pesticides registered for the intended use and applied in accordance with label requirements.	Not revie wed							

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>

2.2.4	Use of integrated pest management where feasible.	MF	10						
<b>Notes</b>	Confirmed the pest management policy is IPM The IPM approach is clearly inherent in the overall management system as well as the chosen silvicultural system, selection silviculture. Healthy trees that are well-suited to the site are retained; less vigorous trees are removed.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.2.5	Supervision of forest chemical applications by state- or provincial-trained or certified applicators.	MF	10						
<b>Notes</b>	Policy and law require.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.2.6	Use of management practices appropriate to the situation, for example: a. notification of adjoining landowners or nearby residents concerning applications and chemicals used; b. appropriate multilingual signs or oral warnings; c. control of public road access during and immediately after applications; d. designation of streamside and other needed buffer strips; e. use of positive shutoff and minimal-drift spray valves; f. aerial application of forest chemicals parallel to buffer zones to minimize drift; g. monitoring of water quality or safeguards to ensure proper equipment use and protection of streams, lakes and other water bodies; h. appropriate storage of chemicals; i. filing of required state or provincial reports; and/or j. use of methods to ensure protection of threatened and endangered species.	MF	10						
<b>Notes</b>	Required by policy and law. Limited interviews.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.3	<b>Program Participants shall implement <u>forest</u> management practices to protect and maintain forest and soil productivity.</b>	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	See indicators.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.3.1	Use of soils maps where available.	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	GIS contains soils maps; plans describe soils.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.3.2	Process to identify soils vulnerable to compaction, and use of appropriate methods to avoid excessive soil disturbance.	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	Confirmed that the selection of appropriate logging systems is covered in the written policy document “Forest Management Policies for The Conservation Fund’s North Coast Timberland.  No new skid trails are allowed within 200 feet of Class 1 streams where slope is greater than 40 percent. Ground-based equipment kept out of Riparian Management Zones to avoid disturbance, with limited exceptions.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.3.3	Use of erosion control measures to <i>minimize</i> the loss of soil and site productivity.	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	Observed extensive use of water bars and broad-based dips.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
--	------------------------------	--------------	----------	------------	------------	------------	------------	-------------------------	---------------------------

2.3.4	Post-harvest conditions conducive to maintaining site productivity (e.g. limited rutting, retained down woody debris, minimized skid trails).	MF	10						
<b>Notes</b>	Completed harvest sites had no rutting, limited soil disturbance, and ample retained down woody debris.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.3.5	Retention of vigorous trees during partial harvesting, consistent with <u>scientific silvicultural standards</u> for the area.	MF		10					
<b>Notes</b>	<p><b>Retention of trees during partial harvests is superb.</b></p> <p>Silviculture sections (Section VI. Silvicultural Objectives, VII. Silvicultural Decisions) of “North Coast Forest Conservation Program Policy Digest, August 2010” describe the approach, which is exemplary.</p> <p>Scientific silvicultural standards for north coastal California are quite limited; forest practices rules guidelines are based on scientific data.</p> <p>Residual trees in the completed THPs were healthy, well-formed, and free-to-grow. Residual trees were generally protected during felling and yarding operations.</p> <p>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.</p>								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.3.6	Criteria that address harvesting and site preparation to protect soil productivity.	MF	10						
<b>Notes</b>	great care is taken to match logging methods with site conditions. Criteria are specific to each THP, including seasonal-specific criteria as well as actions following significant rain events.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.3.7	<u>Road construction and skidding layout to minimize impacts to soil productivity and water quality.</u>	MF	10						

<b>Notes</b>	Confirmed that the RPFs employed by The Conservation Fund continue to emphasize proper road layout and construction, with careful attention during planning, layout, and implementation phases.  “A shift from ground based skidding to skyline cable yarding provides an opportunity to decommission two segments of existing seasonal haul road in conjunction with this project. The total length of road which will be decommissioned and returned to conifer production is approximately 1100 feet.” Source: Piccolotti THP Summary
--------------	--

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<b>2.4</b>	<b>Program Participants shall manage so as to protect forests from damaging agents, such as environmentally or economically undesirable wildfire, pests, diseases <u>and invasive exotic plants and animals</u>, to maintain and improve long-term forest health, productivity and economic viability.</b>	MF	10						
<b>Notes</b>	See indicators.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<b>2.4.1</b>	Program to protect forests from damaging agents.	MF	10						
<b>Notes</b>	Field observations and review of documents confirmed the successful expansion of an extensive silvicultural program to ensure vigorous, properly stocked stands  New invasive species plans are part of the protection program (see Indicator 4.1.7).								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<b>2.4.2</b>	Management to promote healthy and productive forest conditions to minimize susceptibility to damaging agents.	MF	10						
<b>Notes</b>	Confirmed by field observations that forests are generally quite healthy. Some fire-damaged trees are left un-salvaged, but this decision included the necessary balancing of forest health and biodiversity objectives.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>

2.4.3	Participation in, and support of, fire and pest prevention and control programs.	Not reviewed							
	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit-or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.5	<b>Program Participants that deploy improved planting stock, including varietal seedlings, shall use sound scientific methods.</b>	N.A.							
<i>Notes</i>	See indicators.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit-or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.5.1	Program for appropriate research, testing, evaluation and deployment of improved planting stock, <u>including varietal seedlings</u> .	N.A.							
<i>Notes</i>	No use of these as defined by SFI; seed is sourced from trees selected based on phenotype								

**Objective 3. Protection and Maintenance of Water Resources**

To protect water quality in rivers, streams, lakes, and other water bodies.

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit-or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
3.1	<b>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 Canadian or U.S. Environmental Protection Agency-approved water quality programs.</b>	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	See indicators.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit-or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
--	------------------------------	----------	----------	------------	------------	------------	------------	---------------------	-----------------------

