

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

California Polytechnic State University Corporation

Swanton Pacific Ranch

Santa Cruz Count, CA

SCS-FM/COC-00071N

25 Swanton Road
Davenport, CA 95017
Steve Auten
spranch.org

CERTIFIED	EXPIRATION
2 May 2014	1 May 2019

DATE OF FIELD AUDIT
21 May 2015
DATE OF LAST UPDATE
7 July 2015

SCS Contact:
Brendan Grady | Director
Forest Management Certification
+1.510.452.8000
bgrady@scsglobalservices.com

SCSglobal
SERVICES
Setting the standard for sustainability™

2000 Powell Street, Ste. 600, Emeryville, CA 94608 USA
+1.510.452.8000 main | +1.510.452.8001 fax
www.SCSglobalServices.com

Foreword

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

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

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

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

Organization of the Report

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

Table of Contents

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY.....	4
1. GENERAL INFORMATION	4
1.1 Annual Audit Team	4
1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation	4
1.3 Standards Employed	4
2 ANNUAL AUDIT DATES AND ACTIVITIES	5
2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities	5
2.2 Evaluation of Management Systems	6
3. CHANGES IN MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	6
4. RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION	6
4.1 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations	6
4.2 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations	12
5. STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS	16
5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted	16
5.2 Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Responses from the Team, Where Applicable.....	17
6. CERTIFICATION DECISION	17
7. CHANGES IN CERTIFICATION SCOPE	17
8. ANNUAL DATA UPDATE	21
8.1 Social Information.....	21
8.2 Annual Summary of Pesticide and Other Chemical Use	21
SECTION B – APPENDICES (CONFIDENTIAL).....	22
Appendix 1 – List of FMUs Selected For Evaluation	22
Appendix 2 – List of Stakeholders Consulted	22
Appendix 3 – Additional Audit Techniques Employed.....	22
Appendix 4 – Pesticide Derogations	22
Appendix 5 – Detailed Observations	22
Appendix 6 – Chain of Custody Indicators for FMEs	41

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY

1. General Information

1.1 Annual Audit Team

Auditor Name:	Liz Forward	Auditor role:	Lead auditor
Qualifications:	Ms. Forward is a Certification Forester in the SCS Forest Management program. She holds a B.A. in Human Biology from Stanford University and Masters of Environmental Management and Masters of Forestry degrees from Duke University's Nicholas School of Earth and Environmental Science. She has worked in rural land use planning in Colorado and Montana and in forest certification and sustainable agriculture in Indonesia. She is an ISO accredited lead auditor and a Registered Professional Forester (RPF #2974) in the state of California. She has conducted forest management and chain of Custody evaluation and surveillance audits throughout the United States and Indonesia.		

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:	1
C. Additional days spent on preparation, stakeholder consultation, and post-site follow-up:	1
D. Total number of person days used in evaluation:	2

1.3 Standards Employed

1.3.1. Applicable FSC-Accredited Standards

Title	Version	Date of Finalization
FSC US Forest Management Standard	V1-0	July, 2010
All standards employed are available on the websites of FSC International (www.fsc.org), the FSC-US (www.fscus.org) or the SCS Standards page (www.scsglobalservices.com/certification-standards-and-program-documents). Standards are also available, upon request, from SCS Global Services (www.SCSglobalServices.com).		

1.3.2. SCS Interim FSC Standards

Title	Version	Date of Finalization
NA		
This SCS Interim Standard was developed by modifying SCS' Generic Interim Standard to reflect forest management in the region and by incorporating relevant components of the Draft Regional / National Standard and comments from stakeholders. More than one month prior to the start of the field evaluation, the SCS Draft Interim Standard for the country / region was sent out for comment to stakeholders identified by FSC International, SCS, the forest managers under evaluation, and the National Initiative. A copy of the standard is available at www.scsglobalservices.com/certification-standards-and-program-documents or upon request from SCS Global Services (www.SCSglobalServices.com).		

2 Annual Audit Dates and Activities

2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities

Date Thursday, May 21st	
FMU/Location/ sites visited	Activities/ notes
9am, SPR conference room	Opening Meeting: Introductions, client update, review audit scope, audit plan, update on FSC and SCS standards and protocols, review of open CARs/OBS, final site selection
11am – 2pm, Site visits	<p>1) Scott Gulch THP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - THP written only to replace large crossing on a class 2 stream. Proved easier to write a full THP, without a planned harvest, than to obtain a 1600 permit. Speaks to the regulatory scrutiny in the Central Coast District. - Replaced old crossing with a 5x7 aluminum culvert, planted sword fern, Douglas iris, seeded with barley, vegetation around new stream banks. One year later, the crossing did not look new. - Cost of the THP was split with Big Creek, because the access to their property, via Pretty Ranch Rd, is just beyond the crossing. - Discussed recent interactions with the Boy Scout troupe that uses the camp just up from the crossing. A significant amount of consultation with the troupe took place to determine if any trees would come out of the plan area. In the end, mainly due to timing, no trees were removed. - Discussed recent finding of Townsend's big eared bat maternity roost. The roost was located in an old house, and does not affect forestry operations. However, since the species is a candidate for listing, they now have to include it in THPs or if they begin operations with their NTMP. The Valencia tract does not have the trees/structures to support this species. <p>2) Lion's Flat rd:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Drove up through burned area to look at areas treated in the past for French Broom. - Walked out to landing 12 – roadside is thick with broom, even though the area had been mowed and sprayed as part of an earlier control program, then burned in the Lockheed fire. Discussed options for further invasive weed control, prior participation in the Weed Management Area group. Invasive species strategy discussed per CAR from previous audit. - Discussed plantings following the fire and 30% survival rate.
3 – 4pm, SPR conference room	Closing Meeting and Review of Findings: Convene with all relevant staff to summarize audit findings, potential non-conformities and next steps

2.2 Evaluation of Management Systems

SCS deploys interdisciplinary teams with expertise in forestry, social sciences, natural resource economics, and other relevant fields to assess an FME's conformance to FSC standards and policies. Evaluation methods include document and record review, implementing sampling strategies to visit a broad number of forest cover and harvest prescription types, observation of implementation of management plans and policies in the field, and stakeholder analysis. When there is more than one team member, team members may review parts of the standards based on their background and expertise. On the final day of an evaluation, team members convene to deliberate the findings of the assessment jointly. This involves an analysis of all relevant field observations, stakeholder comments, and reviewed documents and records. Where consensus between team members cannot be achieved due to lack of evidence, conflicting evidence or differences of interpretation of the standards, the team is instructed to report these in the certification decision section and/or in observations.

3. Changes in Management Practices

There have been no explicit changes in management practices on SPR this past year. Some notable projects include the substantial progress on design and approval of the field camp, the initiation of the apprenticeship program and work on a regional collaboration for the CFI system. SPR also has a new video to showcase the many opportunities for students on the ranch.

4. Results of the Evaluation

4.1 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations

Finding Number: 2014.1	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	1.5.b
Issue: Signage on the upper (unlocked) gate to Fern Flat Road is old and has been modified with hand-written updates to SPR contact persons and telephone numbers. Most pertinently to this Indicator, the signs prominently state: "Road Closed Through Winter." A reasonable interpretation of this message is that the road is not closed in the summer season which fundamentally conflicts with the policy that has been conveyed by Swanton Pacific personnel to residents located uphill of this gate that the Fern Flat Road segment that runs through the SPR Valencia Tract is closed year-round except for emergency circumstances.	
Observation: The old and outdated signage on the upper gate of Fern Flat Road is not an effectively implemented action to curtail unauthorized use of Fern Flat Road.	

