



2000 Powell St., Suite 600  
Emeryville, CA 94608, USA

[www.scscertified.com](http://www.scscertified.com)

Brendan Grady

[bgrady@scscertified.com](mailto:bgrady@scscertified.com)

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

**Swanton Pacific Ranch**  
**California Polytechnic Corporation**

**SCS-FM/COC-00071N**

125 Swanton Rd, Davenport, CA 95017

Steve Auten: [sauten@calpoly.edu](mailto:sauten@calpoly.edu)

[www.spranch.org](http://www.spranch.org)

| CERTIFIED | EXPIRATION |
|-----------|------------|
| 05/03/09  | 05/03/14   |

| DATE OF FIELD AUDIT |
|---------------------|
| 10/27/11            |
| DATE OF LAST UPDATE |
| 11/28/11            |

### Organization of the Report

This report of the results of our evaluation is divided into two sections. Section A provides the public summary and background information that is required by the Forest Stewardship Council. This section is made available to the general public and is intended to provide an overview of the evaluation process, the management programs and policies applied to the forest, and the results of the evaluation. Section A will be posted on the FSC Certificate Database (<http://info.fsc.org/>) no less than 30 days after issue of the certificate. Section B contains more detailed results and information for the use of by the FME.

*Version 5-0*

*June 2011*

## FOREWORD

|   |  |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|
| <b>Cycle in annual surveillance audits</b>  |  |   |   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <sup>st</sup> annual audit                             | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2 <sup>nd</sup> annual audit | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <sup>rd</sup> annual audit | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <sup>th</sup> annual audit |
| <b>Name of Forest Management Enterprise and abbreviation used in this report:</b> |  |   |   |
| Forest Management Enterprise (FME)  | Swanton Pacific Ranch (SPR)                                      |   |   |

All certificates issued by SCS under the aegis of the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) require annual audits to ascertain ongoing compliance with the requirements and standards of certification. A public summary of the initial evaluation is available on the SCS website [www.scscertified.com](http://www.scscertified.com).

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

- A focused assessment of the status of any outstanding conditions or Corrective Action Requests (CARs; see discussion in section 5.0 for a summary those CARs and their disposition as a result of this annual audit in the separate CAR report file);
- Follow-up inquiry into any issues that may have arisen since the award of certification or prior to the audit; and
- As necessary given the breadth of coverage associated with the first two components, an additional focus on selected topics or issues, the selection of which is not known to the certificate holder prior to the audit.

All items marked with an asterisk (\*) are not required for FMUs that qualify as single SLIMFs.

## Contents

|   |                                     |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| Section A – Public Summary .....  | 4                                   |
| 1.0 General Information .....   | 4                                   |
| 1.1 Annual Audit Team.....  | 4                                   |
| 1.2 Total time spent on evaluation.....   | 4                                   |
| 1.3 Standards Employed .....  | 4                                   |
| 2.0 Annual Audit Dates and Activities.....  | 5                                   |
| 2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities .....                                     | 5                                   |
| 3.0 Changes in Management Practices.....  | 5                                   |
| 4.0 Annual Summary of pesticide and other chemical use .....                        | 6                                   |
| 5.0 Corrective Action Requests (CARs) and Observations (OBSs).....                  | 6                                   |
| 6.0 Stakeholder Comment* .....  | 6                                   |
| 7.0 Certification Decision .....  | 8                                   |
| 8.0 Current list of Non-SLIMF FMUs (multiple FMU and group certificates only) ..... | <b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b> |
| Section B - Appendices.....   | 9                                   |
| Appendix 1 – List of FMUs selected for evaluation (CONFIDENTIAL) .....              | 9                                   |
| Appendix 2 – Evaluation of Management Systems (CONFIDENTIAL)* .....                 | 9                                   |
| Appendix 3 – Stakeholder analysis (CONFIDENTIAL)* .....                             | 10                                  |
| Appendix 4 – Additional Audit Techniques Employed (CONFIDENTIAL)* .....             | 11                                  |
| Appendix 5 – Changes in Certification Scope .....                                   | 11                                  |
| Appendix 6 – Pesticide derogations.....   | 12                                  |
| Appendix 7 – Detailed observations (CONFIDENTIAL).....                              | 12                                  |
| Appendix 8 – Chain of Custody Indicators for FMEs (CONFIDENTIAL) .....              | 18                                  |