3.1.1	Program to implement state or provincial best management practices during all phases of management activities.	MF	10						
<b>Notes</b>	The implementation of California's equivalent to BMPs is ensured by the use of experienced RPFs. Planning documents reveal various aspects of BMP implementation. For example: " <b>Road Assessment and Erosion Control Plan:</b> An existing road network provides access to the plan area. Roads within the THP area were evaluated by Registered Professional Forester Lee Susan. Numerous smaller galvanized drainage culverts are rusting through and are scheduled for replacement. One significant Class 2 watercourse crossing which utilizes 36" diameter culvert was found to be rusted through and will be replaced with an oversized 60" culvert at THP Map Point C26. Aside from culverts which have reached the end of their effective life the roads in this area were found to be in good condition." Source: Piccolotti THP Summary								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
3.1.2	Contract provisions that specify <u>conformance</u> to best management practices.	MF	10						
<b>Notes</b>	BMPs are embedded in THP requirements; by law logger is a LTO and is required to follow these BMP provisions.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
3.1.3	Plans that address wet-weather events (e.g. <u>forest</u> inventory systems, wet-weather tracts, definitions of acceptable operating conditions).	MF	10						
<b>Notes</b>	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.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
3.1.4	Monitoring of overall best management practices implementation.	MF	10						
<b>Notes</b>	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.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<b><u>C</u></b>	<b><u>EXR</u></b>	<b><u>Maj</u></b>	<b><u>Min</u></b>	<b><u>OFI</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Gap *</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Conf. *</u></b>
3.2	<b>Program Participants shall have or develop, implement and document riparian protection measures based on soil type, terrain, vegetation, ecological function, harvesting system and other applicable factors.</b>	MF		10					
<i>Notes</i>	<b>The Conservation Fund and its partner organizations are embarked on an exemplary program of river and stream protection and improvement.</b> See indicators.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<b><u>C</u></b>	<b><u>EXR</u></b>	<b><u>Maj</u></b>	<b><u>Min</u></b>	<b><u>OFI</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Gap *</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Conf. *</u></b>
3.2.1	Program addressing management and protection of <u>rivers</u> , streams, lakes, and other water bodies and riparian zones.	MF		10					
<i>Notes</i>	<b>The program for protection of rivers, streams, and riparian zones is exemplary.</b> The Conservation Fund's North Coast Forests are managed primarily for the protection and restoration of three small to medium coastal watersheds. All activities are grounded in an understanding of the function of these watersheds and the restoration needs, including mitigation of any impacts from current practices. Riparian protections are superb.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<b><u>C</u></b>	<b><u>EXR</u></b>	<b><u>Maj</u></b>	<b><u>Min</u></b>	<b><u>OFI</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Gap *</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Conf. *</u></b>
3.2.2	Mapping of <u>rivers</u> , streams, lakes, and other water bodies as specified in state or provincial best management practices and, where appropriate, identification on the ground.	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	All such features are mapped; buffer zones are flagged on the ground prior to harvests and/or road construction.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<b><u>C</u></b>	<b><u>EXR</u></b>	<b><u>Maj</u></b>	<b><u>Min</u></b>	<b><u>OFI</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Gap *</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Conf. *</u></b>
3.2.3	Implementation of plans to manage or protect <u>rivers</u> , streams, lakes, and other water bodies.	MF		10					
<i>Notes</i>	<b>Implementation of plans to manage or protect streams, lakes and other water bodies is exemplary.</b> Confirmed by review of policies, plans, and project documents that TCF continues to implement an extensive and superb aquatic habitat restoration strategy. Stream and/or river protections are embedded into each THP and are carefully implemented during operations.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
3.2.4	Identification and protection of non-forested wetlands, including bogs, fens and marshes, and vernal pools of <u>ecological significance</u> .	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	Springs and seeps protected in due course of THP or road planning process.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
3.2.5	Where regulations or best management practices do not currently exist to protect riparian areas, use of experts to identify appropriate protection measures.		N.A.						
<i>Notes</i>	Such regulations do exist in California.								

**Objective 4. Conservation of Biological Diversity including Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value.**

To 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 a diversity of types of habitat and successional stages, and conservation of forest plants and animals, including aquatic species.

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
4.1	<b>Program Participants shall have programs to promote biological diversity at stand- and landscape-levels.</b>	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	See indicators.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
4.1.1	Program to promote the conservation of native biological diversity, including species, wildlife habitats and <u>ecological</u> community types.	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	<p>Assessments are conducted &amp; provisions made for RTE habitat protection and improvement; for example from the Piccolotti THP; Summary:</p> <p><b>“Botany:</b> A preliminary botanical assessment was conducted during the spring and summer months of 2009. Listed botanical species were not identified in the plan area during this assessment. Additional botanical surveys will be conducted prior to the commencement of operations. If listed species are located the California Department of Fish and Game will be contacted and appropriate safeguards will be developed and implemented to protect rare botanical species.</p> <p><b>Wildlife:</b> A CDFG database search revealed 5 current Northern Spotted Owl Activity Centers within 0.7 miles of the plan boundary. No harvesting will occur within 1000 feet of known NSO activity centers. Consulting biologist Mike Stephens is conducting additional NSO surveys in the spring of 2010 to determine status and current locations of NSOs in this area. Timber operations will comply with The Conservation Fund’s <i>Spotted Owl Management Plan</i> which was recently approved by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.</p> <p>To promote the development of wildlife habitat, existing snags will be retained wherever possible. Trees with unique structure or high defect are retained for wildlife or snag recruitment throughout the harvest area. No other listed avian or terrestrial wildlife species are known to occur within the plan area.</p> <p><b>Fisheries:</b> Big River, including its larger tributaries, supports populations of steelhead and coho salmon. Harvest activity is minimized near Class I watercourses in order to provide additional protection for this sensitive resource. Trees within 50 feet of Class I waters are not proposed for harvest, and within the balance of the Class I WLPZ harvesting will be minimized.”</p>								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
4.1.2	Program to protect threatened and endangered species.	MF		10					

<i>Notes</i>	<p><b>The Conservation Fund's programs to protect threatened and endangered species on the North Coast Forests are exemplary.</b></p> <p>The Conservation Fund continues to manage these lands with primary emphasis on the protection of habitat for T&amp;E species, and to expand their habitat in most cases. This requires regular adjustments to harvest plans. For example in Big River (Compartment H) the Wheel Gulch THP 1-09-020 the plan area was reduced by 100 acres due to NSO.</p> <p>Assessments are conducted and provisions made for RTE species and for habitat protection and improvement; for example from the Piccolotti THP Summary:</p> <p><b>“Botany:</b> A preliminary botanical assessment was conducted during the spring and summer months of 2009. Listed botanical species were not identified in the plan area during this assessment. Additional botanical surveys will be conducted prior to the commencement of operations. If listed species are located the California Department of Fish and Game will be contacted and appropriate safeguards will be developed and implemented to protect rare botanical species.</p> <p><b>Wildlife:</b> A CDFG database search revealed 5 current Northern Spotted Owl Activity Centers within 0.7 miles of the plan boundary. No harvesting will occur within 1000 feet of known NSO activity centers. Consulting biologist Mike Stephens is conducting additional NSO surveys in the spring of 2010 to determine status and current locations of NSOs in this area. Timber operations will comply with The Conservation Fund's <i>Spotted Owl Management Plan</i> which was recently approved by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.</p> <p>To promote the development of wildlife habitat, existing snags will be retained wherever possible. Trees with unique structure or high defect are retained for wildlife or snag recruitment throughout the harvest area. No other listed avian or terrestrial wildlife species are known to occur within the plan area.</p> <p><b>Fisheries:</b> Big River, including its larger tributaries, supports populations of steelhead and coho salmon. Harvest activity is minimized near Class I watercourses in order to provide additional protection for this sensitive resource. Trees within 50 feet of Class I waters are not proposed for harvest, and within the balance of the Class I WLPZ harvesting will be minimized.”</p> <p>Confirmed many activities designed to protect or restore salmon habitat, including placement of in-stream structures, storm-proofing of roads, road decommissioning projects, and culvert replacement work.</p>
--------------	--

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<b><u>C</u></b>	<b><u>EXR</u></b>	<b><u>Maj</u></b>	<b><u>Min</u></b>	<b><u>OFI</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Gap *</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Conf. *</u></b>
4.1.3	Program to locate and protect known sites associated with viable occurrences of critically imperiled and imperiled species and communities <u>also known as Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value</u> . 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.	MF		10					