FME response (including any evidence submitted)	New signs made
SCS review	SCS reviewed pictures of the new signs hung on the gate at the Fern Flat Rd. While the signs still say "Road Closed Through Winter," the contact numbers have been updated and no trespassing and keep out signs have been added.
Status of OBS:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Non-Conformity <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2014.2	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	2.1.b
Issue: With respect to both the Fern Flat Road segment crossing the Valencia Tract and the Boy Scout Camp on the Swanton Pacific Ranch, the uses that SPR Managers consider to be duly authorized with respect to the road and the area containing and surrounding the Camp have not been properly documented and, as such, individuals and organizations engaged in use of these areas may not be in agreement with SPR Managers.	
Observation: Clarification and documentation of the authorized and permitted uses of the Fern Flat Road and the area occupied by the Boy Scout Camp would help to resolve current or future tensions and possible disputes with people who are using these portions of the certified forest.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	<p>A license agreement was drafted for the Boy Scouts to use the camp. The Scouts have reviewed the document, there have been a couple of meetings and rounds of revision. They are anticipating signing and finalizing the agreement soon.</p> <p>A summary document has been written that gives a timeline of everything that's happened to date regarding the disagreement with the Fern Flat Road Association. A license agreement was draft in March, 2014, but the FFRA did not agree to the terms and wanted a longer term agreement. Multiple meetings have been attended by all parties and legal advice sought. One issue to note is that residents are no longer using the road, although there is still evidence of motorcycle trespass. This has improved the condition of the road. The issue is still ongoing.</p>
SCS review	<p>The auditor reviewed the draft license agreement and finds the actions taken so far to address the use by the Boy Scouts to be adequate. The auditor also reviewed the summary document of the Fern Flat Road Association situation, and finds the actions taken adequate, even though no agreement has yet been reached.</p>

Status of OBS:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed
	<input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Non-Conformity
	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i>

Finding Number: 2014.3	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	4.2.b
Non-Conformity: The contract between Swanton Pacific Corporation and Big Creek Lumber Company that covers timber harvesting, hauling and appurtenant activities does not expressly contain safety provisions/requirements, as stipulated in FSC U.S. National Standard, Indicator 4.2.b.	
Corrective Action Request: Modify all contracts covering activities undertaken by contractors on the forestlands within the scope of FSC Certificate: SCS-FM/COC-00071N , including but not limited to the contract with Big Creek Lumber Company, to expressly incorporate safety provisions/requirements.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	No action taken yet. The contract with Big Creek needs to be amended.
SCS review	As no action was undertaken, this CAR has been raised to a Major and reissued in 2015.
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i>

Finding Number: 2014.4	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	4.5.b
Non-Conformity: The "Contact Us" link on the SPR website's homepage directs the user to a generic page on the Cal Poly campus in San Luis Obispo. This does not provide "a known and accessible means for interested stakeholders to voice grievances and have them resolved" or to generally provide input or ask questions, as is required by FSC U.S. National Standard, Indicator 4.5.b.	

Corrective Action Request: On the SPR website or through other effective mechanisms, establish a known and accessible means for interested stakeholders to voice grievances and have then resolved or to generally provide input or ask questions.	
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	
SCS review	During the opening meeting the auditor reviewed the link available on the SPR home page. The “contact us” link goes to the generic ranch email address, which goes to three people: Brian Dietrick, Courtney Newby, admin support for the ranch, Nick Macias – resource operations education, research, support.
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2014.5	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	6.3.h
Issue: Invasive exotic plant species, notably French broom, are present on the certified forest.	
Observation: There is an opportunity for SPR managers to demonstrate stronger conformity to FSC U.S. National Standard, Indicator 6.3.h by undertaking an assessment of the risks to native species and communities associated with invasive exotic plants found on both the Swanton and Valencia tracts of the certified forest. As warranted, SPR managers should develop, document and implement a strategy to prevent and/or control invasive species such as French broom.	
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	No specific actions yet taken. There is a plan to incorporate this topic into a student summer project on invasive species management.
SCS review	As no actions have been taken, this issue has been reissued as a Minor CAR for 2015.
Status of OBS:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Non-Conformity <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2014.6	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FF 6.4.a
Non-Conformity: There is presently lack of consistency and clarity in the use of several terms, all of which pertain to areas possessing attributes of note and that warrant special consideration in the course of designing and executing management activities on the certified forest. Terms with overlapping but not clearly and operationally defined meaning and use include: Reserve Areas, Reference Areas, Research/Study Areas, and Large Tree Management Areas. Due to this ambiguity, effective consultation with stakeholders and external experts as well as identification of qualifying areas in the certified forest is hampered.	
Corrective Action Request: SPR must review the current array of terms used for areas possessing special attributes on the certified forest and then modify as appropriate so as to establish a more coherent, consistent and effective system and classification nomenclature, in line with FSC requirements.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	No action taken.
SCS review	This finding was discussed at length at both the opening and closing meeting and has been raised to Major.
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2014.7	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FF 7.1.a
Non-Conformity: The description/treatment of areas on the certified forest possessing High Conservation Value Forest attributes is not adequately/consistently presented in the SPR Management Plan. Further the SPR Management Plan Summary has not been updated to incorporated HCVF-related planning, identification and classification work that has been completed on the certified forest.	

Corrective Action Request: In the SPR Management Plan Summary, and other appurtenant plan documents as appropriate, the presentation of SPR's approach to and management designations made with regard to areas possessing High Conservation Value Forest attributes must be updated.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	No action taken.
SCS review	As no corrective actions have been taken, this has been upgraded to a Major CAR.
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2014.8	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	8.3.b (see also SCS COC Indicators for FM)
<p>Issue: There remains some uncertainty on the part of the SPR Operations Director as to proper information (FSC certificate number and claim) to be placed on load tickets accompanying logs from the certified forest going to customers that wish to receive the material as FSC certified. At present, the FSC certificate number and claim is being handwritten on the tickets.</p> <p>Observation: Certainly prior to having a new supply of load tickets produced, a mock-up of the ticket containing the FSC certificate number and claim should be sent to SCS for review. Likewise, the use of the FSC logo and the SCS logo on the SPR website should also be reviewed by appropriate personnel at SCS.</p> <p>SPR is encouraged to use both the FSC and SCS logos in off-product applications such as websites and printed materials.</p>	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	Logo approval received, new trip ticket booklets made.
SCS review	Although SPR received approval for use of the FSC logo on the new load tickets, a mock-up of the ticket was not sent for approval, leading to the certificate code being used without the necessary claim (FSC 100%). As the most recent harvest is finished and wood will not be shipped for a couple of years, there is no need to immediately correct the load ticket booklets. However, the OBS will remain open, to remind SPR to get new load tickets made before the next harvest. As stated in the original Observation, a mock-up of the ticket should be sent to SCS for approval.

Status of OBS:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Non-Conformity <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i>
-----------------------	--

Finding Number: 2014.9	
Select one:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	9.1.c
Issue: There are inconsistencies in the content of three different SPR management plan documents that address HCVF.	
Observation: The clarity of SPR's approach to and status of High Conservation Value Forest areas would be improved by a review and harmonization of the three management plan documents that address HCVF.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	No action taken.
SCS review	This issue has been raised to a Minor CAR for 2015, and will likely be addressed as part of the response to finding 2014.7.
Status of OBS:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Non-Conformity <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i>

4.2 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations

Finding Number: 2015.1	
Select one:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	4.2.b
Non-Conformity: The contract between Swanton Pacific Corporation and Big Creek Lumber Company that covers timber harvesting, hauling and appurtenant activities does not expressly contain safety provisions/requirements, as stipulated in FSC U.S. National Standard, Indicator 4.2.b.	

