

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

Collins Pine Company

Collins Almanor Forest
Tehama & Plumas counties, CA

SCS-FM/COC-00006N

P.O. Box 796
Chester, CA, 96020
Jay Francis

jfrancis@collinsco.com
<http://www.collinswood.com>

CERTIFIED	EXPIRATION
1 August 2013	31 July 2018

DATE OF FIELD AUDIT
14-16 May 2013
DATE OF LAST UPDATE
17 March 2014

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

SCS global
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

SCS Global Services (SCS) is a certification body accredited by the Forest Stewardship Council to conduct forest management and chain of custody evaluations. Under the FSC / SCS certification system, forest management enterprises (FMEs) meeting international standards of forest stewardship can be certified as “well managed,” thereby permitting the FME’s use of the FSC endorsement and logo in the marketplace subject to regular FSC / SCS oversight.

SCS deploys interdisciplinary teams of natural resource specialists and other experts in forested regions all over the world to conduct evaluations of forest management. SCS evaluation teams collect and analyze written materials, conduct interviews with FME staff and key stakeholders, and complete field and office audits of subject forest management units (FMUs) as part of certification evaluations. Upon completion of the fact-finding phase of all evaluations, SCS teams determine conformance to the FSC Principles and Criteria.

Organization of the Report

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

Table of Contents

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY	4
1. GENERAL INFORMATION	4
1.1 Certificate Registration Information	4
1.2 FSC Data Request	5
1.3 Areas Outside of the Scope of Certification (Partial Certification and Excision)	7
1.4 Social Information	8
1.5 Pesticide and Other Chemical Use	8
1.6 Standards Used	9
1.7 Conversion Table English Units to Metric Units.....	9
2. DESCRIPTION OF FOREST MANAGEMENT	10
2.1 Management Context	10
2.2 Forest Management Plan.....	12
2.3 Monitoring System.....	15
3. CERTIFICATION EVALUATION PROCESS	15
3.1 Evaluation Schedule and Team	15
3.2 Evaluation of Management System	17
3.3 Stakeholder Consultation Process	17
4. RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION	19
4.1 Notable Strengths and Weaknesses of the FME Relative to the FSC P&C.....	19
4.2 Process of Determining Conformance	20
5. CERTIFICATION DECISION	34
SECTION B – APPENDICES (CONFIDENTIAL).....	35
Appendix 1 – Current and Projected Annual Harvest for Main Commercial Species	35
Appendix 2 – List of FMUs Selected for Evaluation	35
Appendix 3 – List of Stakeholders Consulted.....	35
Appendix 4 – Additional Evaluation Techniques Employed	36
Appendix 5 – Certification Standard Conformance Table	46
Appendix 6 – Tracking, Tracing and Identification of Certified Products	86
Appendix 7 – Peer Review and SCS Evaluation Team Response to Peer Review	90
Appendix 8 – SLIMF Eligibility Criteria	90

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY

1. General Information

1.1 Certificate Registration Information

1.1.1.a Name and Contact Information

Organization name	Collins Pine Company – Collins Almanor Forest		
Contact person	Jay Francis, Forest Manager		
Address	PO Box 796	Telephone	530-258-4401
	Chester, CA 96020	Fax	530-258-4266
	USA	e-mail	jfrancis@collinsco.com
		Website	http://www.collinswood.com

1.1.1.b FSC Sales Information

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

1.1.2 Scope of Certificate

Certificate Type	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Single FMU	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple FMU
	<input type="checkbox"/> Group	
SLIMF (if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/> Small SLIMF certificate	<input type="checkbox"/> Low intensity SLIMF certificate
	<input type="checkbox"/> Group SLIMF certificate	
	n/a	
# Group Members (if applicable)	1	
Number of FMUs in scope of certificate	1	
Geographic location of non-SLIMF FMU(s)	Latitude & Longitude: E/W 40 degrees 18 minutes; N/S 121 degrees 49 minutes	
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	94,000	
state managed	0	
community managed	0	

Number of FMUs in scope that are:			
less than 100 ha in area	0	100 - 1000 ha in area	0
1000 - 10 000 ha in area	0	more than 10 000 ha in area	1
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is included in FMUs that:			Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac
are less than 100 ha in area	0		
are between 100 ha and 1000 ha in area	0		
meet the eligibility criteria as <i>low intensity</i> SLIMF FMUs	0		
Division of FMUs into manageable units:			

1.2 FSC Data Request

1.2.1 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)	94,000
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	0
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by natural regeneration, or by a combination of natural regeneration and coppicing of the naturally regenerated stems	94,000
Silvicultural system(s)	Area under type of management
Even-aged management	
Clearcut (clearcut size range #####)	
Shelterwood	
Other:	
Uneven-aged management	94,000
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)	
Non-timber Forest Products (NTFPs)	
Area of forest protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for the production of NTFPs or services	
Other areas managed for NTFPs or services	
Approximate annual commercial production of non-timber forest products included in the scope of the certificate, by product type	
Explanation of the assumptions and reference to the data source upon which AAH and NTFP harvest rates estimates are based:	

Estimates of Maximum sustained yield are provided through the CAF sustained yield plan. This document provides extensive analysis of the timber resource broken down by ownership units and cutting block and further distinguishes between morphology, eco-type, watershed and other factors. The projected yield is estimated for a hundred year period based on selection, continuous cover prescriptions augmented by group cutting to encourage pine regeneration.

The Sustained Yield Plan has provided a more formalized and comprehensive framework for guiding management activities on the CAF; the SYP provides corroboration of the sustainability and ecological appropriateness of the annual allowable harvest. The allowable harvest is slightly below current growth and well below projected growth, due to alternatives and trade-offs selected in the final model, including areas where harvest will be reduced or not occur to protect HCVF attributes and other resource values. The SYP is a major step forward in understanding and integrating resource management, when compared to the “THP to THP” basis of management.

Species in scope of joint FM/COC certificate: (Scientific / Latin Name and Common / Trade Name)

- Pinus ponderosa* ponderosa pine
- Pinus lambertiana* sugar pine
- Pinus contorta* lodgepole pine
- Pinus jeffreyi* Jeffrey pine
- Pinus monticola* western white pine
- Abies concolor* white fir
- Abies magnifica* red fir
- Pseudotsuga menziesii* Douglas-fir
- Calocedrus decurrens* incense-cedar

1.2.2 FSC Product Classification

Timber products		
Product Level 1	Product Level 2	Species
W1	W1.1 Roundwood (logs	All
W1	W1.2 Fuel Wood	All
W3	W3.1 Wood chips	All
Non-Timber Forest Products		
Product Level 1	Product Level 2	Product Level 3 and Species
n/a		

1.2.3 Conservation Areas

Total area of forest and non-forest land protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for conservation objectives	4,751 ac (Includes 1,524 ac of RSA)		
High Conservation Value Forest / Areas			
High Conservation Values present and respective areas: Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac			
Code	HCV Type	Description & Location	Area
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> HCV1	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant	- Montane Hardwood Conifer located in S1/2 Sec 31 T27N R3E	117 Acres

		concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g. endemism, endangered species, refugia).		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV2	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant large landscape level forests, contained within, or containing the management unit, where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance.	- Sierran Mixed Conifer, 4 stands distributed across the CAF	872 Acres
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV3	Forests or areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems.	- Aspen, located within the Hart and Sunflower THPs and the margin of Rock Lake - Late Successional/Old Growth, see map	- 9 acres Type 1 – 234 acres Type 2 – 458 acres
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV4	Forests or areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g. watershed protection, erosion control).	- Montane Riparian, distributed throughout the CAF	1,537 acres
<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'				3,227

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

<input type="checkbox"/> <i>N/A – All forestland owned or managed by the applicant is included in the scope.</i>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Applicant owns and/or manages other FMUs not under evaluation.</i>		
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Applicant wishes to excise portions of the FMU(s) under evaluation from the scope of certification.</i>		
Explanation for exclusion of FMUs and/or excision:	Collins Timber Group owns other FMU's throughout the U.S., all of which have been FSC certified for over 15 years	
Control measures to prevent mixing of certified and non-certified product (C8.3):	Same as above	
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac)
Collins Kane	Kane, Pennsylvania, USA	117,800
Collins Lakeview	Oregon & California, USA	97,426

1.4 Social Information

Number of forest workers (including contractors) working in forest within scope of certificate (differentiated by gender):	
128 male workers	8 female workers

1.5 Pesticide and Other Chemical Use

<input type="checkbox"/> FME does not use pesticides.				
Commercial name of pesticide / herbicide	Active ingredient	Quantity applied annually (kg or lbs)	Size of area treated annually (ha or ac)	Reason for use
Chopper, Gly Star & Accord XRT	Glyphosate & Imazapyr	84.5 gallons (Glyphosate) & 124 ounces (Imazapyr)	145 acres	A Imazapyr and Glyphosate combination was used as a preharvest spray on several designated "group selection" areas. A Glyphosate alone spray was used as a release treatment on larger fire rehabilitation sites.
Element & 2,4-D LV6	Triclopyr and 2,4-D	1.5% Triclopyr and 1.5% 2,4-D @ 18 gallons/acre	12 acres	As a release spray on established seedlings / fire rehabilitation
Gly Star	Glyphosate	3-4% @ 11-31 gallons/acre	459 acres	Initial vegetation control on newly planted fire rehabilitation area.
Chopper & Razor	Imazapyr & Glyphosate	3% Imazapyr and 5-10% Glyphosate @ 8 gallons/acre	6.5 acres	Preharvest spray on established group selections
Velpar, Chopper, Razor, Element and 2,4-D LV6	Imazapyr, Glyphosate, Hexazinone, Triclopyr and 2,4-D	3% Imazapyr and 5% Glyphosate @ 8 gallons/acre. 3% Hexazinone at 3 lbs./acre. 1.5% Triclopyr and 1.5% 2,4-	258 acres	Imazapyr and Glyphosate were used as a preharvest spray for group selections and rehabilitation site (29 acres). The Hexazinone for site

		D @ avg. 24 gallons/acre		prep on a rehabilitation site (200 acres). The Triclopyr and 2,4-D as a release spray on 2 different reforestation sites
Chopper & Razor	Glyphosate & Imazapyr	2% Glyphosate and 2% Imazapyr @ 11 gallons/acre	218 acres	Brush treatment on the rehabilitation of understocked area project.