<i>Notes</i>	<p><b>The Conservation Fund exceeds the standard by surveying for previously unknown threatened and endangered species within its North Coast Forests.</b></p> <p>Significant efforts are made to locate and protect sites of RTE species including G1 and G2 species. The program goes beyond checking the databases of known sites, employing specialists to survey for RTE species. For example property-wide botanical surveys have been completed, THP-specific botanical surveys are conducted, and the organization’s field forestry technician has received training in rare plant identification. The technician found a small population of the rare White Rain Orchid near the yarder in the Upper North Fork THP; an immediate interim protection plan was implemented and a more detailed plan for the area was developed in conjunction with the consulting botanist.</p>
--------------	---

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
4.1.4	Development and implementation of criteria, as guided by regionally appropriate <u>best scientific information</u> , to retain stand-level wildlife habitat elements such as snags, <u>stumps</u> , mast trees, down woody debris, den trees and nest trees.	MF	10						

<p><i>Notes</i></p>	<p>Policies have been reviewed by regulatory agencies and by scientists from partner / funding organizations.</p> <p>Source: North Coast Forest Conservation Program Policy Digest, August 2010</p> <p><b>X. Retention Requirements</b></p> <p>[Quoted from the Big River and Salmon Creek IRMP - with edits italicized and in brackets – and equally applicable to GRF]</p> <p>Within a harvest area, the Fund will permanently retain or recruit downed wood, snags, and trees with high wildlife value given their recognized ecological role and ability to enrich the surrounding stand. The following policies for downed wood, snags, and wildlife trees are meant to implement this strategy by providing clear rules and numerical targets for certain types of features. [The FPR do not categorically address general wildlife habitat retention trees (although there are some requirements for protection of active raptor nests), but additional guidance is available from DFG.] Retention trees will be painted (“W”) or tagged by the field foresters as they are marking the timber harvest to communicate the value of these features not just to the loggers but also the public and future foresters. Because a harvest can include over a thousand retention trees, they are not mapped or recorded unless they are suspected NSO nest trees. And while maintaining trees with high wildlife value is important, it is also critical to recognize the wildlife value of the surrounding stand and the conserved landscape, and not expect the harvest stand to mimic or contain all features which may be better represented in other areas of the property.</p> <p><b>Downed Wood</b></p> <p>Target: two pieces per acre (at least one conifer, 18 inch minimum diameter and ten feet minimum length).</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retain existing downed wood except in situations of recent windfall or fire outside of WLPZ. (In most stands this should be sufficient to meet the target.)</li> <li>• Retain snags and mark trees for recruitment snags to eventually become downed wood.</li> <li>• Redistribute cull logs from the landing (unless used for firewood or in stream restoration).</li> </ul> <p><b>Snags and Wildlife Trees</b></p> <p>Target: four per acre on average across stand.</p> <p>Criteria for mandatory retention:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Snags (all should be retained but only those greater than 18-inch DBH and 20 foot height shall count towards the retention targets);</li> <li>• Conifers greater than 48-inch DBH;</li> <li>• Old-growth trees (use MRC definition if in question – see Appendix K [of <i>Big River/Salmon Creek IRMP</i>]);</li> <li>• Raptor nest trees (active or likely to be re-used);</li> <li>• Any hardwood [<i>tanoak, true oak, madrone, chinquapin, and alder</i>] over 20 inches;</li> <li>• Murrelet habitat trees (use MRC definition if in question – see Appendix K [of <i>Big River/Salmon Creek IRMP</i>]);</li> <li>• Den trees (cavity greater than three inch diameter and greater than ten feet above ground);</li> </ul> <p>Trees with basal hollows or other significant features (cavities, acorn granaries, significant burn scars, significant or unusual lichen accumulation, signs of deformity, decadence, unusual bark patterns, or other unique structure or features).</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retain all mandatory [<i>retention</i>] trees and snags except where necessary to fall for operator safety, and protect with screen trees if appropriate.</li> <li>• If below the target number, mark and retain additional recruitment trees.</li> <li>• [<i>At the discretion of the project forester live trees may be designated for girdling to accelerate snag recruitment within a THP area.</i>]</li> </ul>
---------------------	--

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
4.1.5	Program for assessment, conducted either individually or collaboratively, of forest cover types, <u>age or size classes</u> , and habitats at the individual ownership level and, where credible data are available, across the landscape, <u>and take into account findings in planning and management activities.</u>	MF		10					
Notes	<p><b>The Conservation Fund's efforts to support and manage on the basis of landscape-level analysis are exemplary.</b></p> <p>Previously reviewed the TCF report "<i>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.</i>"</p> <p>"This plan was prepared under a contract for the California State Coastal Conservancy. The principal author of the plan was Jenny Griffin, then a consultant to TCF and now TCF's North Coast Program Manager. "<i>Conservation Prospects</i>" 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"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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."</li> </ul> <p>North Coast Forest Conservation Program Policy Digest, August 2010</p> <p>"Conservation Action Planning" section of the Garcia River Management Plan further describes efforts for landscape and property-level analysis of cover types and habitats.</p> <p>This is also covered in the HCVF memo in the North Coast Forest Conservation Program Policy Digest, August 2010:  "TCF has identified the following areas as High Conservation Value Forest features:  a) Oak woodlands and grasslands  b) Pygmy cypress forest  c) Old growth coniferous forest  d) Salmonid spawning streams.  Grasslands and salmonid spawning streams are obviously not "forest," but occur within or on the edge of forests and are recognized as HCVF features because of their critical importance and sensitivity to management practices."</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
4.1.6	Support of and participation in plans or programs for the conservation of old-growth forests in the region of ownership.	Not revie wed							

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<b><u>C</u></b>	<b><u>EXR</u></b>	<b><u>Maj</u></b>	<b><u>Min</u></b>	<b><u>OFI</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Gap *</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Conf. *</u></b>
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.	MF		10					
<i>Notes</i>	<p><b>The Conservation Fund's efforts to understand the extent and impacts of invasive exotic plants and to develop and implement control strategies are exemplary.</b></p> <p>Invasive Plant Management Plan For the Salmon Creek Forest For The Conservation Fund, Mendocino County, California July 15, 2010: "Invasive plants are addressed directly in Section 4.3 where the plan states that the management goal is to reverse the spread of invasives using mechanical means of control as the preferred method. The Conservation Fund has used manual control techniques on Salmon Creek and has a small core of committed volunteers who have already executed a pilot project for the control of jubata and pampas grass. Because of this work and the interest of a dedicated stakeholder group the Salmon Creek Forest Invasive Plant Management Plan is dedicated to manual control of invasive species." The plan describes the problem in the context of the SCF, lists the key invasive species (two grasses and two broom-shrubs are most common), outlines a control strategy, provides various mechanical treatment options as well as preventative treatment options.</p>								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<b><u>C</u></b>	<b><u>EXR</u></b>	<b><u>Maj</u></b>	<b><u>Min</u></b>	<b><u>OFI</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Gap *</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Conf. *</u></b>
4.1.8	Program to incorporate the role of prescribed or natural fire where appropriate.	Not revie wed							