Corrective Action Request: Modify all contracts covering activities undertaken by contractors on the forestlands within the scope of FSC Certificate: SCS-FM/COC-00071N , including but not limited to the contract with Big Creek Lumber Company, to expressly incorporate safety provisions/requirements.	
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2015.2	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	6.3.h
Issue: Invasive exotic plant species, notably French broom, are present on the certified forest. SPR has not yet assessed the extent of invasive plant species, nor prioritized a strategy to their management.	
Finding: SPR must assess the risk of, prioritize, and, as warranted, develop and implement a strategy to prevent or control invasive species, in accordance to the specific requirements under indicator 6.3.h.	
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	
SCS review	
Status of OBS:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Non-Conformity <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2015.3	
Select one: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FF 6.4.a
Non-Conformity: There is presently lack of consistency and clarity in the use of several terms, all of which pertain to areas possessing attributes of note and that warrant special consideration in the course of designing and executing management activities on the certified forest. Terms with overlapping but not clearly and operationally defined meaning and use include: Reserve Areas, Reference Areas, Research/Study Areas, and Large Tree Management Areas. Due to this ambiguity, effective consultation with stakeholders and external experts as well as identification of qualifying areas in the certified forest is hampered.	
Corrective Action Request: SPR must review the current array of terms used for areas possessing special attributes on the certified forest and then modify as appropriate so as to establish a more coherent, consistent and effective system and classification nomenclature, in line with FSC requirements.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2015.4	
Select one: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FF 7.1.a
Non-Conformity: The description/treatment of areas on the certified forest possessing High Conservation Value Forest attributes is not adequately/consistently presented in the SPR Management Plan. Further the SPR Management Plan Summary has not been updated to incorporated HCVF-related planning, identification and classification work that has been completed on the certified forest.	

Corrective Action Request: In the SPR Management Plan Summary, and other appurtenant plan documents as appropriate, the presentation of SPR's approach to and management designations made with regard to areas possessing High Conservation Value Forest attributes must be updated.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2015.5	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	8.3.b (see also SCS COC Indicators for FM)
Issue: There remains some uncertainty on the part of the SPR Operations Director as to proper information (FSC certificate number and claim) to be placed on load tickets accompanying logs from the certified forest going to customers that wish to receive the material as FSC certified. At present, the FSC certificate number and claim is being handwritten on the tickets.	
Observation: Prior to the next harvest, and prior to having a new supply of load tickets produced, a mock-up of the ticket containing the FSC certificate number and claim should be sent to SCS for review. SPR is encouraged to use both the FSC and SCS logos in off-product applications such as websites and printed materials. As the most recent harvest is finished and wood will not be shipped for a couple of years, there is no need to immediately correct the load ticket booklets.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	
SCS review	
Status of OBS:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Non-Conformity <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2015.6	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	9.1.c
Issue: There are inconsistencies in the content of three different SPR management plan documents that address HCVF.	
Finding: SPR's approach to and status of High Conservation Value Forest areas must be clarified through a review and harmonization of the three management plan documents that address HCVF.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	
SCS review	
Status of OBS:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Non-Conformity <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

5. Stakeholder Comments

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

- To solicit input from affected parties as to the strengths and weaknesses of the FME's management, relative to the standard, and the nature of the interaction between the company and the surrounding communities.
- To solicit input on whether the forest management operation has consulted with stakeholders regarding identifying any high conservation value forests (HCVFs).

Principal stakeholder groups are identified based upon results from past evaluations, lists of stakeholders from the FME under evaluation, and additional stakeholder contacts from other sources (e.g., chair of the regional FSC working group). The following types of groups and individuals were determined to be principal stakeholders in this evaluation:

5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted

SPR Staff	
Cal Poly professors	

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

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FME has not received any stakeholder comments from interested parties as a result of stakeholder outreach activities during this annual audit.	
Stakeholder comments	SCS Response
Economic concerns	
Social concerns	
Environmental concerns	

6. Certification Decision

The certificate holder has demonstrated continued overall conformance to the applicable Forest Stewardship Council standards. The SCS annual audit team recommends that the certificate be sustained, subject to subsequent annual audits and the FME's response to any open CARs.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments: Although SPR was issued multiple Major CARs at this audit, it should be noted that all are upgrades from findings from the previous year, and all are related to issues of documentation, rather than field practices.	

7. Changes in Certification Scope

Any changes in the scope of the certification since the previous audit are highlighted in **yellow** in the tables below.

Name and Contact Information

Organization name	California Polytechnic State University Corporation, Swanton Pacific Ranch		
Contact person	Steve Auten		
Address	Swanton Pacific Ranch 125 Swanton Road Davenport, CA 95017 USA	Telephone	831-458-5413
		Fax	831-458-5411
		e-mail	sauten@calpoly.edu
		Website	spranch.org

FSC Sales Information

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FSC Sales contact information same as above.			
FSC salesperson			
Address		Telephone	
		Fax	
		e-mail	
		Website	

Scope of Certificate

Certificate Type	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Single FMU	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple FMU
	<input type="checkbox"/> Group	
SLIMF (if applicable)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Small SLIMF certificate	<input type="checkbox"/> Low intensity SLIMF certificate
	<input type="checkbox"/> Group SLIMF certificate	
# Group Members (if applicable)	1	
Number of FMU's in scope of certificate		
Geographic location of non-SLIMF FMU(s)	Latitude: 37° 1' 59.5128" Longitude: -122° 13' 10.0524"	
Forest zone	<input type="checkbox"/> Boreal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Temperate
	<input type="checkbox"/> Subtropical	<input type="checkbox"/> Tropical
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is: Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac		
privately managed	2,100 acres	
state managed		
community managed		
Number of FMUs in scope that are:		
less than 100 ha in area	100 - 1000 ha in area	1
1000 - 10 000 ha in area	more than 10 000 ha in area	
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is included in FMUs that: Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac		
are less than 100 ha in area		
are between 100 ha and 1000 ha in area	2100	
meet the eligibility criteria as low intensity SLIMF FMUs		
Division of FMUs into manageable units:		
<p>SPR is divided under two main management units, each covered by a separate NTMP: Swanton Pacific Ranch and Valencia Creek. Within SPR there are two larger management units (Scotts Creek and Little Creek) with the remaining stands in scattered satellite units. The Valencia Creek NTMP divides the property into Management Units 1, 2 and 3.</p>		

Production Forests

Timber Forest Products	Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac
Total area of production forest (i.e. forest from which timber may be harvested)	1,182 acres
Area of production forest classified as 'plantation'	0

Area of production forest regenerated primarily by replanting or by a combination of replanting and coppicing of the planted stems	1,182 acres
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by natural regeneration, or by a combination of natural regeneration and coppicing of the naturally regenerated stems	1,182 acres
Silvicultural system(s)	Area under type of management
Even-aged management	0
Clearcut (clearcut size range)	
Shelterwood	
Other:	
Uneven-aged management	1,182 acres
Individual tree selection	
Group selection	
Other:	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (e.g. nursery, recreation area, windbreak, bamboo, silvo-pastoral system, agro-forestry system, etc.)	
The sustainable rate of harvest (usually Annual Allowable Harvest or AAH where available) of commercial timber (m3 of round wood)	Approximately 703,445 bf/ac/year
Non-timber Forest Products (NTFPs)	
Area of forest protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for the production of NTFPs or services	0
Other areas managed for NTFPs or services	0
Approximate annual commercial production of non-timber forest products included in the scope of the certificate, by product type	0
Explanation of the assumptions and reference to the data source upon which AAH and NTFP harvest rates estimates are based:	
The original NTMPs used plot data and stand projection tables to calculate AAC and harvest rates based on 15 year re-entry periods. More recent growth and yield calculations by Harlan Trammer based on CFI plot data have resulted in amended sustainability analysis in both NTMPs. The SPR NTMP has also been amended with post Lockheed Fire stand data.	
Species in scope of joint FM/COC certificate: Scientific/ Latin Name (Common/ Trade Name)	
Coastal redwood (<i>Sequoia sempervirens</i>)	
Douglas-fir (<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>)	

FSC Product Classification

Timber products		
Product Level 1	Product Level 2	Species
W1	W1.1	Coastal redwood (<i>Sequoia sempervirens</i>) Douglas-fir (<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>)
Non-Timber Forest Products		
Product Level 1	Product Level 2	Product Level 3 and Species