## Section A – Public Summary

### 1.0 General Information

#### 1.1 Annual Audit Team

|   |                   |                      |              |
|---|-------------------|----------------------|--------------|
| <b>Auditor Name:</b>  | Dr. Robert Hrubes | <b>Auditor role:</b> | Lead Auditor |
| <b>Qualifications:</b> Dr. Hrubes is a California registered professional forester (#2228) and forest economist with over 30 years of professional experience in both public and public forest management issues. He is the principal architect of the SCS Forest Conservation Program, accredited by the Forest Stewardship Council since 1995. He is currently Senior Vice-President of Scientific Certification Systems. Dr. Hrubes has served as lead auditor for a large number of SCS Forest Conservation Program certification evaluations of North American public forests, industrial forest ownerships and non-industrial forests, as well as operations in Scandinavia, Chile, Brazil, Papua New Guinea, Japan, Malaysia, Australia and New Zealand. Dr. Hrubes holds graduate degrees in forest economics, economics and resource systems management from the University of California-Berkeley and the University of Michigan. His professional forestry degree (B.S.F. with double major in Outdoor Recreation) was awarded from Iowa State University. |                   |                      |              |
| <b>Auditor Name:</b>  | Zane Haxton       | <b>Auditor role:</b> | Auditor      |
| <b>Qualifications:</b> Mr. Haxton holds a M.S. in Forest Resources from Oregon State University and a B.S. from The Evergreen State College. A well-rounded forestry professional, Mr. Haxton held a wide variety of positions in forest research and management before coming to SCS, ranging from work on logging and tree planting crews to experience as a wildland firefighter and research assistant. A specialist in forest inventory, Mr. Haxton holds significant expertise in sampling design, inventory management and growth modeling.  |                   |                      |              |

#### 1.2 Total time spent on evaluation

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| A. Number of days spent on-site assessing the applicant:   | 1   |
| B. Number of auditors participating in on-site evaluation:   | 2   |
| C. Additional days spent on preparation, stakeholder consultation, and post-site follow-up:                      | 1.5 |
| D. Total number of person days used in evaluation:   | 3.5 |
| (Line D = (Total number of days in Line A x Total number of auditors from Line B) + additional days from Line C. |     |

#### 1.3 Standards Employed

| Box 1.3.1. – Applicable FSC-Accredited Standards   |         |                      |
|--|---------|----------------------|
| Title  | Version | Date of Finalization |
|  |         |                      |
| FSC-US Forest Management Standard  | V1-0    | 8 – July – 2010      |
| All standards employed are available on the websites of FSC International ( <a href="http://www.fsc.org">www.fsc.org</a> ), the FSC-US |         |                      |

([www.fscus.org](http://www.fscus.org)) or the SCS Forest Conservation Program homepage ([www.scscertified.com/forestry](http://www.scscertified.com/forestry)). Standards are also available, upon request, from Scientific Certification Systems ([www.scscertified.com](http://www.scscertified.com)).

## 2.0 Annual Audit Dates and Activities

### 2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities

| October 27, 2011                                   |  |
|--|--|
| Little Creek House                                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Opening Meeting</li><li>• Overview of events/activities since the last audit</li><li>• Review of CARs and OBS issued during 2010 surveillance audit</li><li>• Finalization of field visit locations</li></ul>  |
| Field: Site of future “field camp”, Al Smith house | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Reconnaissance of land clearing activities as part of plans for a future “field camp”</li><li>• Discussed conformance of land clearing activities with FSC-US Forest Management Standard V1.0</li><li>• Reconnaissance of Al Smith house and site of planned expansion with goal of creating kitchen and mess hall to support future field camp</li><li>• Discussed county permitting process and funding challenges</li></ul> |
| Field: South Fork timber harvest                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Reconnaissance of approx. 100 acre “green sale” from several vantage points</li><li>• Discussed silvicultural objectives and harvesting operations</li></ul>   |
| Field: proposed redwood restoration site           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Reconnaissance of approx. 13.5 acre Monterrey pine stand slated for conversion to redwood as part of restoration activity</li><li>• Discussed conformance of proposed activity with FSC-US Forest Management Standard V1.0</li></ul>   |
| Auditor deliberations and closing meeting          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Auditor deliberations (sequestered)</li><li>• Closing meeting; disposition of active CARs and OBS; verbal presentation of new Findings.</li></ul>  |

## 3.0 Changes in Management Practices

The changes in management practices employed since the 2010 surveillance audit were implemented due to the Lockheed Fire, which burned over a large portion of the FMU during August 2009. Among other areas, the fire burned over 79% of the area encompassed by the Swanton Pacific Ranch Non-industrial Timber Management Plan (NTMP), which covers the bulk of the FMU. As a result of the fire, a “minor amendment” to this NTMP was filed with Cal-Fire, wherein the sustainability and cumulative impacts analyses were modified as appropriate.