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<b><u>C</u></b>	<b><u>EXR</u></b>	<b><u>Maj</u></b>	<b><u>Min</u></b>	<b><u>OFI</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Gap *</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Conf. *</u></b>
4.2	<b>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.</b>	MF		10					
<i>Notes</i>	<p><b>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.</b></p>								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<b><u>C</u></b>	<b><u>EXR</u></b>	<b><u>Maj</u></b>	<b><u>Min</u></b>	<b><u>OFI</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Gap *</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Conf. *</u></b>

4.2.1	Collection of information on <u>Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value</u> 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 non-proprietary scientific information, time and assistance by staff, or in-kind or direct financial support.	MF		10					
<i>Notes</i>	<p>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.</p> <p>The aquatic inventory and monitoring efforts by The Nature Conservancy represents an effective strategy to manage salmonid habitat on the Garcia Tract.</p> <p>Confirmed continuation of the research and monitoring programs.</p>								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
4.2.2	A methodology to incorporate research results and field applications of biodiversity and ecosystem research into forest management decisions.	MF		10					
<i>Notes</i>	In partnership with The Nature Conservancy and others, TCF has developed and begun to implement an array of monitoring and formal research efforts designed to learn, over time, the best ways to restore and/ or manage for biodiversity concurrent with other social and economic objectives on these lands.								

**Objective 5. Management of Visual Quality and Recreational Benefits.**

To manage the visual impact of forest operations and provide recreational opportunities for the public.

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
5.1	<b>Program Participants shall manage the impact of harvesting on visual quality.</b>	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	See indicators.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
5.1.1	Program to address visual quality management.	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	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.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
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	10						
<i>Notes</i>	Field observations confirm that aesthetic practices are consistent with the requirement.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
5.2	<b>Program Participants shall manage the size, shape and placement of clearcut harvests.</b>		N.A.						
<i>Notes</i>	TCF does not use clearcuts.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<b><u>C</u></b>	<b><u>EXR</u></b>	<b><u>Maj</u></b>	<b><u>Min</u></b>	<b><u>OFI</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Gap *</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Conf. *</u></b>
5.2.1	Average size of clearcut harvest areas does not exceed 120 acres (50 hectares), except when necessary <u>to meet regulatory requirements</u> or to respond to forest health emergencies or other natural catastrophes.		N.A.						
<i>Notes</i>	TCF does not use clearcuts.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<b><u>C</u></b>	<b><u>EXR</u></b>	<b><u>Maj</u></b>	<b><u>Min</u></b>	<b><u>OFI</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Gap *</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Conf. *</u></b>
5.2.2	Documentation through internal records of clearcut size and the process for calculating average size.		N.A.						
<i>Notes</i>	TCF does not use clearcuts.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<b><u>C</u></b>	<b><u>EXR</u></b>	<b><u>Maj</u></b>	<b><u>Min</u></b>	<b><u>OFI</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Gap *</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Conf. *</u></b>
5.3	<b>Program Participants shall adopt a green-up requirement or alternative methods that provide for visual quality.</b>	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	Extensive use of selection silviculture and the THP process ensure that SFI green-up requirements are met. Confirmed in the field.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<b><u>C</u></b>	<b><u>EXR</u></b>	<b><u>Maj</u></b>	<b><u>Min</u></b>	<b><u>OFI</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Gap *</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Conf. *</u></b>
5.3.1	Program implementing the green-up requirement or alternative methods.	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	California RPFs plan and oversee all harvests. Also see Performance Measure 5.3 above.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<b><u>C</u></b>	<b><u>EXR</u></b>	<b><u>Maj</u></b>	<b><u>Min</u></b>	<b><u>OFI</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Gap *</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Conf. *</u></b>
--	------------------------------	--------------	-----------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------

5.3.2	Harvest area tracking system to demonstrate <u>conformance</u> with the green-up requirement or alternative methods.	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	Not needed due to use of selection silviculture. California RPFs plan and oversee all harvests. Also see Performance Measure 5.3 above.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<b><u>C</u></b>	<b><u>EXR</u></b>	<b><u>Maj</u></b>	<b><u>Min</u></b>	<b><u>OFI</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Gap *</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Conf. *</u></b>
5.3.3	Trees in clearcut harvest areas are at least 3 years old or 5 feet (1.5 meters) 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.	N.A.							
<i>Notes</i>	No clearcutting is done.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<b><u>C</u></b>	<b><u>EXR</u></b>	<b><u>Maj</u></b>	<b><u>Min</u></b>	<b><u>OFI</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Gap *</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Conf. *</u></b>
5.4	<b><u>Program Participants shall support and promote recreational opportunities for the public.</u></b>	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	See indicator.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<b><u>C</u></b>	<b><u>EXR</u></b>	<b><u>Maj</u></b>	<b><u>Min</u></b>	<b><u>OFI</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Gap *</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Conf. *</u></b>
5.4.1	<u>Provide recreational opportunities for the public, where consistent with forest management objectives.</u>	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	Pedestrian access is allowed on most portions of these lands; a permit system was developed, first for horse-riding and more recently for pedestrian users. Organized events are allowed by permit: boy scout hikes, bird-watching or census events, etc.								

**Objective 6. Protection of Special Sites.**

To manage lands that are ecologically, geologically or culturally important in a manner that takes into account their unique qualities.

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
6.1	<b>Program Participants shall identify special sites and manage them in a manner appropriate for their unique features.</b>	MF		10					
Notes	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 located all such sites, including previously unknown sites, and to manage them with cutting edge science.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
6.1.1	Use of information such as existing natural heritage data, expert advice or <u>stakeholder consultation</u> in identifying or selecting special sites for protection.	MF		10					
Notes	<p>TCF partners with TNC and others to ensure that they are aware of existing sites, and seek to learn of additional sites.</p> <p>Specialists employed to conduct botanical surveys.</p> <p>NSO surveys (required).</p> <p>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.</p>								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
6.1.2	Appropriate mapping, cataloging and management of identified special sites.	MF		10					
Notes	Interviews, review of documents, and observations confirmed that special sites are mapped, tracked, and managed appropriately.								

**Objective 7. Efficient Use of Forest Resources.**

To promote the efficient use of forest resources.

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<b><u>C</u></b>	<b><u>EXR</u></b>	<b><u>Maj</u></b>	<b><u>Min</u></b>	<b><u>OFI</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Gap *</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Conf. *</u></b>
<b>7.1</b>	<b>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.</b>	MF	10						
<b>Notes</b>	See indicator.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<b><u>C</u></b>	<b><u>EXR</u></b>	<b><u>Maj</u></b>	<b><u>Min</u></b>	<b><u>OFI</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Gap *</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Conf. *</u></b>
<b>7.1.1</b>	Program or monitoring system to ensure efficient utilization, which may include provisions to ensure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <u>management of harvest residue (e.g. slash, limbs, tops) considers economic, social and environmental factors (e.g. organic and nutrient value to future forests) and other utilization needs;</u></li> <li>b. training or incentives to encourage loggers to enhance utilization;</li> <li>c. cooperation with mill managers for better utilization of species and low-grade material;</li> <li>d. <u>exploration of markets for underutilized species and low-grade wood and alternative markets (e.g. bioenergy markets);</u> or</li> <li>e. periodic inspections and reports noting utilization and product separation.</li> </ul>	MF	10						
<b>Notes</b>	<p>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.</p> <p>Supervising foresters work with Licensed Timber Operators (LTO) who are very capable and closely regulated and monitored; Contractors are paid based on delivered volumes.</p> <p>Field observations showed good utilization.</p>								

**This landowner does not procure fiber for mills it owns or controls.**

**N.A. Objective 8. Landowner Outreach.**

To broaden the practice of sustainable forestry by forest landowners through fiber sourcing programs.