1.6 Standards Used

1.6.1 Applicable FSC-Accredited Standards

Title	Version	Date of Finalization
FSC US Forest Management Standard	1.0	July 8, 2012
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).		

1.7 Conversion Table English Units to Metric Units

Length Conversion Factors		
To convert from	To	multiply by
Mile (US Statute)	Kilometer (km)	1.609347
Foot (ft)	Meter (m)	0.3048
Yard (yd)	Meter (m)	0.9144
Area Conversion Factors		
To convert from	To	multiply by
Square foot (sq ft)	Square meter (m ²)	0.09290304
Acre (ac)	Hectare (ha)	0.4047
Volume Conversion Factors		
To convert from	To	multiply by
Cubic foot (cu ft)	Cubic meter (m ³)	0.02831685
Gallon (gal)	Liter (l)	4.546
Quick reference		
1 acre	= 0.404686 ha	
1,000 acres	= 404.686 ha	
1 board foot	= 0.00348 cubic meters	
1,000 board feet	= 3.48 cubic meters	
1 cubic foot	= 0.028317 cubic meters	

2. Description of Forest Management

2.1 Management Context

2.1.1 Regulatory Context

Pertinent Regulations at the National Level	Endangered Species Act Clean Water Act (Section 404 wetland protection) Occupational Safety and Health Act National Historic Preservation Act Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act Americans with Disabilities Act U.S. ratified treaties, including CITES Lacey Act Forest Resources Conservation and Shortage Relief Act National Resource Protection Act National Environmental Protection Act National Wild and Scenic River Act Native American Grave Protection and Repatriation Act Rehabilitation Act Architectural Barriers Act
Pertinent Regulations at the State / Local Level	Z'Berg-Nejedly State Forest Practices Act of 1973 California Endangered Species Act California Environmental Quality Act California Civil Code Section 1008 Native Plant Protection Act Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act The California Forest Practice Regulations (FPR) Williamson Act Timberland Productivity Act

Regulatory Context Description

The lead agency for forest management in California is the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (Cal Fire). This agency oversees all commercial timber operations in the State of California and is responsible for document review for compliance with the requirements of all of the state level regulations. Documents associated with timber harvest (SYP and THP) are considered CEQA equivalent documents. The California Department of Fish and Game is lead for all endangered species concerns, including federally listed species (plants and animals), where authority has been delegated by the US Fish and Wildlife Service. The Central Valley Water Quality Control Board has responsibility for the protection of water quality related to silvicultural activities, beyond that provided by Cal Fire.

2.1.2 Environmental Context

Environmental safeguards:
The most important environmental safeguard employed on Collins Almanor Forest is the single tree

selection silvicultural system. By actively promoting large, older trees for harvest, the managed forest provides for high quality late seral habitat throughout the forest management unit.

In addition, CAF employs more traditional safeguards such as buffer zones around wetland and riparian areas. Unique or rare habitats have been identified and demarcated for protection as part of CAF's high conservation value forest and representative sample area systems. Examples of these types of habitats are aspen stands, meadow systems, and old growth forest areas. CAF also engages in restation

Management strategy for the identification and protection of rare, threatened and endangered (RTE) species and their habitats:

As part of timber harvest plan process, an initial database search of the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) is conducted to locate known presence of RTE species. Field surveys are conducted by a staff biologist to locate populations of species, and protection measures are put in place depending on the needs of the particular species. Special status species with known occurrences on CAF include sandhill crane, willow flycatcher, and pacific fisher.

2.1.3 Socioeconomic Context

In the wider context of the area the forest forms part of a matrix of forest ownerships, both public and private, that provides aesthetic, economic and ecological benefit to the community. Collins Pine Company is an important component of the regional economy of northern Plumas and eastern Tehama counties. The Chester mill is the largest employer in the Chester area. The Collins family and its employee representatives, prominently including the forestry staff, have enjoyed a long and positive relationship with the community in and around Chester. The Collins Pine Company provides jobs for around 200 people in the Chester, CA area through its forestry activity and associated mill. Further indirect input into the community is provided through local taxes and tourism and recreation in the general area and within the forest itself. Collins Almanor Forest therefore plays a significant role in this rural area of northeastern California.

The forest holding extends west and south of Lake Almanor, in Tehama and Plumas counties. These counties may be characterized as resource dependent, with high levels of direct and indirect employment related to the timber industry. In response to shifting federal timber policies, forest management practices, and market fluctuations, the regional economy has experienced periods of boom and bust. The mill at Chester was upgraded in 2003 and continues to be a significant employer in the region.

Public access to the forest is maintained except in ecologically sensitive areas. Hunting and fishing, primarily by the local community is an important aspect of community access.

2.1.4 Land use, Ownership, and Land Tenure

The Collins Almanor Forest is comprised of 94,000 acres located within Plumas and Tehama Counties, in northeastern California. The forest is primarily northern Sierra type with areas of southern Cascadian types. Prominent species are ponderosa pine, sugar pine, and true fir species, with lesser proportions of Douglas-fir, Jeffrey pine, incense-cedar, lodgepole pine and mixed hardwoods. Ownership of the Collins

Almanor Forest (including limited areas where only timber rights are owned) is variably distributed among three ownership groups:

- Collins Family Members (family descendants of E.S. Collins)
- General Board of Global Ministries, United Methodist Church (New York, NY)
- Collins Pine Company (Portland, Oregon)

It is managed under a long-term management agreement between the owners and Collins Pine Company, which also owns and operates a sawmill in Chester, Ca. The relationship between the owners and the land managers is subject to oversight by three designated fiduciary agents.

The historical record of the Collins Family involvement in California forestry began in 1902 with the initial purchase of timberland in Plumas and Tehama Counties in Northeast California by the partnership of Curtis, Collins and Holbrook (CC&H). By 1912, CC&H had acquired over 62,000 acres of the current CAF. A major purchase of heavily cutover land, now known as the Wolf Creek Block, was completed in the 1940's. Occasional purchases of mostly cutover timberland have been added to this base to create the current 94,000-acre CAF. Active management of CAF commenced in 1941 with the development of the mill site in Chester. Since that time, there have been 4 basic harvest cycles or "pass-throughs" of the forest, with each cycle largely driven by stand enhancement objectives.

After the initial award of certification in 1993, Collins Pine Company engaged in a major planning effort for the CAF, resulting in the approval of a Sustained Yield Plan (SYP) in 2004 which integrates timber management planning with watershed and wildlife objectives and constraints. The SYP is a 10-year document and will have to be revised and re-approved in 2014.

2.2 Forest Management Plan

Management Objectives:
<p>The CAF operates under an approved Sustained Yield Plan (SYP). This SYP describes the proposed, future management of approximately 94,000 acres of privately owned forestland located in Plumas and Tehama Counties. Copies of the SYP are on file for review at the Shasta County Library in Redding, the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection's Shasta-Trinity Unit Headquarters in Redding, CDF Lassen-Modoc Unit Headquarters in Susanville, CDF Cascade Area Headquarters in Redding, and at CDF State Headquarters in Sacramento.</p> <p>Sustained yield plans are one of the mechanisms that timberland owners can use to meet the State of California's requirement for maintaining maximum sustained production. SYPs must include projections of timber growth and harvesting over a 100 year planning horizon, assessment of watershed and wildlife resources, and constraints of other resource values on timber production. Issues and mitigation measures that are adequately covered in an approved SYP may be cited by reference in individual Timber Harvesting Plans. This document and requires public review and approval by the Board of forestry. Following approval, SYPs are in force for a period of 10 years.</p> <p>The forest management objectives as stated in the SYP approved in 2004 are as follows:</p>

- Growth, yield and the standing inventory shall be managed so as to produce a sustained flow of sawlogs averaging 33MMBF, annually.
- Silvicultural systems shall be employed that address the owners desire to retain functional and visually attractive forests after harvest. Single tree selection has traditionally dominated CAF management. When implemented over broad stand conditions, however, single tree selection presents regeneration challenges that this SYP must address.
- Adaptations to past management that provide opportunities for pine regeneration will be vigorously explored. They include: continued use of biomass thinning in stagnated understories, an increased toolbox of marking prescriptions to address more varied stand conditions, and the modified use of true fir selection (removal of all non-pine trees in areas up to 2.0 acres), where appropriate.
- The primary wildlife objective is to maintain the vegetative components naturally found in CAF forest types and provide the key habitat elements needed to support all native wildlife.
- Another plan objective is to manage watercourses and adjoining buffer zones so as to maintain the quality and quantity of beneficial uses of waters flowing through CAF.

Forest Composition and Rationale for Species Selection:

By a considerable margin, the most dominant timber type on the CAF is Sierra Mixed Conifer, which occupies 87% of the forested acres within the ownership, largely in the elevation band of 4,200 to 5,500 feet. This type is an association of five main tree species: ponderosa pine, sugar pine, Douglas-fir, white Fir, and incense-cedar. Within this type, stand proportions by species varies across the forest, but ponderosa pine, white fir, and sugar pine are the most prevalent. This association of species can be found intermingled as single trees or as small groups. At lower elevations, Sierra Mixed Conifer gives way to the Ponderosa Pine type. At elevations above the Sierra Mixed Conifer type is found the White Fir type, which largely is limited to areas in the Northwestern portion of the CAF. In isolated areas characterized by poor fall/winter air drainage and high water table, pure stands of lodgepole pine are found. Hardwoods such as alder, dogwood, bigleaf maple, cottonwood and aspen can be found on moist sites within the CAF. Black Oak, the only upland hardwood species on CAF, is limited to the lowest elevations at the very western part of the property and in the lower elevations of the Wolf Creek block.

General Description of Land Management System(s):

The entirety of the CAF is managed under all-aged silviculture, primarily single tree selection. However, due to the difficulties of assuring adequate regeneration of shade-intolerant species, primarily pines, when employing single tree selection silviculture in mixed-conifer forests, Collins foresters have been modifying their silvicultural prescriptions in recent years to better facilitate pine regeneration. Much more aggressive use of group selection as a means of harvesting and providing better opportunities for shade intolerant pine regeneration has been taking place since the last recertification audit in 2003. Planting efforts associated with this increase in group selection have also increased on the CAF.

Harvest Methods and Equipment used:

Harvest methods are include ground based systems, such as handfalling combined with rubber tire or

track skidding. On steeper slopes, cable based skyline systems are used.