The first “green” timber harvest completed under the amended NTMP was the South Fork timber harvest, which had been planned prior to the fire. The audit team observed the post-harvest stand and determined that management actions on the FMU continue to be in conformance with the FSC-US Forest Management Standard V1.0.

#### 4.0 Annual Summary of Pesticide and Other Chemical Use

No pesticides were used on the FMU since the date of the 2010 surveillance audit. FMU personnel indicated interest in future chemical use for control of tanoak, which they feel is too prevalent in some areas of the FMU. They indicated that current funding constraints have curtailed such activity.

#### 5.0 Corrective Action Requests (CARs) and Observations (OBSs)

SCS publishes Corrective Action Requests (CARs) and Observations (OBSs) assigned as a result of previous evaluations, as well as their current status, as separate files on the FSC certificate database. Similarly, SCS publishes a separate file for any newly assigned CARs/OBSs as a result of the current evaluation.

#### 6.0 Stakeholder Comments\*

SCS conducts stakeholder outreach as part of annual audits in order to assess on-going conformance to the applicable FSC standards. Stakeholder consultation activities can include telephone calls, written letters, emails or consultation in the field. The results of stakeholder consultation activities are summarized below. Where a stakeholder comment has triggered a subsequent investigation during the evaluation, the corresponding follow-up action and conclusions from SCS have been noted.

| Box 6.1 – Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Responses from the Team Where Applicable  |                          |
|---|--------------------------|
| SCS did not receive any comments from interested parties as a result of stakeholder outreach activities during this annual audit. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <b>Delete Rest of Table if box checked above</b>  |                          |
| Stakeholder comments  | SCS Response             |
| <b>Economic concerns</b>  |                          |
|   |                          |
|   |                          |
|   |                          |
| <b>Social concerns</b>  |                          |
|   |                          |
|   |                          |
|   |                          |

| Environmental concerns   |            |
|--|------------|
| From CalFire's perspective, the management of the Swanton Pacific Ranch is fully compliant with the California forest practice regulations | Duly noted |
|  |            |
|  |            |

## 7.0 Certification Decision

| Box 7.1 Surveillance Decision  |   |
|--|---|
| The certificate holder has demonstrated continued overall conformance to the applicable Forest Stewardship standards. The SCS annual audit team recommends that the certificate be sustained, subject to subsequent annual audits and the FME's response to any open CARs. | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Comments: Cal Poly's management of the Swanton Pacific Ranch remains at a high level of conformance with the FSC forest stewardship standard.  |   |



## Section B - Appendices

### Appendix 1 – List of FMUs selected for evaluation (CONFIDENTIAL)

|  |
|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FME consists of a single FMU – <i>No further action required</i>   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> FME consists of multiple FMUs – <i>See table below, which applies to multiple FMU and group management evaluations, but is inapplicable if the scope of the evaluation is a single FMU.</i> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> FME consists of a single FMU – <i>No further action required</i>  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> FME consists of multiple FMUs – <i>See table below, which applies to multiple FMU and group management evaluations, but is inapplicable if the scope of the evaluation is a single FMU.</i> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> FME consists of a single FMU – <i>No further action required</i>  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> FME consists of multiple FMUs – <i>See table below, which applies to multiple FMU and group management evaluations, but is inapplicable if the scope of the evaluation is a single FMU.</i> |

### Appendix 2 – Evaluation of Management Systems (CONFIDENTIAL)\*

The selection of criteria to be evaluated was based partly on the document “New requirements of the FSC-US Forest Management Standard (v1.0) as compared to: FSC Pacific Coast Regional Standard (v9.0),” which highlighted any “gaps” between the requirements of the two standards. According to the guidance provided by this document, all red-coded indicators were examined, as were other indicators in the same criteria. In addition, criteria C7.3 was selected for evaluation so that all of P7 could be covered prior to the next full evaluation.