**N.A. Objective 9. Use of Qualified Resource and Qualified Logging Professionals.**

To broaden the practice of sustainable forestry by encouraging forest landowners to utilize the services of forest management and harvesting professionals.

**N.A. Objective 10. Adherence to Best Management Practices.**

To broaden the practice of sustainable forestry through the use of best management practices to protect water quality.

**N.A. Objective 11. Promote Conservation of Biological Diversity, Biodiversity Hotspots and High-Biodiversity Wilderness Areas.**

To broaden the practice of sustainable forestry by conserving biological diversity, biodiversity hotspots and high-biodiversity wilderness areas.

**N.A. Objective 12. Avoidance of Controversial Sources including Illegal Logging.**

To broaden the practice of sustainable forestry by avoidance of illegal logging.

**N.A. Objective 13. Avoidance of Controversial Sources including Fiber Sourced from Areas without Effective Social Laws.**

To broaden the practice of sustainable forestry by avoiding controversial sources.

**Objective 14. Legal and Regulatory Compliance.**

Compliance with applicable federal, provincial, state and local laws and regulations.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
14.1	<b>Program Participants shall take appropriate steps to comply with applicable federal, provincial, state and local forestry and related social and environmental laws and regulations.</b>	MF	10						
Notes	See indicators. The Conservation Fund has demonstrated intent to comply and a very strong compliance record, a laudable achievement given the very difficult regulatory environment in California.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
14.1.1	Access to relevant laws and regulations in appropriate locations.	MF	10						

<i>Notes</i>	Requirement is met: North Coast Forest Conservation Program Policy Digest, August 2010; employee manual; internet; books in office; Pre-harvest inspections as part of the THP approval process.								
--------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
14.1.2	System to achieve compliance with applicable federal, provincial, state or local laws and regulations.	MF	10						

<i>Notes</i>	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 form the heart of the system to achieve compliance.								
--------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
14.1.3	Demonstration of commitment to legal compliance through available regulatory action information.	MF, WM	10						

<i>Notes</i>	In past year no violations occurred on the lands within the scope.								
--------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
14.2	<b>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.</b>	MF	10						

<i>Notes</i>	North Coast Forest Conservation Program Policy Digest, August 2010								
--------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
--	------------------------------	--------------	----------	------------	------------	------------	------------	-------------------------	---------------------------

14.2.1	Written policy demonstrating commitment to comply with social laws, such as those covering civil rights, equal employment opportunities, anti-discrimination 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.	MF	10						
<b>Notes</b>	North Coast Forest Conservation Program Policy Digest, August 2010 (see bottom of page 19). The Conservation Fund - Employee Manual January 2009 covers the full suite of employment issues and refers to many key social laws.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
14.2.2	<u>Forestry enterprises will respect the rights of workers and labor representatives in a manner that encompasses the intent of the International Labor Organization (ILO) core conventions.</u>	MF	10						
<b>Notes</b>	There have not been any ILO-related complaints. If any occur TCF must notify NSF, who must pass these along to SFI Inc.								

**Objective 15. Forestry Research, Science, and Technology.**

To support forestry research, science, and technology, upon which sustainable forest management decisions are based.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
15.1	<b><u>Program Participants shall individually and/or through cooperative efforts involving SFI Implementation Committees, associations or other partners provide in-kind support or funding for forest research to improve forest health, productivity, and sustainable management of forest resources, and the environmental benefits and performance of forest products.</u></b>	MF	10						
<b>Notes</b>									

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
--	-----------------------	--------------	----------	------------	------------	------------	------------	-------------------------	---------------------------

15.1.1	<p>Financial or in-kind support of research to address questions of relevance in the region of operations. The research shall include some of the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. forest health, productivity, and ecosystem functions;</li> <li>b. chemical efficiency, use rate and integrated pest management;</li> <li>c. water quality and/or effectiveness of best management practices <u>including effectiveness of water quality and best management practices for protecting the quality, diversity and distributions of fish and wildlife habitats;</u></li> <li>d. wildlife management at stand- and landscape-levels;</li> <li>e. conservation of biological diversity;</li> <li>f. <u>ecological impacts of bioenergy feedstock removals on productivity, wildlife habitat, water quality and other ecosystem functions;</u></li> <li>g. <u>climate change research for both adaptation and mitigation;</u></li> <li>h. <u>social issues;</u></li> <li>i. <u>forest operations efficiencies and economics;</u></li> <li>j. <u>energy efficiency;</u></li> <li>k. <u>life cycle assessment;</u></li> <li>l. <u>avoidance of illegal logging; and</u></li> <li>m. <u>avoidance of controversial sources.</u></li> </ul>	MF	10						
<b>Notes</b>	<p>Research on the property covers items a, c, and d. This includes detailed monitoring as part of the overall adaptive management approach as well as research projects likely to result in publications in peer-reviewed journals.</p> <p>Some examples of monitoring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ In stream temperature monitoring (Hobo probes) for all properties was completed for 2009 and is in progress for 2010.</li> <li>▪ Historic air and in stream temperature monitoring in Unit C of Salmon Creek was completed for 2009 and is in progress for 2010.</li> <li>▪ Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program (EMAP) at Garcia was completed in 2009 and 2010 by TNC and the Regional Water Board.</li> <li>▪ DFG's fall/winter salmonid spawning surveys continued 2009-2010 on all properties and were expanded in 2010 to include limited stream habitat typing on the Garcia and Big River forests.</li> <li>▪ Invertebrate monitoring was continued at Garcia by TNC.</li> </ul> <p>Source: North Coast Forest Conservation Program, Annual Activity Description for Forest Certification Auditors, September 2010</p>								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
15.1.2	Research on genetically engineered trees via forest tree biotechnology shall adhere to all applicable federal, state, and provincial regulations and international protocols.	N.A.							