Conservation Areas

Total area of forest and non-forest land protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for conservation objectives				12 acres
High Conservation Value Forest/ Areas				
High Conservation Values present and respective areas:				Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac
	Code	HCV Type	Description & Location	Area
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV1	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g. endemism, endangered species, refugia).	Approximately 200 occurrences of rare, threatened and endangered species are recorded on the California Natural Diversity Database on or within 5 miles of Swanton Pacific Ranch properties	
<input type="checkbox"/>	HCV2	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant large landscape level forests, contained within, or containing the management unit, where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance.		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV3	Forests or areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems.	Approximately 200 occurrences of rare, threatened and endangered species are recorded on the California Natural Diversity Database on or within 5 miles of Swanton Pacific Ranch properties	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV4	Forests or areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g. watershed protection, erosion control).	These properties occur within and close to highly urbanized areas in Santa Cruz County, CA and provide a significant amount of refugia for the “beneficial uses” of the State.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	HCV5	Forests or areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g. subsistence, health).		
<input type="checkbox"/>	HCV6	Forests or areas critical to local communities’ traditional cultural identity (areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in cooperation with such local communities).		
Total Area of forest classified as ‘High Conservation Value Forest/ Area’				1500

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

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

8. Annual Data Update**8.1 Social Information**

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

8.2 Annual Summary of Pesticide and Other Chemical Use

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FME does not use pesticides.				
Commercial name of pesticide / herbicide	Active ingredient	Quantity applied annually (kg or lbs)	Size of area treated during previous year	Reason for use

SECTION B – APPENDICES (CONFIDENTIAL)

Appendix 1 – List of FMUs Selected For Evaluation

☒ FME consists of a single FMU

☐ FME consists of multiple FMUs or is a Group

Appendix 2 – List of Stakeholders Consulted

List of FME Staff Consulted

Name	Title	Contact Information	Consultation method
Steve Auten	Ranch Operations Manager		Audit – meeting/field
Dr. Doug Piirto	Professor, Cal Poly		Audit – meeting/field
Dr. Brian Dietterick	Ranch Director		Opening/closing meeting

Appendix 3 – Additional Audit Techniques Employed

No additional audit techniques were employed

Appendix 4 – Pesticide Derogations

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> There are no active pesticide derogations for this FME.		
Name of pesticide / herbicide (active ingredient)		Date derogation approved
Condition		Evidence of progress
	Conformance (C / NC)	

Appendix 5 – Detailed Observations

Evaluation Year	FSC P&C Reviewed
2014	All – (Re)certification Evaluation
2015	P6, P9
20XX	
20XX	
20XX	

C= Conformance with Criterion or Indicator

NC= Nonconformance with Criterion or Indicator

NA = Not Applicable

NE = Not Evaluated

REQUIREMENT	C/NC	COMMENT/CAR
Principle #1: Compliance with Laws and FSC Principles 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.		
Principle #2: Long-term tenure and use rights to the land and forest resources shall be clearly defined, documented and legally established.		
Principle #3: The legal and customary rights of indigenous peoples to own, use and manage their lands, territories, and resources shall be recognized and respected.		
Principle #4: Forest management operations shall maintain or enhance the long-term social and economic well-being of forest workers and local communities.		
Principle #5: 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.		
Principle #6: 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.		
6.1. 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 well as the impacts of on-site processing facilities. Environmental impacts shall be assessed prior to commencement of site-disturbing operations.	C	
6.1.a Using the results of <i>credible scientific analysis, best available information</i> (including relevant databases), and local knowledge and experience, an assessment of conditions on the FMU is completed and includes: 1) Forest community types and development, size class and/or successional stages, and associated <i>natural disturbance regimes</i> ; 2) <i>Rare, Threatened and Endangered (RTE) species</i> and <i>rare ecological communities</i> (including plant communities); 3) Other habitats and species of management concern; 4) Water resources and associated riparian habitats and hydrologic functions; 5) <i>Soil resources</i> ; and	C	As noted last year, SPR has completed a thorough assessment of the conditions on their property in conformance with the requirements of this indicator and written up results in their respective management plan documents (NTMPs, THPs and SPR Management Plan). Under the California FPRs all THPs and NTMPs require an assessment of the current conditions on the FMU in line with items 1-6 of this indicator prior to active operations. Descriptions of the results of the assessment are included in management documents.

6) Historic conditions on the FMU related to forest community types and development, size class and/or successional stages, and a broad comparison of historic and current conditions.		
<p>6.1.b Prior to commencing site-disturbing activities, the forest owner or manager assesses and documents the potential short and long-term impacts of planned management activities on elements 1-5 listed in Criterion 6.1.a.</p> <p>The assessment must incorporate the best available information, drawing from scientific literature and experts. The impact assessment will at minimum include identifying resources that may be impacted by management (e.g., streams, habitats of management concern, soil nutrients). Additional detail (i.e., detailed description or quantification of impacts) will vary depending on the uniqueness of the resource, potential risks, and steps that will be taken to avoid and minimize risks.</p>	C	<p>As required under the California FPRs, all forest managers must document the potential short and long-term impacts of their forest management activities and present their findings in the Cumulative Impact Assessment section of their management plan. Cumulative Impact Assessments cover all resources that might reasonably be impacted by management activities, including soils, biological resources, recreation, aesthetics, traffic, climate and watershed/hydrology.</p> <p>Conversations conducted during this year's field audit that indicate thorough understanding and assessment of potential impacts include those surrounding the new crossing within the Scout Gulch THP and particularly regarding the new construction for the Swanton Pacific Education Center and Field Camp (SPECFC). The Planning Commission unanimously approved the plans one month ago, they have finished Coastal Commission review, and the appeal process has finished, indicating all impacts have been thoroughly analyzed.</p>
6.1.c Using the findings of the impact assessment (Indicator 6.1.b), management approaches and field prescriptions are developed and implemented that: 1) avoid or minimize negative short-term and long-term impacts; and, 2) maintain and/or enhance the long-term ecological viability of the forest.	C	Although not explicitly about impacts of forest practices, the impact assessment conducted for the SPECFC should ensure that negative impacts are minimized and will hopefully improve the long term viability of the forest by encouraging more forestry students to work on the property and conduct research into the unique ecology of the area.
6.1.d On public lands, assessments developed in Indicator 6.1.a and management approaches developed in Indicator 6.1.c are made available to the public in draft form for review and comment prior to finalization. Final assessments are also made available.	NA	FME does not manage public FMUs.
6.2 Safeguards shall exist which protect rare, threatened and endangered species and their habitats (e.g., nesting and feeding areas). Conservation zones and protection areas shall be	C	