The 2011 annual audit began with an opening meeting wherein the OBS and CARs issued during the 2010 annual audit were reviewed. The transition to the FSC-US Forest Management Standard V1.0 was discussed, as were activities that took place subsequent to the 2010 audit. Much of the discussion focused on the post-fire amendment to the Swanton Pacific Ranch NTMP and the subsequent South Fork timber harvest. Other topics of discussion were community outreach activities, such as the hosting of field tours during Redwood Science Symposium. Land clearing activities as part of the planned “field camp” were mentioned by FMU personnel.

The field sites to be visited were determined by the audit team in consideration of the 2011 Annual Audit Itinerary that was previously provided to FMU personnel as well as logistical and other considerations raised by FMU personnel. At the field sites visited, conversations were held regarding conformance to the selected indicators of the FSC-US Forest Management Standard V1.0.

Following the field visit, the auditors deliberated in private regarding the CARs and OBS to be issued, and a closing meeting was held with FMU personnel. At the closing meeting, one CAR and one OBS were issued to the certificate holder.

Following on-site activities, the audit team held conversations with stakeholders (CalFire and DFG personnel were contacted) and reviewed documentation as available on the certificate holder's website.

### Appendix 3 – Stakeholder analysis (CONFIDENTIAL)\*

#### 3.1 Stakeholder list (confidential)

##### List of FME Staff Consulted

| Name             | Title   | Contact              | Consultation method                       |
|------------------|---|----------------------|---|
| Brian Dietterick | Ranch Director                                  | bdietter@calpoly.edu | Extensive discussion during on-site audit |
| Steve Auten      | Resource Manager                                | sauten@calpoly.edu   | Same                                      |
| Douglas Piirto   | Forest Project Coordinator and Department Chair | dpiirto@calpoly.edu  | Same                                      |

##### List of other Stakeholders Consulted

| Name/ Title                                | Organization   | Contact  | Consultation method               |
|--|----------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| Richard Sampson, Forest Practice Inspector | CalFire        | (831) 254-1705<br><a href="mailto:Richard.Sampson@fire.ca.gov">Richard.Sampson@fire.ca.gov</a> | Email, letter; phone interview    |
| Terris Kastner, Environmental Scientist    | California DFG | (408) 365-1066<br><a href="mailto:tkastner@dfg.ca.gov">tkastner@dfg.ca.gov</a>                 | Email, letter; phone message left |

#### 3.2 Stakeholder review, complaints, and resolution

*No stakeholder complaints were lodged against this certified operation.*

| Box 3.2.1 – Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Responses from the Team Where Applicable   |                          |
|--|--------------------------|
| FME has not received any stakeholder complaints and the annual audit uncovered no known disputes since the previous evaluation. SCS has not received any complaints from stakeholders regarding its performance or treatment of FME's management system. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <b>Delete Rest of Table if box checked above</b>   |                          |
| <b>Stakeholder comments</b>  | <b>SCS Response</b>      |
| <b>Economic concerns</b>   |                          |
|  |                          |
|  |                          |
|  |                          |
| <b>Social concerns</b>   |                          |
|  |                          |

|   |                   |
|---|-------------------|
|   |                   |
|   |                   |
| <b>Environmental concerns</b>   |                   |
| <b>From CalFire's perspective, the management of the Swanton Pacific Ranch is fully compliant with the California forest practice regulations</b> | <b>Duly noted</b> |
|   |                   |

#### **Appendix 4 – Additional Audit Techniques Employed (CONFIDENTIAL)\***

The audit team did not employ any additional audit techniques for this annual surveillance audit.

#### **Appendix 5 – Changes in Certification Scope**

There were no changes in the scope of the certification.

## Appendix 6 – Pesticide Derogations

No approved pesticide derogation is held by the certificate holder.