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
15.2	<b>Program Participants shall individually <u>and/or</u> through cooperative efforts involving SFI Implementation Committees, associations or other partners develop or use state, provincial or regional analyses in support of their sustainable forestry programs.</b>	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	See indicator.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
15.2.1	Participation, individually <u>and/or</u> through cooperative efforts involving SFI Implementation Committees <u>and/or</u> associations at the <u>national</u> , state, provincial or regional level, in the development or use of <u>some of</u> the following: a. regeneration assessments; b. growth and drain assessments; c. best management practices implementation and conformance; d. biodiversity conservation information for family forest owners; and e. <u>social, cultural or economic benefit assessments.</u>	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	Item e. annual updates to benefit assessments								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
15.3	<b><u>Program Participants shall individually and/or through cooperative efforts involving SFI Implementation Committees, associations or other partners broaden the awareness of climate change impacts on forests, wildlife and biological diversity.</u></b>	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	These lands are enrolled in a carbon-offset project, the first such project at this scale in California.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
15.3.1	Where available, monitor information generated from regional climate models on long-term forest health, productivity and economic viability.	MF	10						
<b>Notes</b>	Found in the Big River / Salmon Creek Management plan Section 3.5.2 on page 51. Projections are for more extreme storms (implications for storm-proofing and culvert sizing), hotter and drier stands, and increased possibility of fire; and likelihood of more invasive species issues.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
15.3.2	<u>Program Participants are knowledgeable about climate change impacts on wildlife, wildlife habitats and conservation of biological diversity through international, national, regional or local programs.</u>	MF	10						
<b>Notes</b>	Staff members are quite aware; implications are in management plans and clearly being addressed with the management program.								

### Objective 16. Training and Education.

To improve the implementation of sustainable forestry practices through appropriate training and education programs.

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
16.1	<b>Program Participants shall require appropriate training of personnel and contractors so that they are competent to fulfill their responsibilities under the SFI 2010-2014 Standard.</b>	MF	10						
<b>Notes</b>	Required by law in California: Registered Professional Foresters (aka RPF) and Licensed Timber Operators (LTO) must oversee all forestry and harvesting, respectively.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
16.1.1	Written statement of commitment to the SFI 2010-2014 Standard communicated throughout the organization, particularly to <u>facility</u> and woodland managers, fiber sourcing staff and field foresters.	MF	10						
<b>Notes</b>	North Coast Forest Conservation Program Policy Digest, August 2010								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<b><u>C</u></b>	<b><u>EXR</u></b>	<b><u>Maj</u></b>	<b><u>Min</u></b>	<b><u>OFI</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Gap *</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Conf. *</u></b>
16.1.2	Assignment and understanding of roles and responsibilities for achieving SFI 2010-2014 Standard objectives.	MF	10						
<b>Notes</b>	Responsibility is shared and appears to be understood: Evan Smith and Jenny Griffin have overall responsibility; Scott Kelley is on the California SFI Implementation Committee and is responsible for the field component.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<b><u>C</u></b>	<b><u>EXR</u></b>	<b><u>Maj</u></b>	<b><u>Min</u></b>	<b><u>OFI</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Gap *</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Conf. *</u></b>
16.1.3	Staff education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities.	MF	10						
<b>Notes</b>	Professional degrees, RPF status.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<b><u>C</u></b>	<b><u>EXR</u></b>	<b><u>Maj</u></b>	<b><u>Min</u></b>	<b><u>OFI</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Gap *</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Conf. *</u></b>
16.1.4	Contractor education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities.	MF	10						
<b>Notes</b>	All harvests are conducted by California LTOs. Contract consulting foresters are California RPFs.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<b><u>C</u></b>	<b><u>EXR</u></b>	<b><u>Maj</u></b>	<b><u>Min</u></b>	<b><u>OFI</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Gap *</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Conf. *</u></b>
16.1.5	Forestry enterprises shall have a program for the use of certified logging professionals (where available) and qualified logging professionals.	MF	10						
<b>Notes</b>	All harvests are conducted by California LTOs.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
16.2	<b>Program Participants shall work <u>individually and/or</u> with SFI Implementation Committees, logging or forestry associations, or appropriate agencies or others in the forestry community to foster improvement in the professionalism of wood producers.</b>	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	The California SIC has prepared an analysis “California State Implementation Committee Policy and Definitions Regarding Objective 9 of the 2010-2014 SFI Standard July 1, 2010”. From that document: “A <i>Qualified Logging Professional</i> is a logger that is approved by the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection as a Licensed Timber Operator (LTO) and is in good standing and has completed other approved training programs to satisfy the minimum elements of wood producers training (SFI Objective 16.2.1) as specified in the California SIC Policy on Logger Education and Training, dated September 14, 2004. Scott Kelley attended the 2010 California SFI Implementation Committee meeting during which this topic was discussed.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
16.2.1	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. best management practices, including streamside management and road construction, maintenance and retirement; c. reforestation, <u>invasive exotic plants and animals</u> , forest resource conservation, aesthetics, and <u>special sites</u> ; 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.g. <u>Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value</u> ); e. logging safety; f. <u>U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety (COHS)</u> regulations, wage and hour rules, and other provincial, state and local employment laws; g. transportation issues; h. business management; i. public policy and outreach; and j. <u>awareness of emerging technologies</u> .								
<i>Notes</i>	See Performance Measure.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<b><u>C</u></b>	<b><u>EXR</u></b>	<b><u>Maj</u></b>	<b><u>Min</u></b>	<b><u>OFI</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Gap *</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Conf. *</u></b>
16.2.2	<p><u>Participation in or support of SFI Implementation Committees to establish criteria for recognition of logger certification programs, where they exist, that include:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>a. completion of SFI Implementation Committee recognized logger training programs and meeting continuing education requirements of the training program;</u></li> <li><u>b. independent in-the-forest verification of conformance with the logger certification program standards;</u></li> <li><u>c. compliance with all applicable laws and regulations including responsibilities under the U.S. Endangered Species Act, the Canadian Species at Risk Act and other measures to protect wildlife habitat;</u></li> <li><u>d. use of best management practices to protect water quality;</u></li> <li><u>e. logging safety;</u></li> <li><u>f. compliance with acceptable silviculture and utilization standards;</u></li> <li><u>g. aesthetic management techniques employed where applicable; and</u></li> <li><u>h. adherence to a management or harvest plan that is site specific and agreed to by the forest landowner.</u></li> </ul>	10							
<b>Notes</b>	In California the logger certification program is ProLogger; The Conservation Fund uses ProLogger firms when available (Philbrick Logging).								

**Objective 17. Community Involvement in the Practice of Sustainable Forestry.**

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.

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
17.1	<b>Program Participants shall support and promote efforts by consulting foresters, state, provincial and federal agencies, state or local groups, professional societies, <u>conservation organizations, indigenous peoples and governments, community groups, sporting organizations, labor, universities, extension agencies, the American Tree Farm System® and/or other landowner cooperative programs to apply principles of sustainable forest management.</u></b>	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	See indicators.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
17.1.1	Support, <u>including financial</u> , for efforts of SFI Implementation Committees.	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	Interviewed Mark Pawlicki, SPI 530-378-8104 office who confirmed TCF's involvement and support, and who clarified the logger training definitions and training programs available in California.  Scott Kelley, TNC Forester is The Conservation Fund's representative; he attended the 2010 meeting of the California SFI Implementation Committee.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
17.1.2	Support for the development of educational materials for use with forest landowners (e.g. <u>information packets, websites, newsletters, workshops, tours, etc.</u> ).	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	The program's work with landowners is through one-on-one contacts with neighbors.  Involvement with California SFI Implementation Committee.  Project web site describing the overall forestry and conservation program.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
17.1.3	Support for the development of regional, state or provincial information materials that provide forest landowners with practical approaches for addressing <u>special sites</u> and biological diversity issues, such as <u>invasive exotic plants and animals</u> , specific wildlife habitat, <u>Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value</u> , and threatened and endangered species.	MF	10						
<b>Notes</b>	California's SFI Implementation Committee has modest involvement here; handout; conferences and workshops. Local individual outreach; neighbor tours, etc. is the one-on-one approach that works best here.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
17.1.4	Participation in efforts to support or promote conservation of managed forests through voluntary market-based incentive programs such as current-use taxation programs, Forest Legacy Program or conservation easements.	MF	10						
<b>Notes</b>	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.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
17.1.5	Program Participants are knowledgeable about credible regional conservation planning and priority-setting efforts that include a broad range of stakeholders and have a program to <u>take into account the results of these efforts in planning</u> .	MF		10					
<b>Notes</b>	<p><b>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.</b></p> <p>Conservation Prospect provides a collection and synthesis of all of the conservation plans developed for the north coast. See Indicator 4.1.5.</p>								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>