established, appropriate to the scale and intensity of forest management and the uniqueness of the affected resources. Inappropriate hunting, fishing, trapping, and collecting shall be controlled.		
FF Indicator 6.2.a If there is a likely presence of RTE species as identified in Indicator 6.1.a then either a field survey to verify the species' presence or absence is conducted prior to site-disturbing management activities, or management occurs with the assumption that potential RTE species are present. Surveys are conducted by biologists with the appropriate expertise in the species of interest and with appropriate qualifications to conduct the surveys. A secondary review of the survey does not need to be included in the process. If a species is determined to be present, its location should be reported to the manager of the appropriate database.	C	There were no active harvests at the time of the audit, so RTE species surveys were not conducted this season, except prior to the bridge replacement work on Scout Gulch. Surveys for RTE species have occurred in relationship to the proposed Swanton Pacific Education Center and Field Camp (SPECFC) in a few areas near or adjacent to the project site.
6.2.b When RTE species are present or assumed to be present, modifications in management are made in order to maintain, restore or enhance the extent, quality and viability of the species and their habitats. Conservation zones and/or protected areas are established for RTE species, including those S3 species that are considered rare, where they are necessary to maintain or improve the short and long-term viability of the species. Conservation measures are based on relevant science, guidelines and/or consultation with relevant, independent experts as necessary to achieve the conservation goal of the Indicator.	C	<p>Townsend's big eared bat has become more of an issue in the Redwoods as a candidate species for listing. They are known to occupy only 6 or 7 sites along the central coast. Recently, a maternity roost was found in the Cheese house across the street from the Green House at 125 Swanton Road on Cal Poly Swanton Pacific Ranch Property (CPSPR). As the roost was found in a structure on the road, it has not affected forestry operations.</p> <p>The 2014 harvest of Valencia Creek followed protection measures for RTE species in the Valencia Creek NTMP http://spranch.calpoly.edu/documents.ldml . The Scout Gulch THP was also completed but, was specifically for the installation of a crossing near the Boy Scout Camp in the northern "diamond" of the property and as such had no RTE species concerns.</p>
6.2.c For medium and large public forests (e.g. state forests), forest management plans and operations are designed to meet species' recovery goals, as well as landscape level biodiversity conservation goals.	NA	FME does not manage public FMUs.
6.2.d Within the capacity of the forest owner or manager, hunting, fishing, trapping, collecting and	C	Hunting and collecting of any species on the ranch is not permitted unless expressly associated with and required by

other activities are controlled to avoid the risk of impacts to vulnerable species and communities (See Criterion 1.5).		ongoing research projects.
6.3. 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.	C	
6.3.a.1 The forest owner or manager maintains, enhances, and/or restores under-represented successional stages in the FMU that would naturally occur on the types of sites found on the FMU. Where old growth of different community types that would naturally occur on the forest are under-represented in the landscape relative to natural conditions, a portion of the forest is managed to enhance and/or restore old growth characteristics.	C	The Legacy Tree report is close to completion for the Valencia Creek property. It catalogues all the surveyed legacy trees on the property. Ongoing single tree selection harvests ensure most successional stages are present in every stand, with the exception of old growth remnants.
6.3.a.2 When a rare ecological community is present, modifications are made in both the management plan and its implementation in order to maintain, restore or enhance the viability of the community. Based on the vulnerability of the existing community, conservation zones and/or protected areas are established where warranted.	C	A number of rare ecological communities are described in the SPR Management Plan and have been designated as Special Treatment Areas. This either means they will be managed only to preserve the unique ecological characteristics of the site, or to protect the site in its current state.
6.3.a.3 When they are present, management maintains the area, structure, composition, and processes of all Type 1 and Type 2 old growth . Type 1 and 2 old growth are also protected and buffered as necessary with conservation zones, unless an alternative plan is developed that provides greater overall protection of old growth values. Type 1 Old Growth is protected from harvesting and road construction. Type 1 old growth is also protected from other timber management activities, except as needed to maintain the ecological values associated with the stand, including old growth attributes (e.g., remove exotic	C	Two type 2 old growth stands have been identified on SPR and are managed in keeping with requirements. Both areas are considered reserves and their management, protection and monitoring is described in the HCV report.

<p>species, conduct controlled burning, and thinning from below in dry forest types when and where restoration is appropriate).</p> <p>Type 2 Old Growth is protected from harvesting to the extent necessary to maintain the area, structures, and functions of the stand. Timber harvest in Type 2 old growth must maintain old growth structures, functions, and components including individual trees that function as refugia (see Indicator 6.3.g).</p> <p>On public lands, old growth is protected from harvesting, as well as from other timber management activities, except if needed to maintain the values associated with the stand (e.g., remove exotic species, conduct controlled burning, and thinning from below in forest types when and where restoration is appropriate).</p> <p>On American Indian lands, timber harvest may be permitted in Type 1 and Type 2 old growth in recognition of their sovereignty and unique ownership. Timber harvest is permitted in situations where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Old growth forests comprise a significant portion of the tribal ownership. 2. A history of forest stewardship by the tribe exists. 3. High Conservation Value Forest attributes are maintained. 4. Old-growth structures are maintained. 5. Conservation zones representative of old growth stands are established. 6. Landscape level considerations are addressed. 7. Rare species are protected. 		
<p>6.3.b To the extent feasible within the size of the ownership, particularly on larger ownerships (generally tens of thousands or more acres), management maintains, enhances, or restores habitat conditions suitable for well-distributed populations of animal species that are</p>	C	<p>While SPR is small enough that its management alone does not significantly contribute to habitat conditions, its location in the Santa Cruz Mountains, adjacent to other managed and protected forests, provides continual forest cover for the many species that depend on it.</p>

characteristic of forest ecosystems within the landscape.		
<p>6.3.c Management maintains, enhances and/or restores the plant and wildlife habitat of Riparian Management Zones (RMZs) to provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) habitat for aquatic species that breed in surrounding uplands; b) habitat for predominantly terrestrial species that breed in adjacent aquatic habitats; c) habitat for species that use riparian areas for feeding, cover, and travel; d) habitat for plant species associated with riparian areas; and, e) stream shading and inputs of wood and leaf litter into the adjacent aquatic ecosystem. 	C	<p>Collaborative riparian restoration projects have occurred in lower Scotts Creek with the addition of flood plain access and LWD added to the stream channel. Multiple Coho salmon have been seen in the newly placed structures and multiple “reds” have also been seen in the restoration area.</p> <p>A newly installed stream crossing was added on a class II stream under the Scout Gulch THP. The crossing was visited during the field audit and found to be well installed. New vegetation was planted and is growing well and the project has significantly enhanced the stream section.</p>
<p>Stand-scale Indicators</p> <p>6.3.d Management practices maintain or enhance plant species composition, distribution and frequency of occurrence similar to those that would naturally occur on the site.</p>	C	Species composition is generally what would naturally be found on site, with an eye for Redwood dominated sites.
<p>6.3.e When planting is required, a local source of known provenance is used when available and when the local source is equivalent in terms of quality, price and productivity. The use of non-local sources shall be justified, such as in situations where other management objectives (e.g. disease resistance or adapting to climate change) are best served by non-local sources. Native species suited to the site are normally selected for regeneration.</p>	C	097 stock seed collected from the Santa Cruz Mountains was utilized by Green Diamond out of Blue Lake, California. They grow a plug stock called 015 seedling plug that is a bit larger than the normal 08 plug stock. These seedlings have shown a higher survival rate. SPR has planted numerous seedlings in the wake of the Lockheed fire. 5,000 redwood trees were planted last year at Valencia Creek Tract and another 2500 will be planted in March.
<p>6.3.f Management maintains, enhances, or restores habitat components and associated stand structures, in abundance and distribution that could be expected from naturally occurring processes. These components include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) large live trees, live trees with decay or declining health, snags, and well-distributed coarse down and dead woody material. Legacy trees where present are not harvested; and b) vertical and horizontal complexity. <p>Trees selected for retention are generally representative of the dominant species found on</p>	C	SPR continues to add to their legacy tree report, with the most up to date version sent in April, which includes legacy trees from the Valencia Creek tract.