## Appendix 7 – Detailed observations (CONFIDENTIAL)

| Evaluation year | FSC P&C Reviewed  |
|-----------------|---|
| 2009            | All – Recertification Evaluation  |
| 2010            | C4.4, P6, C7.1, C7.2, C7.4  |
| 2011            | C1.2, C1.6, C3.2, C4.2, C4.4, C5.5, C6.1, C6.3, C6.6, C6.8, C6.10, C7.1, C7.3, C8.1, C9.1 |
| 2012            |   |
| 2013            |   |

**C= Conformance with Criterion**

**C/NC= Overall Conformance with Criterion, but there are Indicator non-conformances**

**NC= Non-Conformance with Criterion**

| REQUIREMENT   | C/NC | COMMENT/CAR  |
|---|------|--|
| <b>P1 Forest management shall respect all applicable laws of the country in which they occur, and international treaties and agreements to which the country is a signatory, and comply with all FSC Principles and Criteria.</b> |      |  |
| <b>C1.2. All applicable and legally prescribed fees, royalties, taxes and other charges shall be paid.</b>  | C    | The applicable Family Forest indicator (1.2a) states “Low risk of negative social or environmental impact.” Given the low-intensity nature of forest management operations on the FMU, there is a very low risk of negative social or environmental impact. In addition, the close affiliation of the FMU with the State of California ensures conformance with the criterion.   |
| <b>C1.6. Forest managers shall demonstrate a long-term commitment to adhere to the FSC Principles and Criteria.</b>   | C    | The goal of maintaining “forest certification through the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) to improve financial returns and demonstrate sustainable practices” is listed as a primary goal by the certificate holder on page 12 of the “Swanton Pacific Ranch Management Plan” accessed through the FMU’s website at <a href="http://www.spranch.org/files/2011SPRManagement%20Plan_v4_111025.pdf">http://www.spranch.org/files/2011SPRManagement%20Plan_v4_111025.pdf</a> (accessed October 28, 2011). The reasons for the certificate holder not including the entire SPR in the scope of the FMU were documented and confirmed during prior audits. |
| <b>P3 The legal and customary rights of indigenous peoples to own, use and manage their lands, territories, and resources shall be recognized and respected.</b>  |      |  |
| <b>C3.2. Forest management shall not threaten or diminish, either directly or indirectly, the resources or tenure rights of indigenous peoples.</b>   | C    | Conformance with this indicator is ensured as part of the process of developing an NTMP, which requires that input must be solicited by a list of “Native American heritage contacts” that includes tribal liaisons. FMU personnel have also made contact with Chuck Stiplen, affiliated with the San Francisco Estuary Institute, who has been a helpful resource.  |
| <b>P4 Forest management operations shall maintain or enhance the long-term social and economic well-being of forest workers and local communities.</b>  |      |  |
| <b>C4.2. Forest management should meet or exceed all</b>  | C    | As discussed regarding indicator C1.2a, a very low risk of negative  |

Version 5-0

June 2011

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of employees and their families.  |   | social or environmental impact has been maintained. Regarding workplace safety, it should be noted that the certificate holder contracts with Big Creek Lumber Company to perform most of the forest management tasks that are not performed by FMU personnel or student interns. FMU personnel showed the audit team that Section 1.5 of the "forestry services and timber sale contract" in place with Big Creek Lumber Company requires that forest management tasks be performed in a "good, careful and workmanlike manner."  |
| <b>C4.4. Management planning and operations shall incorporate the results of evaluations of social impact. Consultations shall be maintained with people and groups directly affected by management operations.</b>   | C | The certificate holder clearly understands the likely social impacts of management activities and incorporates this understanding into management planning and operations. This was evidenced by the degree of care taken to ensure that the proposed expansion of facilities would result in said facilities being visible from CA Hwy 1. As discussed regarding indicator C1.2a, a very low risk of negative social or environmental impact has been maintained.   |
| <b>P5 Forest management operations shall encourage the efficient use of the forest's multiple products and services to ensure economic viability and a wide range of environmental and social benefits.</b>   |   |  |
| <b>C5.5. Forest management operations shall recognize, maintain, and, where appropriate, enhance the value of forest services and resources such as watersheds and fisheries.</b>   | C | Although no municipal watersheds are located near the FMU, the certificate holder has been in contact with personnel from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association to study the effects of forest management on fish habitat. The certificate holder has been highly active in promoting non-commercial tourism on the FMU through public tours (such as the "Redwood Symposium" and railroad exhibition) and through the provision of educational experiences for California Polytechnic State University Students. The certificate holder has been actively involved in the expansion of existing infrastructure to allow more students to visit, and spend the night, on the FMU. With regards to carbon storage and sequestration, a major analysis was conducted for the Valencia tract. Although this analysis indicated that not much was to be gained from registering this tract under the Climate Action Registry, the certificate holder is mindful of the possibilities regarding carbon storage and sequestration.<br><br><b>See OBS 2011.1</b> |
| <b>C5.6. The rate of harvest of forest products shall not exceed levels that can be permanently sustained.</b>  | C | The Sustained Analysis in Section 3 of the Swanton Pacific Ranch NTMP (which excludes the Valencia Creek tract), as well as the Valencia Creek NTMP, exhibits a superior level of timber management planning relative to common practice among similarly-sized ownerships throughout the United States, and is completely adequate to demonstrate conformance to this criterion.   |
| <b>P6 Forest management shall conserve biological diversity and its associated values, water resources, soils, and unique and fragile ecosystems and landscapes, and, by so doing, maintain the ecological functions and the integrity of the forest.</b>                                       |   |  |
| <b>C6.1. Assessments of environmental impacts shall be completed -- appropriate to the scale, intensity of forest management and the uniqueness of the affected resources -- and adequately integrated into management systems. Assessments shall include landscape level considerations as</b> | C | Section 3 of the Swanton Pacific Ranch NTMP (2007) discusses current and historic forest community types and successional stages. Late-successional forest is specifically discussed in pages 167-168. Rare, threatened and endangered species, as well as other species of management concern, are assessed in Section 4 of the Swanton   |