17.2	<b>Program Participants shall support and promote, at the state, provincial or other appropriate levels, mechanisms for public outreach, education and involvement related to sustainable forest management.</b>	MF		10					
<i>Notes</i>	See indicators.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
17.2.1	Periodic educational opportunities promoting sustainable forestry, such as a. field tours, seminars, <u>websites, webinars</u> or workshops; b. educational trips; c. self-guided forest management trails; d. publication of articles, educational pamphlets or newsletters; or e. support for state, provincial, and local forestry organizations and soil and water conservation districts.	MF		10					

**Notes**

**The Conservation Fund’s outreach activities on its North Coast Forest Conservation Program exceed the requirements for opportunities to promote sustainable, conservation-oriented forestry.**

Note: The Conservation Fund, while not required to, appears to also meet or exceed the requirements for outreach on public lands.

The brochure “North Coast Forest Conservation Initiative 2009 Annual Report” describes the following aspects of the project: timber harvests, management planning, restoration, equestrian program, climate action, and plans for 2010. This brochure is colorful, easy to understand, and contains the innovative “Caspar Index” providing interesting quantitative “facts”.

**“Public Outreach**

- Advisory Group met in October 2009 and July 2010.
- Offered public tours for each THP prior to submission.
- Conducted public tours of post-harvest THPs on Big River & Salmon Creek.
- Continued partnership with Pacific Community Charter School (65 students, grades 1-8): onsite tour of Inman Creek LWD project (October); all-school presentation by Evan Smith (December); onsite tour cancelled due to rain (June); ongoing coordination for additional presentations, tours, and potential projects.
- Evan Smith gave presentations to the Mendocino Coast Botanical Gardens, Oregon State Land Board, Yale School of Forestry & Oregon Forest Resources Institute.
- Conducted a community meeting and update on TCF activities in the Caspar Community Center on January 13, 2010. Several dozen stakeholders attended and very positive feedback was received during and after the event.
- Volunteers planted 200 redwood seedlings on Salmon Creek, January 2010.
- Second year implementing Stewardship Equestrian Permit Program for Salmon Creek.
- Launched Pilot Stewardship Pedestrian Access Program on Big River and Salmon Creek forests in March 2010.
- Accomplished volunteer-led hand-removal of invasive pampas grass on Salmon Creek. Cost of backhoe removal of pampas (\$700) was split with the local community group. Hand removal of plumes continues.
- Offered community walk in June 2010 to view spring azalea bloom on Salmon Creek.
- Conducted private onsite tours on Big River for Cal EPA (May), the Packard Foundation (May) & UC Santa Cruz Professor Tim Duane (June).
- Conducted a public tour in partnership with TNC of the Inman Creek LWD project in August 2010.
- Participated in CA-SIC and local Aerial Fire Patrol Co-op.
- Collaborating with the UDSA Office of Environmental Markets to develop a case study based on the Big River and Salmon Creek forests for the “Farms, Ranches, and Forests of the Future” project to document how markets for ecosystem services are working in selected landscapes.

Source: North Coast Forest Conservation Program, Annual Activity Description for Forest Certification Auditors September 2010

2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
-----------------------	--------------	----------	------------	------------	------------	------------	-------------------------	---------------------------

17.3	<b>Program Participants shall establish, at the state, provincial, or other appropriate levels, procedures to address concerns raised by loggers, consulting foresters, employees, <u>unions</u>, the public or other Program Participants regarding practices that appear inconsistent with the SFI Standard principles and objectives.</b>	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	See indicators.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
17.3.1	Support for SFI Implementation Committees (e.g. toll free numbers and other efforts) to address concerns about apparent nonconforming practices.	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	The Conservation Fund is involved in the California SIC and has been extensively involved in SFI at the national level.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
17.3.2	Process to receive and respond to public inquiries. <u>SFI Implementation Committees shall submit data annually to SFI Inc. regarding concerns received and responses.</u>	MF	10				10		
<i>Notes</i>	<p><b><u>There is an opportunity to improve the process for receiving and recording public inquiries.</u></b></p> <p>Process in place involves office manager who responds immediately to any inquiry; those that are not immediately resolved are documented. Office Manager keeps a record of unresolved calls/emails/inquiries. Confirmed "The Conservation Fund Incident Log (Vandalism, Poaching, Abandoned Vehicles, etc). However this log does not include issues/inquiries resolved immediately.</p> <p>Also have a Citizen's Advisory Group; meetings convened periodically; most local concerns are funneled through this group.</p> <p>In California any citizen can comment on any THP.</p> <p>IRMP describes the overall goal of being open to comments and responsive to questions, etc.</p>								

**N.A. Objective 18. Public Land Management Responsibilities.**

To promote and implement sustainable forest management on public lands.

**Objective 19. Communications and Public Reporting.**

To broaden the practice of sustainable forestry by documenting progress and opportunities for improvement.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
19.1	<b><u>A Certified Program Participant shall provide a summary audit report, prepared by the certification body, to SFI Inc. after the successful completion of a certification, recertification or surveillance audit to the SFI 2010-2014 Standard.</u></b>	MF							
Notes	See indicators.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
19.1.1	The summary audit report submitted by the <i>Program Participant</i> (one copy must be in English), shall include, at a minimum, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. a description of the audit process, <i>objectives</i> and scope;</li> <li>b. a description of substitute <i>indicators</i>, if any, used in the audit and a rationale for each;</li> <li>c. the name of <i>Program Participant</i> that was audited, including its SFI representative;</li> <li>d. a general description of the <i>Program Participant's</i> forestland and manufacturing operations included in the audit;</li> <li>e. the name of the <i>certification body</i> and <i>lead auditor</i> (names of the <i>audit team</i> members, including <i>technical experts</i> may be included at the discretion of the <i>audit team</i> and <i>Program Participant</i>);</li> <li>f. the dates the certification was conducted and completed;</li> <li>g. a summary of the findings, <u>including general descriptions of evidence of conformity</u> and any nonconformities and corrective action plans to address them, opportunities for improvement, and exceptional practices; and</li> <li>h. the certification decision.</li> </ul>	MF	10						

<i>Notes</i>	Understood; NSF will prepare a public report meeting these requirements.								
--------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<i>19.2</i>	<b>Program Participants shall report annually to SFI Inc. on their conformance with the SFI 2010-2014 Standard.</b>	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	Confirmed with SFI, Inc.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<i>19.2.1</i>	Prompt response to the SFI annual progress report.	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	Confirmed with SFI, Inc.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<i>19.2.2</i>	Recordkeeping for all the categories of information needed for SFI annual progress reports.	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	The Conservation Fund keeps excellent records, including detailed records of outreach and special activities. For example, the “North Coast Forest Conservation Program, Annual Activity Description for Forest Certification Auditors, September 2010” (see indicator 17.2.1 above).								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<i>19.2.3</i>	Maintenance of copies of past reports to document progress and improvements to demonstrate conformance to the SFI 2010-2014 Standard.	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	Confirmed by review of 2009 SFI Progress Report Form.								