the site.		
<p>6.3.g.1 In the Southeast, Appalachia, Ozark-Ouachita, Mississippi Alluvial Valley, and Pacific Coast Regions, when <i>even-aged systems</i> are employed, and during salvage harvests, live trees and other native vegetation are retained within the harvest unit as described in Appendix C for the applicable region.</p> <p>In the Lake States Northeast, Rocky Mountain and Southwest Regions, when even-aged silvicultural systems are employed, and during salvage harvests, live trees and other native vegetation are retained within the harvest unit in a proportion and configuration that is consistent with the characteristic natural disturbance regime unless retention at a lower level is necessary for the purposes of restoration or rehabilitation. See Appendix C for additional regional requirements and guidance.</p>	NA	No even-age management is practiced on SPR.
<p>6.3.g.2 Under very limited situations, the landowner or manager has the option to develop a qualified plan to allow minor departure from the opening size limits described in Indicator 6.3.g.1. A qualified plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is developed by qualified experts in ecological and/or related fields (wildlife biology, hydrology, landscape ecology, forestry/silviculture). 2. Is based on the totality of the <i>best available information</i> including peer-reviewed science regarding natural disturbance regimes for the FMU. 3. Is spatially and temporally explicit and includes maps of proposed openings or areas. 4. Demonstrates that the variations will result in equal or greater benefit to wildlife, water quality, and other values compared to the normal opening size limits, including for sensitive and rare species. 5. Is reviewed by independent experts in wildlife 	NA	

biology, hydrology, and landscape ecology, to confirm the preceding findings.		
6.3.h The forest owner or manager assesses the risk of, prioritizes, and, as warranted, develops and implements a strategy to prevent or control <i>invasive species</i> , including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. a method to determine the extent of invasive species and the degree of threat to native species and ecosystems; 2. implementation of management practices that minimize the risk of invasive establishment, growth, and spread; 3. eradication or control of established invasive populations when feasible: and, 4. monitoring of control measures and management practices to assess their effectiveness in preventing or controlling invasive species. 	NC	See CAR 2015.2.
6.3.i In applicable situations, the forest owner or manager identifies and applies site-specific fuels management practices, based on: (1) natural fire regimes, (2) risk of wildfire, (3) potential economic losses, (4) public safety, and (5) applicable laws and regulations.	C	Following the Lockheed fire there is relatively little ongoing fuels management that is completed associated with harvests. Roads are kept open to allow access in case of emergencies, and the anticipated addition of a forestry apprentice should allow more road brushing to be completed.
6.4. Representative samples of existing ecosystems within the landscape shall be protected in their natural state and recorded on maps, appropriate to the scale and intensity of operations and the uniqueness of the affected resources.	C/NC	
FF Indicator 6.4.a For family forests, the forest owner or manager documents the ecosystems that would naturally exist on the FMU, and assesses the adequacy of their representation and protection in the landscape (see Criterion 7.1). The consultation and assessment process may be more informal; however, on all FMUs, outstanding examples of common community types (e.g., common types with Natural Heritage viability rankings of A and B) are identified in the assessment to be protected or managed to maintain their conservation value.	NC	See Major CAR 2015.3

FF Indicator 6.4.b <i>Low risk of negative social or environmental impact. However, on all FMUs where outstanding examples of common community types exist (see Guidance for 6.4.a.), they should be protected or managed to maintain their conservation value.</i>	C	As noted in 2015.3, there is a lack of clarity in terminology employed by SPR for special treatment areas. However, this does not detract from their management or maintenance of conservation and ecological values.
6.4.c Management activities within RSAs are limited to low impact activities compatible with the protected RSA objectives, except under the following circumstances: a) harvesting activities only where they are necessary to restore or create conditions to meet the objectives of the protected RSA, or to mitigate conditions that interfere with achieving the RSA objectives; or b) road-building only where it is documented that it will contribute to minimizing the overall environmental impacts within the FMU and will not jeopardize the purpose for which the RSA was designated.	C	Within the above mentioned array of special treatment areas, management is undertaken only in a manner consistent with the noted value of the site. SPR is fully roaded and new road building is rarely necessary.
6.4.d The RSA assessment (Indicator 6.4.a) shall be periodically reviewed and if necessary updated (at a minimum every 10 years) in order to determine if the need for RSAs has changed; the designation of RSAs (Indicator 6.4.b) is revised accordingly.	C	In response to Major CAR 2015.3, the assessment and designation of RSAs, in compliance with Indicator 6.4.a, will be reviewed this year.
6.4.e Managers of large, contiguous public forests establish and maintain a network of representative protected areas sufficient in size to maintain species dependent on interior core habitats.	NA	FME does not manage public FMUs.
6.5 Written guidelines shall be prepared and implemented to control erosion; minimize forest damage during harvesting, road construction, and all other mechanical disturbances; and to protect water resources.	C	
6.5.a The forest owner or manager has written guidelines outlining conformance with the Indicators of this Criterion.	C	As noted last year, SPR conducts forestry operations as planned under approved THPs or NTMPs. These documents contain guidelines for operations under the California Forest Practice Rules (FPRs) that address the indicators of this criterion.
6.5.b Forest operations meet or exceed Best Management Practices (BMPs) that address	C	California does not have state mandated BMPs; rather, the California Forest Practice Rules function as a set of required

components of the Criterion where the operation takes place.		management practices.
<p>6.5.c Management activities including site preparation, harvest prescriptions, techniques, timing, and equipment are selected and used to protect soil and water resources and to avoid erosion, landslides, and significant soil disturbance. Logging and other activities that significantly increase the risk of landslides are excluded in areas where risk of landslides is high. The following actions are addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slash is concentrated only as much as necessary to achieve the goals of site preparation and the reduction of fuels to moderate or low levels of fire hazard. • Disturbance of topsoil is limited to the minimum necessary to achieve successful regeneration of species native to the site. • Rutting and compaction is minimized. • Soil erosion is not accelerated. • Burning is only done when consistent with natural disturbance regimes. • Natural ground cover disturbance is minimized to the extent necessary to achieve regeneration objectives. • Whole tree harvesting on any site over multiple rotations is only done when research indicates soil productivity will not be harmed. • Low impact equipment and technologies is used where appropriate. 	C	<p>As there were no active harvests at the time of the audit and all THPs had been closed out, there were no current operations activities to review. As such, the findings from the previous audit stand, in that no problems were found with stand disturbance or soil erosion during active operations.</p>
<p>6.5.d The transportation system, including design and placement of permanent and temporary haul roads, skid trails, recreational trails, water crossings and landings, is designed, constructed, maintained, and/or reconstructed to reduce short and long-term environmental impacts, habitat fragmentation, soil and water disturbance and cumulative adverse effects, while allowing for customary uses and use rights. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • access to all roads and trails (temporary and permanent), including recreational trails, and 	C	<p>As stated in last year's report, SPR is fully roaded and no new roads are being built at this time. Road maintenance is conducted regularly and no road issues were noted during the audit, save the ongoing issue with the Fern Flat Road Association. This issue was discussed at length and can be reviewed in last year's audit report. This year, following several meetings, unauthorized use of the road has decreased and further road damage diminished. SPR cooperates regularly with neighbor Big Creek regarding shared access points and roads.</p>

<p>off-road travel, is controlled, as possible, to minimize ecological impacts;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • road density is minimized; • erosion is minimized; • sediment discharge to streams is minimized; • there is free upstream and downstream passage for aquatic organisms; • impacts of transportation systems on wildlife habitat and migration corridors are minimized; • area converted to roads, landings and skid trails is minimized; • habitat fragmentation is minimized; • unneeded roads are closed and rehabilitated. 		
<p>6.5.e.1 In consultation with appropriate expertise, the forest owner or manager implements written <i>Streamside Management Zone (SMZ) buffer</i> management guidelines that are adequate for preventing environmental impact, and include protecting and restoring water quality, hydrologic conditions in rivers and stream corridors, wetlands, vernal pools, seeps and springs, lake and pond shorelines, and other hydrologically sensitive areas. The guidelines include vegetative buffer widths and protection measures that are acceptable within those buffers.</p> <p>In the Appalachia, Ozark-Ouachita, Southeast, Mississippi Alluvial Valley, Southwest, Rocky Mountain, and Pacific Coast regions, there are requirements for minimum SMZ widths and explicit limitations on the activities that can occur within those SMZs. These are outlined as requirements in Appendix E.</p>	C	<p>As noted below, in deciding to manage streamside buffer zones to slightly different buffer widths and canopy requirements, extensive consultation with appropriate experts was conducted. All relevant agencies conducted a thorough review of the proposed buffer management and determined it in keeping with the intent of the FPRs.</p>
<p>6.5.e.2 Minor variations from the stated minimum SMZ widths and layout for specific stream segments, wetlands and other water bodies are permitted in limited circumstances, provided the forest owner or manager demonstrates that the alternative configuration maintains the overall extent of the buffers and provides equivalent or greater environmental protection than FSC-US</p>	C	<p>SPR manages their stream buffers to a slightly different set of requirements than the current Threatened and Impaired Watershed Rules would require. Justification for this minor variation is fully described in the 2014 re-evaluation report.</p>