|  |             |  |
|--|-------------|--|
| <p>well as the impacts of on-site processing facilities. Environmental impacts shall be assessed prior to commencement of site-disturbing operations.</p>  |             | <p>Pacific Ranch NTMP. Water and soil resources are also discussed in Section 4 of the Swanton Pacific Ranch NTMP.</p> <p>For Valencia Creek, Section 9.4 of the Swanton Pacific Ranch Management Plan (2011) discusses current forest community types and successional stages, while Section 4.3 discusses historic conditions. Rare, threatened and endangered species, as well as other species of management concern, are addressed in Item 32 of the Valencia Creek NTMP (2001). Valencia Creek's soils are described in Section 5.5.2 of the Swanton Pacific Ranch Management Plan. Water resources on the Valencia Creek tract are assessed in Item 26 of the Valencia Creek NTMP.</p> <p>The Swanton Pacific Ranch and Valencia Creek NTMPs contain adequate information to demonstrate that the certificate holder assessed the potential short and long-term impacts of planned management activities on the above-mentioned elements, and that the certificate holder adopted management approaches to mitigate any potential impacts.</p>  |
| <p><b>C6.3. Ecological functions and values shall be maintained intact, enhanced, or restored, including: a) Forest regeneration and succession. b) Genetic, species, and ecosystem diversity. c) Natural cycles that affect the productivity of the forest ecosystem.</b></p> | <p>C/NC</p> | <p>In accordance with 6.3.a, the certificate holder is committed to maintaining under-represented successional stages, such as old growth, on the FMU. Some Type II old growth is present on the FMU, and the certificate holder has delineated and protected this resource. The certificate holder's "old growth policy", posted on its website (<a href="http://www.spranch.org/forest_management.ldml">http://www.spranch.org/forest_management.ldml</a>), identifies the characteristics that are used to identify old growth trees to be protected from harvest.</p> <p>In accordance with 6.3.b, the certificate holder has taken steps to maintain, enhance and restore habitat conditions suitable for animal species native to the local ecosystem. As evidence of this, the audit team observed an approximately 13.5 acre site that was planted to Monterrey pine (a non-native species) in the past, which the certificate holder would like convert to redwood (a native species).</p> <p>In accordance with 6.3.c, the certificate holder maintains plant and wildlife habitat of riparian management zones. This is guaranteed by the certificate holder's conformance to the California Forest Practice Rules as well as the certificate holder's stated objective of restoring riparian areas in Queseria and Scotts Creeks.</p> <p>Conformance with 6.3.d was demonstrated through on-site inspection of the South Fork timber harvest. It is clear that the certificate holder is attempting to maintain and restore "natural" conditions in conjunction with the certificate holder's other objectives for the FMU, and timber harvest is planned accordingly. FMU personnel expressed concerns about the prevalence of tanoak within the FMU, which FMU personnel claims is present in greater abundance than would occur naturally.</p> <p>In accordance with 6.3.e, the certificate holder is committed to only planting native species where planting is required within the FMU. At this time, the certificate holder is <i>not in conformance</i> with indicator 6.3.f. Indicator 6.3.f requires that protections are in place</p> |