Explanation of the management structures:

The managing entity of the Collins Almanor Forest is:

Collins Pine Company

P.O. Box 796

Chester, CA 96020

Current ownership of the Collins Almanor Forest (including limited areas where only timber rights are owned) is variably distributed between three ownership groups:

Collins Family Members

General Board of Global Ministries, United Methodist Church (New York, New York)

Collins Pine Company (Portland, Oregon)

The 94,000 acres comprising CAF is composed of 9 different variations in proportion of ownership between the above three groups, with the largest block (over 77,000 acres) being the lands of the former Curtis, Collins and Holbrook Company (CC&H). Undivided ownership of the former CC&H lands is roughly apportioned as: 55% to the United Methodist Church, General Board of Global Ministries, and 45% to individual members of the Collins family (descendants of E.S. Collins, the principal owner of CC&H).

The second largest component of CAF is the approximately 6,000 acres held by the Collins California Trust (CCT), whose beneficiaries are members of the Collins family. The Collins Timber Properties (CTP) component of the CAF amounts to approximately 3,200 acres with undivided interest held by Collins family members as well as Collins Pine Company. Minor holdings include Rock Creek Investors (a Collins family & Collins Pine holding), parcels with exclusive title held by the United Methodist Church and lands held exclusively by Collins Pine Company, which includes the mill site. Finally, the CAF includes approximately 1,300 acres of land for which Collins Pine Company, or the CC&H partnership, owns only the timber rights.

The CAF is divided into four geographically contiguous Management Units (MU): Chester MU, Onion MU, Rhyolite MU, and Wolf Creek MU. Within the four Management Units, specific cutting units have been delineated which generally are sized to be equal to a timber harvest plan (THP) operational area.

Forestry services are provided by the professional forester (RPF) and forestry technician staff of the CAF. Contractors are hired by Collins Pine Company for most silvicultural operations. The contractors are selected based on cost, place of origin and past performance, with past performance weighed heavily in the selection process. All timber operators are Licensed Timber Operators (LTOs) in the State of California.

Training opportunities for all forestry staff are provided upon request of the individual staff member. The CAF provides travel expenses, registrations costs and pay while at approved training for staff members.

2.3 Monitoring System

Growth and Yield of all forest products harvested:
CAF maintains its own continuous forest inventory system on the forest, with fixed CFI plots. Traditional inventory metrics such as species and volume are recorded.
Forest dynamics and changes in composition of flora and fauna:
General forest composition is captured through use of the California Wildlife Habitat Relationship System. Cruise data is fed into the system to identify habitat types across the forest, and is updated when new monitoring data becomes available. Surveys for RTE species always occur as part of timber harvest planning. Additional surveys are conducted on a case by case basis depending on staff availability.
Environmental Impacts:
Harvesting operations are routinely inspected for possible impacts as part of timber sale administration. Environmental impacts from the road system is captured through a road monitoring program that identifies erosion hazards.
Social Impacts:
CAF monitors social impacts of their operations by tracking stakeholder comments. Note that this area of monitoring was identified as an area of non-conformance during this evaluation.
Costs, Productivity, and Efficiency:
CAF's internal accounting procedures track costs and revenues as part of normal business operations.

3. Certification Evaluation Process

3.1 Evaluation Schedule and Team

3.1.1 Evaluation Itinerary and Activities

Date: Tuesday May 14th	
FMU / Location / sites visited	Activities / notes
Collins Almanor Forest Offices (AM)	Opening Meeting: Introductions, client update, review audit scope, audit plan, intro/update to FSC and SCS standards and protocols, review of open CARs/OBS, final site selection
Field Tour (PM)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dirt bike open recreation area, area adjacent to active nest site, discussed recreation management Bridge replacement on Warner Valley Road, Sunflower THP – marked but uncut, discussed group selection harvesting Wolf Creek THP – selection thinning harvest, removal of primarily white fir Chips Fire Salvage area – discussed salvage operations, fire management, retention guidelines, replanting strategies
Date: Wednesday May 15th	
FMU / Location / sites visited	Activities / notes
Field Tour (AM)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aspen stand – discussed HCVF measures, tree retention policies, restoration and management approaches Mud Lake – seasonal meadow candidate RSA area, discussed RSA protection strategies, cross boundary management issues,

	recreation protection measures <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chips Fire Salvage – contractor interviews, active salvage operations.
Collins Almanor Forest Offices (PM)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews with field staff, document review
Date: Thursday May 16th	
FMU / Location / sites visited	Activities / notes
Collins Almanor Forest Offices	8:00 – 11:00 Document review, closing meeting preparation, consolidation of findings
Collins Almanor Forest Offices	11:00 – 12:00 Closing Meeting and Review of Findings
Sandhouse THP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuous Forest Inventory plot in selection harvest area, discussed monitoring procedures • Meadow restoration site, lodgepole pine removal, sandhill crane management • Group selection harvest, discussed pesticide use and • Aspen stand discussed conifer removal and protection measures

3.1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation

A. Number of days spent on-site assessing the applicant:	3
B. Number of auditors participating in on-site evaluation:	2
C. Additional days spent on preparation, stakeholder consultation, and post-site follow-up:	5
D. Total number of person days used in evaluation:	11

3.1.3 Evaluation Team

Auditor Name:	Mr. Brendan Grady	Auditor role:	Lead auditor
Qualifications:	Mr. Grady is the Director, Forest Management Certification for SCS. In that role, he provides daily management and quality control for the program. He participated as a team member and lead auditor in forest certification audits throughout the United States, Europe, and South East Asia. Brendan has a B.S. in Forestry from the University of California, Berkeley, and a Juris Doctorate from the University of Washington School of Law. Brendan is a member of the State Bar of California, and was an attorney in private practice focusing on environmental law before taking his current role at SCS.		
Auditor Name:	Dr. Robert J. Hrubes	Auditor role:	Auditor
Qualifications:	Dr. Hrubes is a California registered professional forester (#2228) and forest economist with over 30 years of professional experience in both private and public forest management issues. He is presently Executive Vice-President of SCS Global Services. In addition to serving as team leader for the Michigan state forestlands evaluation, Dr. Hrubes worked in collaboration with other SCS personnel to develop the programmatic protocol that guides all SCS Forest Conservation Program evaluations. Dr. Hrubes has previously led numerous audits under the SCS Forest Conservation Program of North American public forest, industrial forest ownerships and non-industrial forests, as well as operations in Scandinavia, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Australia and New Zealand. Dr. Hrubes holds graduate degrees in forest economics		

	<p>(Ph.D.), economics (M.A.) and resource systems management (M.S.) from the University of California-Berkeley and the University of Michigan. His professional forestry degree (B.S.F. with double major in Outdoor Recreation) was awarded from Iowa State University. He was employed for 14 years, in a variety of positions ranging from research forester to operations research analyst to planning team leader, by the USDA Forest Service. Upon leaving federal service, he entered private consulting from 1988 to 2000. He has been Senior V.P. at SCS since February, 2000.</p>
--	---

3.2 Evaluation of Management System

3.2.1 Methodology and Strategies Employed

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.

3.2.2 Pre-evaluation

A pre-evaluation of the FME *was not* required by FSC norms.

A pre-evaluation of the FME was conducted as required by and in accordance with FSC norms.

3.3 Stakeholder Consultation Process

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 the pre-evaluation (if one was conducted), 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:

3.3.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted During Evaluation for Certification

FME Management and staff	Pertinent Tribal members and/or representatives
Consulting foresters	Members of the FSC National Initiative
Contractors	Members of the regional FSC working group
Lease holders	FSC International
Adjacent property owners	Local and regionally-based environmental organizations and conservationists
Local and regionally-based social interest and civic organizations	Forest industry groups and organizations
Purchasers of logs harvested on FME forestlands	Local, state, and federal regulatory agency personnel
Recreational user groups	Other relevant groups

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. A public notice was sent to stakeholders at least 6 weeks prior to the audit notifying them of the audit and soliciting comments. 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.

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

Stakeholder Comments	SCS Response
Economic Comments	
Collins has maintained commitment to local hiring and boosting the local economy. They have made continued investments in their mill, which is notable for a company in a rural economy.	Noted as evidence of conformance.
Social Comments	
Collins prides itself on being a good neighbor in the community.	Noted as evidence of conformance.
There are many examples of how they engage with the community, including donating land for a community center, funding a scholarship at the local high school.	Noted as evidence of conformance.
Collins is engaged in numerous local civic organizations.	Noted as evidence of conformance.
Environmental Comments	

CAF's practices of selection harvesting, responsible forest management and eco-friendly timber harvesting methodology continue to be at the forefront of FSC forest management practices in California.	Noted as evidence of conformance.
CAF's forest management practices are in sharp contrast to neighboring industrial landowners.	Noted as evidence of conformance.
If everyone did forestry like Collins did we would be having a different conversation about forestry in the U.S.	Noted as evidence of conformance.
It is clear that Collins takes stewardship of their land seriously.	Noted as evidence of conformance.

4. Results of The Evaluation

Table 4.1 below, contains the evaluation team's findings as to the strengths and weaknesses of the subject forest management operation relative to the FSC Principles of forest stewardship. Weaknesses are noted as Corrective Action Requests (CARs) related to each principle.