regional requirements for those stream segments, water quality, and aquatic species, based on site-specific conditions and the best available information. The forest owner or manager develops a written set of supporting information including a description of the riparian habitats and species addressed in the alternative configuration. The CB must verify that the variations meet these requirements, based on the input of an independent expert in aquatic ecology or closely related field.		
6.5.f Stream and wetland crossings are avoided when possible. Unavoidable crossings are located and constructed to minimize impacts on water quality, hydrology, and fragmentation of <i>aquatic habitat</i> . Crossings do not impede the movement of aquatic species. Temporary crossings are restored to original hydrological conditions when operations are finished.	C	Crossings are well designed and executed. The new crossing on Scout Gulch THP was visited during the audit and was well installed. Stream bank vegetation had been planted and watered, such that the site no longer looked disturbed. SPR collaborated well with Big Creek for the entire project.
6.5.g Recreation use on the FMU is managed to avoid negative impacts to soils, water, plants, wildlife and wildlife habitats.	C	Recreation is primarily by students living and working on the ranch and is carefully controlled by the ranch staff. There is some concern that there will be an increase in unregulated recreational access from adjacent properties, if these become open to the public.
6.5.h Grazing by domesticated animals is controlled to protect in-stream habitats and water quality, the species composition and viability of the riparian vegetation, and the banks of the stream channel from erosion.	C	Although SPR has an active cow/calf operation, there is no grazing within forested portions of the ranch, and grazing pasture is carefully controlled.
6.6. 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	C	

training shall be provided to minimize health and environmental risks.		
6.6.a No products on the FSC list of Highly Hazardous Pesticides are used (see FSC-POL-30-001 EN FSC Pesticides policy 2005 and associated documents).	C	No chemicals are currently being applied on SPR. None of the chemicals applied in the past are on the HHP list.
<p>FF Indicator 6.6.b All toxicants used to control pests and competing vegetation, including rodenticides, insecticides, herbicides, and fungicides are used only when and where non-chemical management practices are: a) not available; b) prohibitively expensive, taking into account overall environmental and social costs, risks and benefits; c) the only effective means for controlling invasive and exotic species; or d) result in less environmental damage than non-chemical alternatives (e.g., top soil disturbance, loss of soil litter and down wood debris). If chemicals are used, the forest owner or manager uses the least environmentally damaging formulation and application method practical.</p> <p>Written strategies are developed and implemented that justify the use of chemical pesticides. Family forest owners/managers may use brief and less technical written procedures for applying common over-the-counter products. Any observed misuse of these chemicals may be considered as violation of requirements in this Indicator. Whenever feasible, an eventual phase-out of chemical use is included in the strategy.</p>	C	SPR is not currently using chemicals to control vegetation on the property. Chemical was last used in 2010 to control broom infestation and was used in combination with mowing, fire and hand pulling. SPR used to be part of a Weed Management Area (WMA) group. Membership in the group allowed for information sharing on chemical use strategies and made grant money available to spray French broom. However, as control of invasive species was not prioritized, membership lapsed. As a component of CAR 2015.2 SPR will be working on a written strategy for chemical use and invasives control.
6.6.c Chemicals and application methods are selected to minimize risk to non-target species and sites. When considering the choice between aerial and ground application, the forest owner or manager evaluates the comparative risk to non-target species and sites, the comparative risk of worker exposure, and the overall amount and type of chemicals required.	NA	At this time, no chemicals are being applied. When addressing CAR 2015.2 SPR will need to ensure any methods selected to apply chemicals will minimize risks.
6.6.d Whenever chemicals are used, a written prescription is prepared that describes the site-	NA	In the past, all chemicals have been applied by licensed applicators. At this time, since no chemical is being used,

specific hazards and environmental risks, and the precautions that workers will employ to avoid or minimize those hazards and risks, and includes a map of the treatment area. Chemicals are applied only by workers who have received proper training in application methods and safety. They are made aware of the risks, wear proper safety equipment, and are trained to minimize environmental impacts on non-target species and sites.		there are no current written prescriptions.
6.6.e If chemicals are used, the effects are monitored and the results are used for adaptive management. Records are kept of pest occurrences, control measures, and incidences of worker exposure to chemicals.	NA	Chemicals are not being used. SPR managers are aware of the monitoring requirements should they begin using chemicals again.
6.7. Chemicals, containers, liquid and solid non-organic wastes including fuel and oil shall be disposed of in an environmentally appropriate manner at off-site locations.	C	
6.7.a The forest owner or manager, and employees and contractors, have the equipment and training necessary to respond to hazardous spills	C	All forest workers are required to maintain training in responding to hazardous spills per their contracts with SPR.
6.7.b In the event of a hazardous material spill, the forest owner or manager immediately contains the material and engages qualified personnel to perform the appropriate removal and remediation, as required by applicable law and regulations.	C	No spills have occurred in the past year. The CA FPRs incorporate requirements for remediation of spill sites and CALFIRE checks sites after large spills.
6.7.c. Hazardous materials and fuels are stored in leak-proof containers in designated storage areas, that are outside of riparian management zones and away from other ecological sensitive features, until they are used or transported to an approved off-site location for disposal. There is no evidence of persistent fluid leaks from equipment or of recent groundwater or surface water contamination.	C	There were no active harvests at the time of the field audit, so no equipment could be reviewed for leaks or site contamination. However, SPR does maintain a hazardous materials plan, which includes an inventory of hazardous substances, MSDS, and methods for labeling, handling and disposing of hazardous materials.
6.8. 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.	C	Biological control agents are not used for any purpose on SPR.

6.8.a Use of <i>biological control agents</i> are used only as part of a pest management strategy for the control of invasive plants, <i>pathogens</i> , insects, or other animals when other pest control methods are ineffective, or are expected to be ineffective. Such use is contingent upon peer-reviewed scientific evidence that the agents in question are non-invasive and are safe for native species.	NA	
6.8.b If biological control agents are used, they are applied by trained workers using proper equipment.	NA	
6.8.c If biological control agents are used, their use shall be documented, monitored and strictly controlled in accordance with state and national laws and internationally accepted scientific protocols. A written plan will be developed and implemented justifying such use, describing the risks, specifying the precautions workers will employ to avoid or minimize such risks, and describing how potential impacts will be monitored.	NA	
6.8.d Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) are not used for any purpose	C	No GMOs have been used on SPR.
6.9. The use of exotic species shall be carefully controlled and actively monitored to avoid adverse ecological impacts.	NA	No exotic species are used for any purpose on SPR.
6.9.a The use of <i>exotic species</i> is contingent on the availability of credible scientific data indicating that any such species is non-invasive and its application does not pose a risk to native biodiversity.	NA	
6.9.b If exotic species are used, their provenance and the location of their use are documented, and their ecological effects are actively monitored.	NA	
6.9.c The forest owner or manager shall take timely action to curtail or significantly reduce any adverse impacts resulting from their use of exotic species	NA	
6.10. Forest conversion to plantations or non-forest land uses shall not occur, except in circumstances where conversion: a) Entails a very limited portion of the forest management unit; and b) Does not occur on High	C	