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
|  |   | <p>for “legacy trees” (as distinct from old growth trees); however, the certificate holder does not currently have any explicit policy regarding the treatment of legacy trees. <b>See Minor CAR 2011.1</b></p> <p>Indicator 6.3.g is not applicable to the FMU, as the certificate holder does not generally employ even-aged silvicultural systems within the FMU.</p> <p>In accordance with 6.3h, the certificate holder is committed to monitoring and controlling invasive species within the FMU. The certificate holder has historically implemented treatment of French broom. However, as with every land owner, funding is a constant obstacle to treatment of invasive species, and no treatment of French broom occurred within the past year.</p> <p>In accordance with 6.3i, the certificate holder conducted active salvage efforts subsequent to the Lockheed Fire, and FMU personnel communicated that part of the motivation for salvage was to removed fire-damaged trees and reduce post-fire fuel loading.</p> |
| <b>C6.6. Management systems shall promote the development and adoption of environmentally friendly non-chemical methods of pest management and strive to avoid the use of chemical pesticides. World Health Organization Type 1A and 1B and chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides; pesticides that are persistent, toxic or whose derivatives remain biologically active and accumulate in the food chain beyond their intended use; as well as any pesticides banned by international agreement, shall be prohibited. If chemicals are used, proper equipment and training shall be provided to minimize health and environmental risks.</b> | C | According to FMU personnel, no chemicals were used for pest management within the past year. The audit team did not observe any evidence to contradict this statement.  |
| <b>C6.8. Use of biological control agents shall be documented, minimized, monitored, and strictly controlled in accordance with national laws and internationally accepted scientific protocols. Use of genetically modified organisms shall be prohibited.</b>  | C | According to FMU personnel, no biological control agents were used for pest management within the past year. The audit team did not observe any evidence to contradict this statement.  |
| <b>C6.10. Forest conversion to plantations or non-forest land uses shall not occur, except in circumstances where conversion:</b><br><b>a) Entails a very limited portion of the forest management unit; and b) Does not occur on High Conservation Value Forest areas; and c) Will enable clear, substantial, additional, secure, long-term conservation benefits across the forest management unit.</b>  | C | The audit team observed the site of a proposed future “field camp” (which is envisioned to contain housing and other facilities for use by visiting Cal Poly students and others). A footprint of approximately 2.5 acres was cleared in preparation for construction. This land-clearing activity clearly meets the criteria specified. In particular, the expansion of educational facilities for natural resources students will most certainly enable “clear, substantial, additional, secure, long-term conservation benefits across the forest management unit.”  |
| <b>P7 A management plan -- appropriate to the scale and intensity of the operations -- shall be written, implemented, and kept up to date. The long-term objectives of management, and the means of achieving them, shall be clearly stated.</b>   |   |   |
| <b>C7.1. The management plan and supporting documents shall provide:</b><br><b>a) Management objectives.</b><br><b>b) description of the forest resources to be managed, environmental limitations, land use and ownership status, socio-economic conditions, and a profile of adjacent lands.</b>   | C | The Swanton Pacific Ranch Management Plan contains specific management objectives and provides a timeline for implementation of each objective. This plan also describes the forest resources to be managed over the FMU, and specific objectives and silvicultural methods to be implemented for each “unit” (i.e. stand). The NTMP documents for Swanton Pacific Ranch and the Valencia Creek tract   |