4.1 Notable Strengths and Weaknesses of the FME Relative to the FSC P&C.

Principle / Subject Area	Strengths Relative to the Standard	Weaknesses Relative to the Standard
P1: FSC Commitment and Legal Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Positive relationship with regulators Long history of commitment to FSC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No observed weaknesses
P2: Tenure & Use Rights & Responsibilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear land title is held No reported tenure conflicts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tracking of use rights could be improved, see OBS 2013.1
P3: Indigenous Peoples' Rights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CAF engages in outreach to local tribes as part of THP process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No observed weaknesses
P4: Community Relations & Workers' Rights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CAF is a strong positive presence in the local community Exemplary support of local education on forestry and forest management Health and safety program required for all staff and contractors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collins should confirm that its compensation package continues to meet local norms, see OBS 2013.2 Sociological impacts document should be periodically updated, see OBS 2013.3
P5: Benefits from the Forest	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collins is a key contributor to the local economy Field reviews showed minimal waste of forest products 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collins has an opportunity to diversify products and services it manages on its FMUs, see OBS 2013.4

P6: Environmental Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thorough assessment of possible impacts has been conducted as part of CAF’s management planning. • CAF engages in restoration efforts for unique plant communities, such as wet meadow systems and aspen stands 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tracking of data related to changes in road density could be improved, see OBS 2013.5 • Site-specific prescriptions and maps are not being produced prior to pesticide use, see CAR 2013.6 • Monitoring of pesticide use must be improved, see CAR 2013.7
P7: Management Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CAF has a variety of management documents, with their Sustained Yield Plan providing a thorough management plan • Comprehensive and high quality public summary of management plan is available on Collins website 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training records should be kept more comprehensively, see OBS 2013.8
P8: Monitoring & Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CAF has their own continuous forest inventory system for growth and yield data • Strong road system monitoring program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managers were not able to demonstrate that the socio-economic effects of their management activities on the CAF are being monitored, see CAR 2013.9
P9: High Conservation Value Forests	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CAF has conducted an HCVF analysis and designated HCVF areas throughout the forest 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No observed weaknesses
P10: Plantations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not applicable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not applicable
Chain of custody	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk of mixing of certified and non-certified material is low 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A non-conforming logo use was found on the Collins website, see CAR 2013.10 • Records for CoC training are not being kept, see CAR 2013.11

4.2 Process of Determining Conformance

4.2.1 Structure of Standard and Degrees of Non-Conformance

FSC-accredited forest stewardship standards consist of a three-level hierarchy: principle, the criteria that correspond to that principle, and the performance indicators that elaborate each criterion. Consistent with SCS Forest Conservation Program evaluation protocols, the team collectively determines whether or not the subject forest management operation is in conformance with every applicable indicator of the relevant forest stewardship standard. Each nonconformance must be evaluated to determine whether it constitutes a major or minor nonconformance at the level of the associated criterion or sub-criterion. Not all indicators are equally important, and there is no simple numerical formula to determine whether an operation is in nonconformance. The team therefore must use their collective judgment to assess

each criterion and determine if the FME is in conformance. If the FME is determined to be in nonconformance at the criterion level, then at least one of the applicable indicators must be in major nonconformance.

Corrective action requests (CARs) are issued for every instance of a non-conformance. Major nonconformances trigger Major CARs and minor nonconformances trigger Minor CARs.

4.2.1 Interpretations of Major CARs, Minor CARs and Observations

Major CARs: Major nonconformances, either alone or in combination with nonconformances of all other applicable indicators, result (or are likely to result) in a fundamental failure to achieve the objectives of the relevant FSC Criterion given the uniqueness and fragility of each forest resource. These are corrective actions that must be resolved or closed out before a certificate can be awarded. If Major CARs arise after an operation is certified, the timeframe for correcting these nonconformances is typically shorter than for Minor CARs. Certification is contingent on the certified FME’s response to the CAR within the stipulated time frame.

Minor CARs: These are corrective action requests in response to minor nonconformances, which are typically limited in scale or can be characterized as an unusual lapse in the system. Most Minor CARs are the result of nonconformance at the indicator-level. Corrective actions must be closed out within a specified time period of award of the certificate.

Observations: These are subject areas where the audit team concludes that there is conformance, but either future nonconformance may result due if the matter is not addressed or the FME could achieve exemplary status through further refinement. Action on Observations is voluntary and does not affect the maintenance of the certificate. However, Observations can become CARs if performance with respect to the pertinent Indicator(s) associated with the Observation falls into nonconformance, as determined in future audits.

4.2.2 Major Nonconformances

<input type="checkbox"/>	No Major CARs were issued to the FME during the evaluation. Any Minor CARs from previous surveillance audits have been reviewed and closed prior to the issuance of a certificate.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Major CARs were issued to the FME during the evaluation, which have all been closed to the satisfaction of the audit team and meet the requirements of the standards. Any Minor CARs from previous surveillance audits have been reviewed and closed prior to the issuance of a certificate.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Major CARs were issued to the FME during the evaluation and the FME has not yet satisfactorily closed all Major CARs.

4.2.3 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations

Finding Number: 2012.1

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:	FSC –US 6.4.c
<p>Non-Conformity: CAF has developed and implemented a protocol for selection of RSAs and HCVFs on the forest. This protocol involves utilization of a number of assessments including SNEP, CA-GAP, and the WHR habitat rating systems. As a result several unique communities and species were identified on the CAF lands. These have been documented and mapped as either RSAs or HCVFs. While the RSAs have been identified, no specific management plans for protection of the unique resources of these areas have been developed.</p>	
<p>Corrective Action Request: By the 2013 recertification audit, CAF shall develop and implement management guidelines that specify management activities within RSAs are limited to low impact activities compatible with the protected RSA objectives.</p>	
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	The RSA protocols were clarified, in writing, to state that any management will be limited to low impact activities compatible with protected RSA objectives.
SCS review	Closed.
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2012.2	
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:	FSC – US 6.4.d
<p>Non-Conformity: In the Protocol for Selection of Forest Stewardship Council Representative Sample Areas and High Conservation Value Forests for the Collins Almanor Forest there was no indication of the planned periodic review and updating of RSAs.</p>	
<p>Corrective Action Request: By the 2013 Recertification Audit, CAF shall provide a plan within the RSA assessment for periodically reviewing and, if necessary, updating it in order to determine if the need for RSAs has changed and if revision of the RSAs is warranted. This must occur at a minimum of every 10 years.</p>	

FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	The written RSA protocols were updated to state that plans will be considered for revision no less frequently than every 10 years.
SCS review	Closed
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i>

Finding Number: 2012.3	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
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:	FSC – US 6.3.a.3 (see also 1.4.a)
<p>Non-Conformity: CAF has identified areas of both Type I and Type II old growth and has developed management guidelines to maintain the area, structure, composition and processes of these old growth areas. During the course of the annual surveillance audit, a pending California Transportation project to widen and straighten Highway 32, which would impact the Type II old growth stand in the Deer Creek area was reviewed. The widening and straightening project will increase the size of the highway right-of-way to include some of the Type II old growth stand and all trees in a portion of this new right-of-way will be cut. This project will reduce the area of Type II old growth present on the CAF, if implemented. Cal Trans informed CAF that if CAF would not willingly sell the right-of-way, the State would go forward with eminent domain proceedings, so this potential reduction in Type II old growth is beyond the control of CAF.</p>	
<p>Corrective Action Request: CAF should keep SCS advised of the progress of the Highway 32 widening and straightening project, since implementation of this project would result in a reduction of the Type II old growth area on the CAF.</p>	
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	CAF informed SCS at the time that the highway expansion project was approved in November 2012. At the time of the 2013 audit, harvesting related to the project had already been completed.
SCS review	As the HCVF reduction was due to a governmental action outside of the control of the certificate holder, a finding of non-conformance is not warranted.
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i>

4.2.4 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations

Finding Number: 2013.1	
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 type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify): non-binding
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US 2.1.b
Background: Currently, the company does not have a single comprehensive register that catalogs and maintains use and access rights held by other parties on the FMU. Some records are kept at the local office in Chester and others are at the corporate headquarters in Portland.	
Observation: Tracking of use rights could be improved by the maintenance of a single register/system, to harmonize records held at different offices.	
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: 2013.2	
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 type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify): non-binding
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US 4.1.a
Background: Collins' overall compensation package for its employees has been eroding, recently. Cost of living adjustments have not occurred in recent years, and the pension program has been downgraded.	
Observation: Through an appropriate review/calibration effort, Collins should confirm that its compensation package continues to meet or exceed prevailing local norms within the forest products industry.	
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: 2013.3	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):non-binding
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US 4.4.a
Background: CAF managers produced a summary document entitled “Sociological Impacts of CAF” that describes the socioeconomic context of the region and how CAF and Collins Pine affect it. This document was produced in response to the current FSC national standard, which went into effect in 2010, and it has not been updated.	
Observation: CAF managers should periodically update its summary document in order to take account of any changes in its socio-economic impacts.	
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: 2013.4	
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 type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify): non-binding
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US 5.4.a
Background: Although CAF is an important contributor to the local/regional economy, its regional economic contributions are primarily driven by timber products.	
Observation: CAF has an opportunity to diversify the products and services it manages on its FMU by investigating opportunities for carbon and other non-timber forest products.	
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: 2013.5	
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 type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify): non-binding
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US 6.5.d
Background: CAF managers are tracking total number of road miles constructed or reconstructed, and road miles of abandoned. The way the data was presented to the auditors made it appear that road density is increasing, although conversations with staff revealed that this is not the case.	
Observation: The data being tracked could be put to better use to analyze road density and to judge and convey whether it is increasing or decreasing, over time.	
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: 2013.6	
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:	FSC-US 6.6.d
Non-Conformity: Site-specific prescriptions and maps are not produced prior to use of pesticides.	
Corrective Action Request: Whenever chemicals are used, a written prescription must be prepared that describes the site-specific hazards and environmental risks and the precautions that workers will employ to avoid or minimize those hazards and risks; a map of the treatment area must be included.	
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: 2013.7	
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:	FSC-US 6.6.e
Non-Conformity: Monitoring of pesticide use is not occurring with sufficient structure to understand where opportunities exist to decrease use; e.g., whether desired effects can be achieved with lower application levels.	
Corrective Action Request: If chemicals are used, the effects must be expressly monitored and the results used for adaptive management. Written records must be kept of pest/pathogen occurrences, control measures, and incidences of worker exposure to chemicals.	
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: 2013.8	
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 type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify): non-binding
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US 7.3.a
Background: Interviews with staff indicated that training was occurring, both on-boarding for newer employees and continuing education for more experienced staff. However, training records of employee training/education activities are not being kept.	
Observation: Training records should be more effectively and comprehensively maintained.	
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: 2013.9	
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:	FSC-US 8.2.d.3
Non-Conformity: CAF managers were not able to demonstrate that the socio-economic effects of their management activities on the CAF are being monitored.	
Corrective Action Request: The landowner or manager shall monitor relevant socio-economic issues (see Indicator 4.4.a), including the social impacts of harvesting, participation in local economic opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.g), the creation and/or maintenance of quality job opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.b), and local purchasing opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.e).	
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: 2013.10	
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:	SCS FSC Chain of Custody Indicators for Forest Management Enterprises; 3.2
Non-Conformity: A non-conforming use of FSC logo was found on the collinsco.com website homepage (logo does not use the promotional panel format or list a trademark license code).	
Corrective Action Request: The FME must, as a standard operating procedure, request authorization from SCS to use the FSC on-product labels and/or FSC trademarks for promotional use.	
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 <i>(refer to description above)</i>

Finding Number: 2013.11	
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:	SCS FSC Chain of Custody Indicators for Forest Management Enterprises; 5.2
Non-Conformity: Records are not being kept pertaining to training for chain of custody procedures.	
Corrective Action Request: The FME shall maintain up-to-date records of its COC training and/or communications program, such as a list of trained employees, completed COC trainings, the intended frequency of COC training (i.e., training plan), and related program materials (e.g., presentations, memos, contracts, employee handbooks, etc.).	
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

5. Certification Decision

Certification Recommendation	
FME be awarded FSC certification as a “Well-Managed Forest” subject to the minor corrective action requests stated in Section 4.2.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
The SCS evaluation team makes the above recommendation for certification based on the full and proper execution of the SCS Forest Conservation Program evaluation protocols. If certification is recommended, the FME has satisfactorily demonstrated the following without exception:	
FME has addressed any Major CAR(s) assigned during the evaluation.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
FME has demonstrated that their system of management is capable of ensuring that all of the requirements of the applicable standards (see Section 1.6 of this report) are met over the forest area covered by the scope of the evaluation.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
FME has demonstrated that the described system of management is being implemented consistently over the forest area covered by the scope of the certificate.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments:	

SECTION B – APPENDICES (CONFIDENTIAL)

Appendix 1 – Current and Projected Annual Harvest for Main Commercial Species

Considerations in the modeling of yield over time were that the basis for silviculture would remain primarily selection silviculture augmented by “true fir Selection” and “biomass thinning prescription”, both prescriptions designed to encourage propagation of pine.