Conservation Value Forest areas; and c) Will enable clear, substantial, additional, secure, long-term conservation benefits across the forest management unit.		
6.10.a Forest <i>conversion</i> to non-forest land uses does not occur, except in circumstances where conversion entails a very limited portion of the forest management unit (note that Indicators 6.10.a, b, and c are related and all need to be conformed with for conversion to be allowed).	C	As noted in the 2014 recertification report, in 2011 CALFIRE approved a “Less Than 3 Acre Conversion Exemption” for SPR for a portion of the Satellite Stands Unit. The reason for the exemption is planned construction of Field Camp Cabins to aid in the educational mission of SPR. The exemption area was removed from the NTMP harvest area.
6.10.b Forest <i>conversion</i> to non-forest land uses does not occur on high conservation value forest areas (note that Indicators 6.10.a, b, and c are related and all need to be conformed with for conversion to be allowed).	C	No HCVF are included in the area removed from the NTMP.
6.10.c Forest <i>conversion</i> to non-forest land uses does not occur, except in circumstances where conversion will enable clear, substantial, additional, secure, long term conservation benefits across the forest management unit (note that Indicators 6.10.a, b, and c are related and all need to be conformed with for conversion to be allowed).	C	The education, field work and research opportunities generated by the conversion have been thoroughly explained in the SPR applications to CALFIRE and in the 2014 SCS report.
6.10.d Natural or semi-natural stands are not converted to plantations. Degraded, semi-natural stands may be converted to restoration plantations.	C	No conversion to plantations has occurred on SPR.
6.10.e Justification for land-use and stand-type conversions is fully described in the long-term management plan, and meets the biodiversity conservation requirements of Criterion 6.3 (see also Criterion 7.1.I)	C	Full justification for the conversion was written up for the amendment to the NTMP.
6.10.f Areas converted to <i>non-forest use</i> for facilities associated with subsurface mineral and gas rights transferred by prior owners, or other conversion outside the control of the certificate holder, are identified on maps. The forest owner or manager consults with the CB to determine if removal of these areas from the scope of the certificate is warranted. To the extent allowed by these transferred rights, the forest owner or manager exercises control over the location of	NA	No areas have been converted to non-forest uses in association with mineral or gas rights.

surface disturbances in a manner that minimizes adverse environmental and social impacts. If the certificate holder at one point held these rights, and then sold them, then subsequent conversion of forest to non-forest use would be subject to Indicator 6.10.a-d.		
Principle #7: 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.		
Principle #8: 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. <i>Applicability Note: On small and medium-sized forests (see Glossary), an informal, qualitative assessment may be appropriate. Formal, quantitative monitoring is required on large forests and/or intensively managed forests.</i>		
Principle #9: 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. High Conservation Value Forests are those that possess one or more of the following attributes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Forest areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant: concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g., endemism, endangered species, refugia); and/or large landscape level forests, contained within, or containing the management unit, where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance b) Forest areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems c) Forest areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g., watershed protection, erosion control) d) Forest areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g., subsistence, health) and/or critical to local communities' traditional cultural identity (areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in cooperation with such local communities). 		
9.1 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.	C	
9.1.a The forest owner or manager identifies and maps the presence of High Conservation Value Forests (HCVF) within the FMU and, to the extent that data are available, adjacent to their FMU, in a manner consistent with the assessment process, definitions, data sources, and other guidance described in Appendix F. Given the relative rarity of old growth forests in the contiguous United States, these areas are normally designated as HCVF, and all old growth must be managed in conformance with Indicator 6.3.a.3 and	C	SPR undertook a full HCVF assessment in 2005 in accordance with the required assessment process. HCVs were identified under categories 1 (Coho Salmon Habitat, Steelhead Trout Habitat, Red-Legged Frog Habitat, Monterey pine forests), 3 (Burl forming manzanita stands, General Smith Stand, Second Growth Reserve, Old redwood, Douglas-fir, and California nutmeg specimens) and 4 (Inner Gorge of Valencia Creek). Maps of HCVF have been included in multiple reports, including the Legacy Tree Report and "High Conservation Values of Swanton Pacific Ranch," which is also available on the ranch website. These documents are likely going to be updated soon as a

requirements for legacy trees in Indicator 6.3.f.		component of CAR 2015.6, so references to HCVF will soon change in documentation.
FF Indicator 9.1.b In developing the assessment, the forest owner or manager consults with databases, qualified experts, and/or best available research and literature.	C	The HCVF assessment was undertaken in response to a CAR, which included the necessary consultation requirements. SPR has a number of faculty and local experts at their disposal for periodic, continual consultation.
9.1.c A summary of the assessment results and management strategies (see Criterion 9.3) is included in the management plan summary that is made available to the public.	NC	See Minor CAR 2015.6
9.2 The consultative portion of the certification process must place emphasis on the identified conservation attributes, and options for the maintenance thereof.	C	
9.2.a The forest owner or manager holds consultations with stakeholders and experts to confirm that proposed HCVF locations and their attributes have been accurately identified, and that appropriate options for the maintenance of their HCV attributes have been adopted.	C	As noted above, given the breadth of faculty and experts involved in operations at SPR, there are frequent opportunities for ongoing consultation in relation to HCVF and any other sensitive or unique areas on the ranch.
9.2.b On public forests, a transparent and accessible public review of proposed HCV attributes and HCVF areas and management is carried out. Information from stakeholder consultations and other public review is integrated into HCVF descriptions, delineations and management.	NA	FME does not manage public FMUs.
9.3 The management plan shall include and implement specific measures that ensure the maintenance and/or enhancement of the applicable conservation attributes consistent with the precautionary approach. These measures shall be specifically included in the publicly available management plan summary.	C	
9.3.a The management plan and relevant operational plans describe the measures necessary to ensure the maintenance and/or enhancement of all high conservation values present in all identified HCVF areas, including the precautions required to avoid risks or impacts to such values (see Principle 7). These measures are implemented.	C	The report “High Conservation Values on Swanton Pacific Ranch” includes a table detailing the specific prescriptions for each designated HCV. This report may be updated in response to this year’s findings.
9.3.b All management activities in HCVFs must	C	SPR remains committed to ensuring designated HCVs are

maintain or enhance the high conservation values and the extent of the HCVF.		maintained.
9.3.c If HCVF attributes cross ownership boundaries and where maintenance of the HCV attributes would be improved by coordinated management, then the forest owner or manager attempts to coordinate conservation efforts with adjacent landowners.	C	<p>The situation regarding the boundaries of designated HCVF areas has not changed since last year's audit:</p> <p>Maps of HCV areas designated due to species of special concern do not indicate that the designated areas cross ownership boundaries. The General Smith Stand which is designated HCVF due to the presence of old growth, abuts the property boundary, necessitating management of the HCV by the adjacent property owner. In this case, that owner is Big Creek, who is also committed to maintaining the stand in its current condition.</p>
9.4 Annual monitoring shall be conducted to assess the effectiveness of the measures employed to maintain or enhance the applicable conservation attributes.	C	
9.4.a The forest owner or manager monitors, or participates in a program to annually monitor, the status of the specific HCV attributes, including the effectiveness of the measures employed for their maintenance or enhancement. The monitoring program is designed and implemented consistent with the requirements of Principle 8. FF Indicator: Low risk of negative social or environmental impact for private family forests. Public lands must follow the requirements in Indicator 9.4.a.	C	<p>HCV resources are periodically visited, most more than annually, to determine if there have been any changes to the status of the specific HCVF. SPR is in the process of completing a 15 year measurement interval on Continuous Forest Inventory on the Scotts Creek Stand. A portion of this analysis will occur along the HCVF heritage tree stand along Scotts Creek and other portions of second growth forest in close proximity.</p>
9.4.b When monitoring results indicate increasing risk to a specific HCV attribute, the forest owner/manager re-evaluates the measures taken to maintain or enhance that attribute, and adjusts the management measures in an effort to reverse the trend.	C	Monitoring has not resulted in any notable increase in risk.

Appendix 6 – Chain of Custody Indicators for FMEs

☒ Chain of Custody indicators were not evaluated during this annual audit.