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <p>c) Description of silvicultural and/or other management system, based on the ecology of the forest in question and information gathered through resource inventories.</p> <p>d) Rationale for rate of annual harvest and species selection.</p> <p>e) Provisions for monitoring of forest growth and dynamics.</p> <p>f) Environmental safeguards based on environmental assessments.</p> <p>g) Plans for the identification and protection of rare, threatened and endangered species.</p> <p>h) Maps describing the forest resource base including protected areas, planned management activities and land ownership.</p> <p>i) Description and justification of harvesting techniques and equipment to be used.</p> |   | <p>more explicitly discuss the harvest limits to be employed. The other information required for conformance to FF indicator 7.1.a is also contained within these documents. The audit team observed that actions undertaken on the FMU are consistent with the management plan and help achieve its stated goals.</p>  |
| <p><b>C7.3. Forest workers shall receive adequate training and supervision to ensure proper implementation of the management plans.</b></p>   | C | <p>All of the FMU personnel interviewed appeared to be adequately trained to ensure proper implementation of the management plans. As previously discussed, the certificate holder contracts with Big Creek Lumber Company to perform most of the forestry labor not performed by interns. Big Creek Lumber Company is highly regarded in terms of performance and safety, and is an A-category Licensed Timber Operator (Cal Fire list of Licensed Timber Operators, <a href="http://www.fire.ca.gov/resource_mgt/resource_mgt_forestpractice_ltos.php">http://www.fire.ca.gov/resource_mgt/resource_mgt_forestpractice_ltos.php</a>, accessed November 1, 2011). In addition, Big Creek Lumber Company is the holder of a group FSC certificate, and their crews are therefore used to performing forest management labor to FSC standards.</p> |
| <p><b>P8 Monitoring shall be conducted -- appropriate to the scale and intensity of forest management -- to assess the condition of the forest, yields of forest products, chain of custody, management activities and their social and environmental impacts.</b></p>  |   |   |
| <p><b>C8.1. The frequency and intensity of monitoring should be determined by the scale and intensity of forest management operations, as well as, the relative complexity and fragility of the affected environment. Monitoring procedures should be consistent and replicable over time to allow comparison of results and assessment of change.</b></p>  | C | <p>As is not surprising given the FMU's affiliation with the University, the certificate holder is currently undertaking a suite of monitoring activities on a far more intensive basis than is common practice among owners of comparably sized holdings. Many of these monitoring efforts are summarized on the certificate holder's website at <a href="http://www.spranch.org/monitoring.ldml">http://www.spranch.org/monitoring.ldml</a>. During on-site audit activities, the FMU personnel were able to produce a very thick binder stuffed with monitoring protocols for all of the various projects.</p>   |
| <p><b>8.2. Forest management should include the research and data collection needed to monitor, at a minimum, the following indicators:</b></p> <p>a) yield of all forest products harvested,</p> <p>b) growth rates, regeneration, and condition of the forest,</p> <p>c) composition and observed changes in the flora and fauna,</p> <p>d) environmental and social impacts of harvesting and other operations, and</p> <p>e) cost, productivity, and efficiency of forest management.</p>   | C | <p>The certificate holder maintains a network of approximately 200 Continuous Forest Inventory (CFI) plots across the FMU. Through these plots, information on species, volumes, stocking, regeneration, stand/forest composition and structure and timber quality is collected. Due to the small size of the FMU and the active management being undertaken, the certificate holder should be able to detect any significant, unanticipated removal/loss/increased vulnerability of forest resources, as occurred with the Lockheed Fire. The certificate holder maintains records of harvested timber, as with the South Fork timber sale. Finally, the certificate holder monitors for rare, threatened and endangered species (such as the red legged</p>   |



|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
|   |   | <p>frog) and their habitat and invasive species, focusing particularly on riparian areas such as that surrounding Queseria Creek. As is discussed in the HCV Report Summary (2005), monitoring is an important aspect of HCV management.</p> <p>The certificate holder engages in active informal monitoring of the road system, particularly after significant rain events, as was revealed during on-site discussion. The certificate holder is also engaged on ongoing informal social monitoring, and is keenly aware of the costs and revenues of forest management activities.</p> |
| <b>P9 Management activities in high conservation value forests shall maintain or enhance the attributes which define such forests. Decisions regarding high conservation value forests shall always be considered in the context of a precautionary approach.</b> |   |  |
| <b>C9.1. Assessment to determine the presence of the attributes consistent with High Conservation Value Forests will be completed, appropriate to scale and intensity of forest management.</b>   | C | <p>An assessment of High Conservation Value Forests was completed that incorporates the requirements of criteria 9.1. As is required by 9.1.c, a summary of this report is freely available on the certificate holder's website (<a href="http://www.spranch.org/files/HCVWeb.pdf">http://www.spranch.org/files/HCVWeb.pdf</a>, accessed November 1, 2011).</p>  |

## **Appendix 8 – Chain of Custody Indicators for FMEs (CONFIDENTIAL)**

Criterion 8.3 and the SCS' Chain of Custody (COC) indicators for Forest Management Enterprises (FMEs) were not reviewed during this audit. No nonconformities in the FME's implementation of COC procedures and use of FSC trademarks were discovered during the audit. Furthermore, SCS has not received any complaints from FSC representatives or FME's customers regarding trademark infringement and lapses in the implementation of COC procedures.