Estimated sustained yield in the SYP is given as 32 million board feet growing to 42.6 million board feet by the end of the hundred year period. The allowable annual harvest remains at 33 million board feet (mmbf). This allowable harvest level is designed to harvest 85% of growth, plus 2 mmbf of the approximately 3 mmbf of annual mortality. As a result of slow stand conversion to more vigorous, free-to-grow trees, net growth has increased from zero in the 1940’s to approximately 350 board feet per acre per year now. Eventually, net growth is expected to reach approximately 425 board feet per acre per year.

Growth Model Projections Results

Long term Sustainable Harvest Level = 42.62 MMBF per Year

Species Composition	1998	2098	Ending inventory	mbf/acre
% Inventory Sugar Pine	26%	29%	All acres	27.2
% Inventory Ponderosa Pine	19%	15%	Less riparian areas	25.8
% Inventory True Fir	42%	37%	Less riparian and 1995 Late Seral Acre	24.3

Appendix 2 – List of FMUs Selected for Evaluation

FME consists of a single FMU

FME consists of multiple FMUs or is a Group

Appendix 3 – List of Stakeholders Consulted

List of FME Staff Consulted

Name	Title	Contact Information	Consultation method
Jay Francis	Forest Manager	jfrancis@collinsco.com	Interview
Andy Juska	Forester	ajuska@collinsco.com	Interview
Eric O’Kelley	Forester	eokelley@collinsco.com	Interview
Bob Birdsall	Forester	bbirdsall@collinsco.com	Interview
Jake Blaufuss	Forester	jblaufuss@collinsco.com	Interview
Glenn Gerbatz	Forester	ggerbatz@collinsco.com	Interview

Linda Thomasma	Wildlife Biologist	lthomasma@collinsco.com	Interview
Paul Harlan	VP, Resources	pharlan@collinsco.com	Interview
Nancy Helseth	VP, Human Resources	nhelseth@collinsco.com	Interview
Marilyn Hendrick		mhendrick@collinsco.com	Interview
Cameron Waner		cwaner@collinsco.com	Interview

List of other Stakeholders Consulted

Name	Organization	Contact Information	Consultation method	Requests Cert. Notf.
Jonathan Kusel	Sierra Institute for Community and Environment	jkusel@sierrainstitute.org	Interview	N
Bruce Castle	Ebbets Pass Forest Watch	blcastle@wavecable.com	Email correspondence	N
Candice Roseberry	Roseberry Timber		Field Interview	N
Terry Roseberry	Roseberry Timber		Field Interview	N

Appendix 4 – Additional Evaluation Techniques Employed

During the CLF and CAF recertification assessments it became clear that certain policies, procedures, and data management at the Collins Corporate (CC) headquarters affects the conformance of each of the Collins Companies’ FMUs (Collins Almanor Forest, Collins Kane Forest, and Collins Lakeview Forest). SCS communicated with CC staff to arrange an on-site evaluation of FSC-US Criteria and/or Indicators that surfaced during each local FMU’s on-site assessments as being potentially managed or influenced at the corporate level.

SCS staff initially determined that the Criteria in the table below may be treated at the corporate level wholly or partially. During the office visit, SCS determined which Criteria and/or Indicators were or were not covered under any corporate level policies, procedures or data management systems. The table provides a summary of the determination of applicability of each Criterion and/or Indicators at the corporate level.

*C = CC found to be in conformance to Criterion or Indicator**

*NC = CC found to be in nonconformance to Criterion or Indicator**

NA = Criterion or Indicator is not applicable to ANY FMU

LL = Conformance to this Criterion or Indicator is wholly determined at the local level for each FMU

*NOTE: Evidence of conformance or nonconformance may include a combination of evidence from the corporate and local FMU levels. So while conformance at the corporate level may provide an overall indication of conformance, in determining conformance SCS auditors may still take into account divisions of responsibilities between CC and local FMU staff, as well as conditions at each local FMU.

REQUIREMENT	SCS Audit Team Notes	C/N C
-------------	----------------------	----------

REQUIREMENT	SCS Audit Team Notes	C/N C
P1 Forest management shall respect all applicable laws of the country in which they occur, and international treaties and agreements to which the country is a signatory, and comply with all FSC Principles and Criteria.		
C1.2. All applicable and legally prescribed fees, royalties, taxes and other charges shall be paid.		C
1.2.a. The forest owner or manager provides written evidence that all applicable and legally prescribed fees, royalties, taxes and other charges are being paid in a timely manner. If payment is beyond the control of the landowner or manager, then there is evidence that every attempt at payment was made.	Collins Corporate (CC): All invoices, as well as check copies, are maintained at the corporate office in a scanned version only. There currently are no outstanding payments as evinced through a demonstration of CC's corporate accounting system for every state where the FMUs operate.	C
C1.6. Forest managers shall demonstrate a long-term commitment to adhere to the FSC Principles and Criteria.		C
1.6.a. The forest owner or manager demonstrates a long-term commitment to adhere to the FSC Principles and Criteria and FSC and FSC-US policies, including the FSC-US Land Sales Policy, and has a publicly available statement of commitment to manage the FMU in conformance with FSC standards and policies.	CC: See http://www.collinsco.com/certified-forests/ for "All three Collins forests— Pennsylvania, Almanor, and Lakeview— have been independently certified by Scientific Certification Systems (SCS) in accordance with the principles and criteria of the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC)." Note that Collins Lakeview and Collins Almanor have recently received a CAR for use of the old language. During the CC office assessment, the Marketing Coordinator sent a message to website staff to update the language with "standards and policies."	C
1.6.b. If the certificate holder does not certify their entire holdings, then they document, in brief, the reasons for seeking partial certification referencing FSC-POL-20-002 (or subsequent policy revisions), the location of other managed forest units, the natural resources found on the holdings being excluded from certification, and the management activities planned for the holdings being excluded from certification.	The Collins Companies certifies its entire forestland holdings.	NA
1.6.c. The forest owner or manager notifies the Certifying Body of significant changes in ownership and/or significant changes in management planning within 90 days of such change.	Conformance to this indicator is determined at the level of each local FMU.	LL
P2 Long-term tenure and use rights to the land and forest resources shall be clearly defined, documented and		

REQUIREMENT	SCS Audit Team Notes	C/N C
legally established.		
C2.3. Appropriate mechanisms shall be employed to resolve disputes over tenure claims and use rights. The circumstances and status of any outstanding disputes will be explicitly considered in the certification evaluation. Disputes of substantial magnitude involving a significant number of interests will normally disqualify an operation from being certified.		C
2.3.a. If disputes arise regarding tenure claims or use rights then the forest owner or manager initially attempts to resolve them through open communication, negotiation, and/or mediation. If these good-faith efforts fail, then federal, state, and/or local laws are employed to resolve such disputes.	CC: The dispute resolution procedure is to be treated in each local FMU’s FMP. CC occasionally becomes involved in disputes over ownership or use rights. The Vice-President, Resources is the corporate contact and person responsible for land use and rights issues, which are brought forward to the VP by either the local Resource Manager or by direct contact by affected ownership via email or phone. CC’s VP is working with Kane on one dispute right now after a legal survey.	C
2.3.b. The forest owner or manager documents any significant disputes over tenure and use rights.	CC: CC demonstrated records over the ownership dispute at Kane. The process to resolve this dispute is currently ongoing.	C
P4 Forest management operations shall maintain or enhance the long-term social and economic well-being of forest workers and local communities.		
C4.1. The communities within, or adjacent to, the forest management area should be given opportunities for employment, training, and other services.		C
4.1.a. Employee compensation and hiring practices meet or exceed the prevailing local norms within the forestry industry.	CC: CC does compensation reviews as evinced through salary surveys viewed with VP of HR. HR periodically compares their salary information to market data collected at the local level. Salary determinations are done collaboratively with HR at corporate and staff at local FMU offices. Salary reviews that occur at the local level are covered in those respective reports.	C
4.1.b. Forest work is offered in ways that create high quality job opportunities for employees.	Conformance to this indicator is determined at the level of each local FMU.	LL
4.1.c. Forest workers are provided with fair wages.	CC: VP of Resources works with local forestry staff to examine salaries or wages in each FMU’s region. VP of HR demonstrated some Forest Salary Comparison records as evidence of	C