**Objective 20. Management Review and Continual Improvement.**

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

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<b>20.1</b>	<b>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.</b>	MF	10						
<b>Notes</b>	See indicators.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<b>20.1.1</b>	System to review commitments, programs and procedures to evaluate effectiveness.	MF	10						
<b>Notes</b>	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. THP records; TCF’s North Coast Program Office Manager keeps a record of all unresolved calls/emails/inquiries. Advisory Group meetings convened periodically.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<b>20.1.2</b>	System for collecting, reviewing, and reporting information to management regarding progress in achieving SFI 2010-2014 Standard objectives and performance measures.								
<b>Notes</b>	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.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<b>20.1.3</b>	Annual review of progress by management and determination of changes and improvements necessary to continually improve conformance to the SFI 2010-2014 Standard.	MF	10						
<b>Notes</b>	Confirmed agenda and meeting notes from the 2009 Annual Program Reviews. Internal Review was held 1/12/10 by Jenny Griffin, Scott Kelly, Holly Newberger, Evan Smith, and Madison Thompson. External Review held 1.13.10 included these folks and contractors.								

**Field Sites**

“Suggested features for field review include, on the Garcia, the North Fork road upgrade project (active operation), the Olsen Gulch THP area (planned, not yet submitted), the Upper North Fork THP area (group harvests, initiated this year and to be resumed next year), and possibly the Inman Creek LWD project (completed). On Big River: Wheel Gulch THP (active), and Laguna Pass THP (likely completed by 9/17) (Coombs Gulch THP, likely completed 9/27, is another options). All is pretty quiet on Salmon Creek but if there’s anything there you’d like to see, we can do that, too. JG”

THP Name	THP #	Tract	Net Volume (mbf=thousand bf; mmbf=million bf)	Status	Written THP Summary Available?
Laguna Pass (Compartment R) (likely completed by 9/17)	1-09-044	Big River	2 mmbf original est. 800 mbf estimate after sale preparation 1180 mbf (actual 2010)	Cable harvest in progress. Tractor harvest completed. 800 mbf redwood volume.	Yes
Coombs Gulch (Compartment S) likely completed 9/27, is an option	1-09-097	Big River	2 mmbf (est.) 1.4 mmbf estimate after sale preparation 1.96 mmbf (actual 2010)	Harvesting completed 2010.	Yes
Wheel Gulch (Compartment H)  ACTIVE	1-09-020	Big River	2 mmbf original est. 552 mbf logged 2009 312 mbf (actual 2010) volume may be less due to NSO acres lost	Approved, 28% of THP completed in 2009; remainder projected to be completed in 2010. Plan area reduced by 100 acres due to NSO.	Yes
Upper North Fork	1-08-094	Garcia	700 mbf (est.) 120 mbf (actual 2010)	Approved, partially harvested in 2010.	Yes
Olsen Gulch	not yet submitted	Garcia	700 mbf (est.)	THP drafting in progress, to be submitted 2010.	Yes—new since last audit

## **Monday September 27, 2010**

### **Audit Participants**

Mike Ferrucci, Lead Auditor

Wally Mark, Auditor

Evan Smith, Vice President Forestland Acquisition & Finance, TCF

Jenny Griffin, Program Manager, TCF

Holly Newberger, Office Manager, TCF

Jordan Golinkoff, Forest Carbon Analyst, TCF

Margery Hoppner, Bookkeeper, TCF

Scott Kelley, Senior Forester, TCF

Madison Thompson, Forest Technician, TCF

Lee Susan, RPF, Summit Forestry

Eric Hontou, Forestry Technician, Summit Forestry

Al Lawrence, LTO for cat-logger crew at Laguna Pass THP

### **Field Sites**

Site 1 Wheel Gulch Crossing on Big River Road: revisited culverts seen 2009 SA during construction; working well

Site 2 Wheel Gulch THP, Active portion of yarder harvest; interviewed Mark Robertson, Logging Supervisor, LTO, Philbrick Logging (California ProLogger Company, LTO training; spill kits; first aid kits)

Site 3 Wheel Gulch THP, Completed portion of ground based harvest unit:

Site 4 Temporary Steel Bridge, Little North Fork of the Big River

Site 5 Picolotti pending THP: proposed 448 acres mostly for selection, discussion of THP planning and approval process, reviewed marking

Site 6 Laguna Pass THP: completed today, observed final load of logs leaving site; reviewed completed section of flood plain harvest and issues in complying with regulations requiring leaving the 13 largest trees per acre

Site 7 Road Decommissioning Project appurtenant to Laguna Pass THP: removed several high-risk culverts, outsloped some parts of roads, but mostly used rolling dips

Site 8 Carbon plot monumentation

**Tuesday September 28, 2010**

**Audit Participants**

Mike Ferrucci, Lead Auditor

Wally Mark, Auditor

Evan Smith, Vice President Forestland Acquisition & Finance, TCF

Jenny Griffin, Program Manager, TCF

Holly Newberger, Office Manager, TCF

Jordan Golinkoff, Forest Carbon Analyst, TCF

Margery Hoppner, Bookkeeper, TCF

Scott Kelley, Senior Forester, TCF

Jason Pelletier, North Coastal Regional Project Director, TNC

Karen Geer, The Coastal Conservancy

Jenn Carrah, Field Scientist, TNC

**Field Sites**

Site 1 Jack (Wild) Fire 2008 Graphite Road: 740 acre ground fire, did not salvage, have since developed a fire plan

Site 2 Upper North Fork THP: 256-acre harvest partially complete (challenges with contractors) combination of single tree and group selection; group selection areas will be planted

Site 3 Garcia River Bridge Replacement: using three 100-foot rail cars, two side-by-side, third cut in half and side-by-side

Site 4 Blue Water Hole Road Storm-proofing of a mid-slope road by smoothing berms, outsloping as needed, new culverts, and rolling dips; managed as a Supplemental Environmental Project, funded by Pulte Homes as environmental mitigation, designed to withstand 100-year flood event.

Site 5: Inman Creek Large Wood Restoration Project: large woody debris in-stream restoration by placing large logs in the stream, mostly unanchored but wedged opportunistically; monitored 1 year later – most pieces moved but still in the stream, some moved out to the main stem, many good quality, multi-log log-jams formed; habitat quality for fish (assessed pools, riffles) improved

**Appendix IV**



**SFI Reporting Form (no changes)**