REQUIREMENT	SCS Audit Team Notes	C/N C
	determining fair wages.	
4.1.d. Hiring practices and conditions of employment are non-discriminatory and follow applicable federal, state and local regulations.	CC: CC’s hiring practices and conditions adhere to all applicable laws and regulations as stated in corporate-level policies: “The Collins Companies is an Equal Opportunity Employer. All qualified applicants receive consideration for employment without regard to race, color, creed, religion, gender, national origin, age, veteran status, disability, or any other status protected by law. This applies for all hiring, whether or not involved with CAF, CLF or CPF.”	C
4.1.e. The forest owner or manager provides work opportunities to qualified local applicants and seeks opportunities for purchasing local goods and services of equal price and quality.	CC: Most purchases are left up to each FMU. CC has certain corporate level contracts that may apply to local FMUs, such as those for rental cars (e.g., National/ Enterprise) and tires (e.g., Les Schwab).	C
4.1.f. Commensurate with the size and scale of operation, the forest owner or manager provides and/or supports learning opportunities to improve public understanding of forests and forest management.	Conformance to this indicator is determined at the level of each local FMU.	LL
4.1.g. The forest owner or manager participates in local economic development and/or civic activities, based on scale of operation and where such opportunities are available.	Conformance to this indicator is determined at the level of each local FMU.	LL
C4.2. Forest management should meet or exceed all applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of employees and their families.		C
4.2.a. The forest owner or manager meets or exceeds all applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of employees and their families (also see Criterion 1.1).	Conformance to this indicator is determined at the level of each local FMU.	LL
4.2.b. The forest owner or manager and their employees and contractors demonstrate a safe work environment. Contracts or other written agreements include safety requirements.	CC: CC will be reviewing all contract templates this year to ensure that safety requirements are sufficiently covered for each FMU. SCS found no nonconformities in 2013 to contract requirements for this indicator. Contracts for Kane (e.g., Timber Harvest Contract) and Lakeview (e.g., Work Contract) were examined. Collins is careful to respect the legal separation of employer / contractor under contracting rules.	C
4.2.c. The forest owner or manager hires well-qualified service providers to safely implement the	Conformance to this indicator is determined at the level of each local FMU.	LL

REQUIREMENT	SCS Audit Team Notes	C/N C
management plan.		
C4.3 The rights of workers to organize and voluntarily negotiate with their employers shall be guaranteed as outlined in Conventions 87 and 98 of the International Labor Organization (ILO).		C
4.3.a. Forest workers are free to associate with other workers for the purpose of advocating for their own employment interests.	CC: CC does not interfere with workers’ rights to freely associate or advocate for their own employment interests as stipulated under federal laws.	C
4.3.b. The forest owner or manager has effective and culturally sensitive mechanisms to resolve disputes between workers and management.	CC: The Complaint Handling section of the Salaried Employee Handbook addresses how disputes and complaints can be addressed between workers and management. This applies to each FMU.	C
C4.4. Management planning and operations shall incorporate the results of evaluations of social impact. Consultations shall be maintained with people and groups (both men and women) directly affected by management operations.		C
<p>4.4.a. The forest owner or manager understands the likely social impacts of management activities, and incorporates this understanding into management planning and operations. Social impacts include effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Archeological sites and sites of cultural, historical and community significance (on and off the FMU); • Public resources, including air, water and food (hunting, fishing, collecting); • Aesthetics; • Community goals for forest and natural resource use and protection such as employment, subsistence, recreation and health; • Community economic opportunities; • Other people who may be affected by management operations. <p>A summary is available to the CB.</p>	Conformance to this indicator is determined at the level of each local FMU.	LL
4.4.b. The forest owner or manager seeks and considers input in management planning from people who would likely be affected by management activities.	CC: Whenever an email or comment via the comment form, the Marketing Coordinator first attempts to deal with the comment directly or forward the question or comment to local forest	C

REQUIREMENT	SCS Audit Team Notes	C/N C
	managers. Marketing coordinator demonstrated records of email comments and responses or that comments have been forwarded to each local FMU. Additionally, at the corporate level, specifically the VP, Resources, is available anytime to be engaged on issues if necessary.	
4.4.c. People who are subject to direct adverse effects of management operations are apprised of relevant activities in advance of the action so that they may express concern.	Conformance to this indicator is determined at the level of each local FMU.	LL
<p>4.4.d. For public forests, consultation shall include the following components:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clearly defined and accessible methods for public participation are provided in both long and short-term planning processes, including harvest plans and operational plans; 2. Public notification is sufficient to allow interested stakeholders the chance to learn of upcoming opportunities for public review and/or comment on the proposed management; 3. An accessible and affordable appeals process to planning decisions is available. <p>Planning decisions incorporate the results of public consultation. All draft and final planning documents, and their supporting data, are made readily available to the public.</p>	The Collins Companies do not manage any public forests.	NA
C4.5. Appropriate mechanisms shall be employed for resolving grievances and for providing fair compensation in the case of loss or damage affecting the legal or customary rights, property, resources, or livelihoods of local peoples. Measures shall be taken to avoid such loss or damage.	Conformance to this indicator is determined at the level of each local FMU.	LL
P5 Forest management operations shall encourage the efficient use of the forest’s multiple products and services to ensure economic viability and a wide range of environmental and social benefits.		
C5.1. Forest management should strive toward economic viability, while taking into account the full environmental, social, and operational costs of production, and ensuring the investments necessary to maintain the ecological productivity of the forest.		C

REQUIREMENT	SCS Audit Team Notes	C/N C
<p>5.1.a. The forest owner or manager is financially able to implement core management activities, including all those environmental, social and operating costs, required to meet this Standard, and investment and reinvestment in forest management.</p>	<p>CC: The CFO/ VP, Finance was able to demonstrate that production reports can be created using data reported from each local FMU. It is largely up to each FMU to track its operating costs and needs for investment. Each FMU is responsible for their financial reporting, under the constraints of corporate direction. Each division produces its own financial statements and production reporting. This is consolidated at the corporate level and CC has annual independent financial audits. Additionally, each location is responsible for identifying investment needs which needs corporate and/or board approval depending on the investment levels. VP, Resources may become involved with reviewing costs and investment opportunities at the local level.</p>	<p>C</p>
<p>5.1.b. Responses to short-term financial factors are limited to levels that are consistent with fulfillment of this Standard.</p>	<p>Conformance to this indicator is determined at the level of each local FMU.</p>	<p>LL</p>
<p>C5.2. Forest management and marketing operations should encourage the optimal use and local processing of the forest’s diversity of products.</p>	<p>Conformance to this indicator is determined at the level of each local FMU.</p>	<p>LL</p>
<p>C5.3. Forest management should minimize waste associated with harvesting and on-site processing operations and avoid damage to other forest resources.</p>	<p>Conformance to this indicator is determined at the level of each local FMU.</p>	<p>LL</p>
<p>C5.4. Forest management should strive to strengthen and diversify the local economy, avoiding dependence on a single forest product.</p>		<p>C</p>
<p>5.4.a. The forest owner or manager demonstrates knowledge of their operation’s effect on the local economy as it relates to existing and potential markets for a wide variety of timber and non-timber forest products and services.</p>	<p>CC: CC works in a collaborative manner with each FMU. Specifically at the VP, Resources levels and other levels. Evidence of this is in the work that VP-Resources did in promoting and getting the potential for a biomass plant by Iberdrola to locate in CLF that almost came to fruition. At the corporate level CC is always looking for opportunities. Red Rock Biofuels as an example in CLF post Iberdrola for biomass based jet fuel. At other corporate levels, sales staff are involved in communicating demands from new and current customers as evinced through emails</p>	<p>C</p>

REQUIREMENT	SCS Audit Team Notes	C/N C
	send through the CC website to the Marketing Coordinator.	
5.4.b The forest owner or manager strives to diversify the economic use of the forest according to Indicator 5.4.a.	CC: Evidence of biomass and biofuels initiatives has been reviewed extensively by SCS staff at previous assessments of CLF.	C
C5.5. Forest management operations shall recognize, maintain, and, where appropriate, enhance the value of forest services and resources such as watersheds and fisheries.	Conformance to this indicator is determined at the level of each local FMU.	LL
C5.6. The rate of harvest of forest products shall not exceed levels which can be permanently sustained.	Conformance to this indicator is determined at the level of each local FMU.	LL
P7 A management plan -- appropriate to the scale and intensity of the operations -- shall be written, implemented, and kept up to date. The long-term objectives of management, and the means of achieving them, shall be clearly stated.		
C7.1. The management plan and supporting documents shall provide: a) Management objectives; b) description of the forest resources to be managed, environmental limitations, land use and ownership status, socio-economic conditions, and a profile of adjacent lands; c) Description of silvicultural and/or other management system, based on the ecology of the forest in question and information gathered through resource inventories; d) Rationale for rate of annual harvest and species selection; e) Provisions for monitoring of forest growth and dynamics; f) Environmental safeguards based on environmental assessments; g) Plans for the identification and protection of rare, threatened and endangered species; h) Maps describing the forest resource base including protected areas, planned management activities and land ownership; i) Description and justification of harvesting techniques and equipment to be used.	Conformance to this indicator is determined at the level of each local FMU.	LL
C7.4. While respecting the confidentiality of information, forest managers shall make publicly available a summary of the primary elements of the management plan, including those listed in Criterion 7.1.		C

REQUIREMENT	SCS Audit Team Notes	C/N C
<p>7.4.a. While respecting landowner confidentiality, the management plan or a management plan summary that outlines the elements of the plan described in Criterion 7.1 is available to the public either at no charge or a nominal fee.</p>	<p>CC: On an as needed basis. The FMU's operate independently. Corporate, through the VP-Resources, directs as needed the fulfillment of requirements of elements such as these. We have collaborated together on what each is using and on what is listed in the public summaries. Each is pulled from a variety of data and reports and thus each has a slightly different</p> <p>The Marketing Coordinator in Portland handles all of the website traffic and updates to the CC website. CC's role is ensuring that the public summary of the FMP is posted on the CC website. Determination of conformance to the content of public summaries will be treated at each local FMU.</p> <p>During the office visit, the Marketing Coordinator communicated with CLF and CAF staff on updating the public summaries on the CC website.</p>	<p>C</p>
<p>7.4.b. Managers of public forests make draft management plans, revisions and supporting documentation easily accessible for public review and comment prior to their implementation. Managers address public comments and modify the plans to ensure compliance with this Standard.</p>	<p>The Collins Companies do not manage any public forests.</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>P8 Monitoring shall be conducted -- appropriate to the scale and intensity of forest management -- to assess the condition of the forest, yields of forest products, chain of custody, management activities and their social and environmental impacts.</p>		
<p>8.2. Forest management should include the research and data collection needed to monitor, at a minimum, the following indicators: a) yield of all forest products harvested, b) growth rates, regeneration, and condition of the forest, c) composition and observed changes in the flora and fauna, d) environmental and social impacts of harvesting and other operations, and e) cost, productivity, and efficiency of forest management.</p>		<p>C</p>
<p>8.2.a.1. For all commercially harvested products, an inventory system is maintained. The inventory system includes at a minimum: a) species, b) volumes, c) stocking, d) regeneration, and e) stand and forest composition and structure; and f) timber</p>	<p>Conformance to this indicator is determined at the level of each local FMU.</p>	<p>LL</p>

REQUIREMENT	SCS Audit Team Notes	C/N C
quality.		
8.2.a.2. Significant, unanticipated removal or loss or increased vulnerability of forest resources is monitored and recorded. Recorded information shall include date and location of occurrence, description of disturbance, extent and severity of loss, and may be both quantitative and qualitative.	Conformance to this indicator is determined at the level of each local FMU.	LL
8.2.b The forest owner or manager maintains records of harvested timber and NTFPs (volume and product and/or grade). Records must adequately ensure that the requirements under Criterion 5.6 are met.	Conformance to this indicator is determined at the level of each local FMU.	LL
8.2.c. The forest owner or manager periodically obtains data needed to monitor presence on the FMU of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Rare, threatened and endangered species and/or their habitats; 2) Common and rare plant communities and/or habitat; 3) Location, presence and abundance of invasive species; 4) Condition of protected areas, set-asides and buffer zones; 5) High Conservation Value Forests (see Criterion 9.4). 	Conformance to this indicator is determined at the level of each local FMU.	LL
8.2.d.1. Monitoring is conducted to ensure that site specific plans and operations are properly implemented, environmental impacts of site disturbing operations are minimized, and that harvest prescriptions and guidelines are effective.	Conformance to this indicator is determined at the level of each local FMU.	LL
8.2.d.2. A monitoring program is in place to assess the condition and environmental impacts of the forest-road system.	Conformance to this indicator is determined at the level of each local FMU.	LL
8.2.d.3. The landowner or manager monitors relevant socio-economic issues (see Indicator 4.4.a), including the social impacts of harvesting, participation in local economic opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.g), the creation and/or maintenance of quality job opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.b), and local purchasing opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.e).	Conformance to this indicator is determined at the level of each local FMU.	LL
8.2.d.4. Stakeholder responses to management activities are monitored and recorded as necessary.	CC: CC's Marketing Coordinator maintains records of all communications received via the CC	C

REQUIREMENT	SCS Audit Team Notes	C/N C
	website. Any comments dealing with stakeholder issues are forwarded to staff at the applicable local FMU.	
8.2.d.5. Where sites of cultural significance exist, the opportunity to jointly monitor sites of cultural significance is offered to tribal representatives (see Principle 3).	Conformance to this indicator is determined at the level of each local FMU.	LL
8.2.e. The forest owner or manager monitors the costs and revenues of management in order to assess productivity and efficiency.	CC: The CFO/ VP, Finance was able to demonstrate that production reports can be created using data reported from each local FMU. These reports include information on costs and revenues that can be used to monitor productivity and efficiency.	C
C8.5. While respecting the confidentiality of information, forest managers shall make publicly available a summary of the results of monitoring indicators, including those listed in Criterion 8.2.	Conformance to this indicator is determined at the level of each local FMU.	LL

Appendix 5 – Certification Standard Conformance Table

C= Conformance with Criterion or Indicator

C/NC= Overall Conformance with Criterion, but there are Indicator nonconformances

NC= Nonconformance with Criterion or Indicator

NA= Not Applicable

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.		
1.1 Forest management shall respect all national and local laws and administrative requirements.	C	
1.1.a Forest management plans and operations demonstrate compliance with all applicable federal, state, county, municipal, and tribal laws, and administrative requirements (e.g., regulations). Violations, outstanding complaints or investigations are provided to the Certifying Body (CB) during the annual audit.	C	Operations and management plans reviewed during the audit demonstrated compliance with applicable laws and regulations. No recent violations or complaints or notices from Cal Fire have occurred.

<p>1.1.b To facilitate legal compliance, the <i>forest owner</i> or <i>manager</i> ensures that employees and contractors, commensurate with their responsibilities, are duly informed about applicable laws and regulations.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Foresters and loggers require competency-focused licensing by the state. Interviews with staff consistently revealed in-depth working knowledge of applicable laws and regulations.</p>
<p>1.2. All applicable and legally prescribed fees, royalties, taxes and other charges shall be paid.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>1.2.a The forest owner or manager provides written evidence that all applicable and legally prescribed fees, royalties, taxes and other charges are being paid in a timely manner. If payment is beyond the control of the landowner or manager, then there is evidence that every attempt at payment was made.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Taxes are paid to the state board of equalization on amount of volume harvested. There is no evidence indicating that Collins is in arrears on payments of taxes and fees.</p>
<p>1.3. In signatory countries, the provisions of all binding international agreements such as CITES, ILO Conventions, ITTA, and Convention on Biological Diversity, shall be respected.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>1.3.a. Forest management plans and operations comply with relevant provisions of all applicable binding international agreements.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>In the U.S., treaty requirements are applied through implementation of federal legislation, and therefore compliance with federal law is de facto compliance with binding international agreements.</p>
<p>1.4. Conflicts between laws, regulations and the FSC Principles and Criteria shall be evaluated for the purposes of certification, on a case by case basis, by the certifiers and the involved or affected parties.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>1.4.a. Situations in which compliance with laws or regulations conflicts with compliance with FSC Principles, Criteria or Indicators are documented and referred to the CB.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>A recent example of a conflict was the harvesting of a stand of old growth required as part of a highway expansion project. The situation was properly documented and referred to SCS.</p>
<p>1.5. Forest management areas should be protected from illegal harvesting, settlement and other unauthorized activities.</p>		
<p>1.5.a. The forest owner or manager supports or implements measures intended to prevent illegal and unauthorized activities on the <i>Forest Management Unit</i> (FMU).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>CAF has a patrol person that tours the forest, and staff have a regular presence in the forest to discourage and control illegal activities on the forest.</p>
<p>1.5.b. If illegal or unauthorized activities occur, the forest owner or manager implements actions designed to curtail such activities and correct the</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>CAF personnel work closely with local law enforcement agencies when illegal activities are encountered on the forest, such as illegal drug issues.</p>

situation to the extent possible for meeting all land management objectives with consideration of available resources.		
1.6. Forest managers shall demonstrate a long-term commitment to adhere to the FSC Principles and Criteria.		
1.6.a. The forest owner or manager demonstrates a long-term commitment to adhere to the FSC Principles and Criteria and FSC and FSC-US policies, including the FSC-US Land Sales Policy, and has a publicly available statement of commitment to manage the FMU in conformance with FSC standards and policies.	C	Collins has posted a statement of commitment to FSC on its website. More importantly, it has demonstrated commitment through its early engagement with FSC, and history of support of certification.
1.6.b. If the certificate holder does not certify their entire holdings, then they document, in brief, the reasons for seeking partial certification referencing FSC-POL-20-002 (or subsequent policy revisions), the location of other managed forest units, the natural resources found on the holdings being excluded from certification, and the management activities planned for the holdings being excluded from certification.	NA	
1.6.c. The forest owner or manager notifies the Certifying Body of significant changes in ownership and/or significant changes in management planning within 90 days of such change.	C	Collins staff are in regular communication with SCS over any significant changes to the scope of the certificate.
Principle #2: Long-term tenure and use rights to the land and forest resources shall be clearly defined, documented and legally established.		
2.1. Clear evidence of long-term forest use rights to the land (e.g., land title, customary rights, or lease agreements) shall be demonstrated.	C	
2.1.a The forest owner or manager provides clear evidence of <i>long-term</i> rights to use and manage the FMU for the purposes described in the management plan.	C	Clear evidence of ownership rights was presented. Audit team reviewed sample of deeds.
2.1.b The forest owner or manager identifies and documents legally established use and access rights associated with the FMU that are held by other parties.	C	Currently, the company does not have a single comprehensive register that maintains use and access rights held by other parties on the FMU. Some records are kept at the local office in Chester and others are at the corporate headquarters in Portland. OBS 2013.1 was issued.

<p>2.1.c Boundaries of land ownership and use rights are clearly identified on the ground and on maps prior to commencing management activities in the vicinity of the boundaries.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Signs are posted on CAF forest boundaries. Property lines are blazed.</p>
<p>2.2. Local communities with legal or customary tenure or use rights shall maintain control, to the extent necessary to protect their rights or resources, over forest operations unless they delegate control with free and informed consent to other agencies. <i>Applicability Note: For the planning and management of publicly owned forests, the local community is defined as all residents and property owners of the relevant jurisdiction.</i></p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>2.2.a The forest owner or manager allows the exercise of tenure and use rights allowable by law or regulation.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>No conflicts related to exercise of tenure or use rights were observed or made known to the audit team. Grazing rights are one of the few examples of a tenure rights held by third parties. More common is limited recreational use on CAF by users without a formal tenure right, such as a dirt bike area.</p>
<p>2.2.b In FMUs where tenure or use rights held by others exist, the forest owner or manager consults with groups that hold such rights so that management activities do not significantly impact the uses or benefits of such rights.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Annual meetings occur with grazing rights owners at which time potential impacts are discussed.</p>
<p>2.3. Appropriate mechanisms shall be employed to resolve disputes over tenure claims and use rights. The circumstances and status of any outstanding disputes will be explicitly considered in the certification evaluation. Disputes of substantial magnitude involving a significant number of interests will normally disqualify an operation from being certified.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>2.3.a If disputes arise regarding tenure claims or use rights then the forest owner or manager initially attempts to resolve them through open communication, negotiation, and/or mediation. If these good-faith efforts fail, then federal, state, and/or local laws are employed to resolve such disputes.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>A recurring issue has involved Keefer Ranch, a property where Collins owns the harvesting rights but not the underlying land. Harvest plans have been met with opposition by the ranch owner, although there has been open communication and negotiation over specific harvests (e.g., joint tree marking exercise). Although this is a recurring issue, no non-conformities were found to exist.</p>

<p>2.3.b The forest owner or manager documents any significant disputes over tenure and use rights.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>All such disputes are documented.</p>
<p>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.</p>		
<p>3.1. Indigenous peoples shall control forest management on their lands and territories unless they delegate control with free and informed consent to other agencies.</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>CAF does not manage tribal forests</p>
<p>3.1.a Tribal forest management planning and implementation are carried out by authorized tribal representatives in accordance with tribal laws and customs and relevant federal laws.</p>	<p>NA</p>	
<p>3.1.b The manager of a tribal forest secures, in writing, informed consent regarding forest management activities from the tribe or individual forest owner prior to commencement of those activities.</p>	<p>NA</p>	
<p>3.2. Forest management shall not threaten or diminish, either directly or indirectly, the resources or tenure rights of indigenous peoples.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>3.2.a During management planning, the forest owner or manager consults with American Indian groups that have legal rights or other binding agreements to the FMU to avoid harming their resources or rights.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>No tribes have legal rights or binding agreements on the FMU.</p>
<p>3.2.b Demonstrable actions are taken so that forest management does not adversely affect tribal resources. When applicable, evidence of, and measures for, protecting tribal resources are incorporated in the management plan.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>When the THP process reveals archeological sites, protective buffers are put in place.</p>
<p>3.3. Sites of special cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance to indigenous peoples shall be clearly identified in cooperation with such peoples, and recognized and protected by forest managers.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>3.3.a. The forest owner or manager invites consultation with tribal representatives in identifying sites of current or traditional cultural, archeological, ecological, economic or religious significance.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>As part of the THP planning and review process, local American Indian groups are contacted in order to solicit comment and input on potential arch sites.</p>
<p>3.3.b In consultation with tribal representatives,</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Protection measures on CAF are typically limited to</p>

<p>the forest owner or manager develops measures to protect or enhance areas of special significance (see also Criterion 9.1).</p>		<p>buffer zones. Collins staff has worked collaboratively and provided technical assistance to the Maidu Stewardship Project, a group attempting to manage neighboring land for cultural purposes (e.g. stimulating bear grass growth for traditional weaving), although these projects are not taking place within CAF, itself.</p>
<p>3.4. Indigenous peoples shall be compensated for the application of their traditional knowledge regarding the use of forest species or management systems in forest operations. This compensation shall be formally agreed upon with their free and informed consent before forest operations commence.</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>No traditional knowledge is being used in forest management.</p>
<p>3.4.a The forest owner or manager identifies whether <i>traditional knowledge</i> in forest management is being used.</p>	<p>NA</p>	
<p>3.4.b When traditional knowledge is used, written protocols are jointly developed prior to such use and signed by local tribes or tribal members to protect and fairly compensate them for such use.</p>	<p>NA</p>	
<p>3.4.c The forest owner or manager respects the confidentiality of tribal traditional knowledge and assists in the protection of such knowledge.</p>	<p>NA</p>	
<p>Principle #4: Forest management operations shall maintain or enhance the long-term social and economic well-being of forest workers and local communities.</p>		
<p>4.1. The communities within, or adjacent to, the forest management area should be given opportunities for employment, training, and other services.</p>		
<p>4.1.a Employee compensation and hiring practices meet or exceed the prevailing <i>local</i> norms within the forestry industry.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Collins' overall compensation package for its employees has been eroding recently. Cost of living adjustments have not occurred in recent years, and the pension program has been downgraded. OBS 2013.2 was issued.</p>
<p>4.1.b Forest work is offered in ways that create high quality job opportunities for employees.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Foresters are provided with work opportunities in a variety of different aspects of forest management, allowing staff to take advantage of high quality opportunities.</p>
<p>4.1.c Forest workers are provided with fair wages.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Compensation to staff and contractors has been fair. The downturn in the timber economy has eroded</p>

		compensation somewhat, although layoffs were avoided.
4.1.d Hiring practices and conditions of employment are non-discriminatory and follow applicable federal, state and local regulations.	C	No evidence of discrimination in hiring or employment practices.
4.1.e The forest owner or manager provides work opportunities to qualified local applicants and seeks opportunities for purchasing local goods and services of equal price and quality.	C	Work opportunities are provided to local job applicants. Staff and contractors are all locally based.
4.1.f Commensurate with the size and scale of operation, the forest owner or manager provides and/or supports learning opportunities to improve public understanding of forests and forest management.	C	CAF provides exemplary support of public education about forest management. The prime example is a museum on the mill grounds devoted to the history of Collins and logging. Collins also supports school tours and other community educational efforts.
4.1.g The forest owner or manager participates in local economic development and/or civic activities, based on scale of operation and where such opportunities are available.	C	Collins plays a large role in the local economy, particularly through operating the Chester mill. Collins also participates in local organizations, such as the Almanor Basin Watershed Advisory Committee.
4.2. Forest management should meet or exceed all applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of employees and their families.	C	
4.2.a The forest owner or manager meets or exceeds all applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of employees and their families (also see Criterion 1.1).	C	CAR staff demonstrated knowledge of health and safety requirements during the audit. No lost time accidents involving CAF staff occurred over the past year, although one occurred involving a contractor.
4.2.b The forest owner or manager and their employees and contractors demonstrate a safe work environment. Contracts or other written agreements include safety requirements.	C	Field observations by the audit team confirmed safe working conditions. Contract agreements include written safety requirements (reviewed contract with A&M Timber). All contractors are required to file a safety plan.
4.2.c The forest owner or manager hires well-qualified service providers to safely implement the management plan.	C	Logging contractors must be licensed by the state.
4.3 The rights of workers to organize and voluntarily negotiate with their employers shall be guaranteed as outlined in Conventions 87 and 98 of the International Labor Organization (ILO).	C	
4.3.a Forest workers are free to associate with other workers for the purpose of advocating for their own employment interests.	C	Although CAF employees are not unionized, there is no evidence of CAF interference with workers right to associate.
4.3.b The forest owner or manager has effective	C	CAF managers have an open door policy for surfacing

<p>and culturally sensitive mechanisms to resolve disputes between workers and management.</p>		<p>and resolving issues.</p>
<p>4.4. Management planning and operations shall incorporate the results of evaluations of social impact. Consultations shall be maintained with people and groups (both men and women) directly affected by management operations.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>4.4.a The forest owner or manager understands the likely social impacts of management activities, and incorporates this understanding into management planning and operations. Social impacts include effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Archeological sites and sites of cultural, historical and community significance (on and off the FMU); • Public resources, including air, water and food (hunting, fishing, collecting); • Aesthetics; • Community goals for forest and natural resource use and protection such as employment, subsistence, recreation and health; • Community economic opportunities; • Other people who may be affected by management operations. <p>A summary is available to the CB.</p>		<p>CAF managers produced a summary document entitled “Sociological Impacts of CAF” that describes the socioeconomic context of the region and how CAF and Collins Pine affect it. This document was produced in response to the current FSC national standard, which went into effect in 2010, and it has not been updated. OBS 2013.3 was issued.</p>
<p>4.4.b The forest owner or manager seeks and considers input in management planning from people who would likely be affected by management activities.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The THP process provides an established and robust opportunity for the public to comment on management operations. The SYP approval process also entails substantial opportunities for stakeholder input. In addition, Collins maintains an open door policy with the community. Stakeholder interviews indicate that managers are sensitive to community concerns and willing to adapt activities in order to accommodate any issues.</p>
<p>4.4.c People who are subject to direct adverse effects of management operations are apprised of relevant activities in advance of the action so that they may express concern.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Public notices to adjacent/nearby landowners are required as part of the THP process.</p>
<p>4.4.d For <i>public forests</i>, consultation shall include the following components:</p>	<p>NA</p>	

<p>4. Clearly defined and accessible methods for public participation are provided in both long and short-term planning processes, including harvest plans and operational plans;</p> <p>5. Public notification is sufficient to allow interested stakeholders the chance to learn of upcoming opportunities for public review and/or comment on the proposed management;</p> <p>6. An accessible and affordable appeals process to planning decisions is available.</p> <p>Planning decisions incorporate the results of public consultation. All draft and final planning documents, and their supporting data, are made readily available to the public.</p>		
<p>4.5. Appropriate mechanisms shall be employed for resolving grievances and for providing fair compensation in the case of loss or damage affecting the legal or customary rights, property, resources, or livelihoods of local peoples. Measures shall be taken to avoid such loss or damage.</p>	C	
<p>4.5.a The forest owner or manager does not engage in negligent activities that cause damage to other people.</p>	C	No evidence of negligent operations arose during the audit.
<p>4.5.b The forest owner or manager provides a known and accessible means for interested stakeholders to voice grievances and have them resolved. If significant disputes arise related to resolving grievances and/or providing fair compensation, the forest owner or manager follows appropriate dispute resolution procedures. At a minimum, the forest owner or manager maintains open communications, responds to grievances in a timely manner, demonstrates ongoing good faith efforts to resolve the grievances, and maintains records of legal suites and claims.</p>	C	<p>Stakeholder interviews confirm that CAF managers actively respond to community concerns, when they arise.</p> <p>Managers have maintained positive and open discussions even in difficult cases such as Keefer Ranch.</p>
<p>4.5.c Fair compensation or reasonable mitigation is provided to local people, communities or adjacent landowners for substantiated damage or loss of</p>	C	No such incidents have occurred requiring compensation to be paid.

income caused by the landowner or manager.		
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.		
5.1. Forest management should strive toward economic viability, while taking into account the full environmental, social, and operational costs of production, and ensuring the investments necessary to maintain the ecological productivity of the forest.	C	
5.1.a The forest owner or manager is financially able to implement core management activities, including all those environmental, social and operating costs, required to meet this Standard, and investment and reinvestment in forest management.	C	Although CAF has tightened its belt somewhat during the recent economic downturn, there was no evidence that core management activities were not carried out. In particular, CAF has maintained its road maintenance program and staff biologist position.
5.1.b Responses to short-term financial factors are limited to levels that are consistent with fulfillment of this Standard.	C	The economic downturn did not result in substantial changes to the management of the forest.
5.2. Forest management and marketing operations should encourage the optimal use and local processing of the forest’s diversity of products.	C	
5.2.a Where forest products are harvested or sold, opportunities for forest product sales and services are given to local harvesters, value-added processing and manufacturing facilities, guiding services, and other operations that are able to offer services at competitive rates and levels of service.	C	Logs harvested from the forest go primarily to feed the local Collins sawmill and cogeneration plant in Chester, which is a major contributor to the local economy. Logs are occasionally sold to other specialty mills in the region. CAF has not exported any logs overseas.
5.2.b The forest owner or manager takes measures to optimize the use of harvested forest products and explores product diversification where appropriate and consistent with management objectives.	C	Collins’ investment in the cogeneration facility has allowed CAF to utilize smaller diameter material.
5.2.c On public lands where forest products are harvested and sold, some sales of forest products or contracts are scaled or structured to allow small business to bid competitively.	NA	
5.3. Forest management should minimize waste associated with harvesting and on-site processing operations and avoid damage to other forest resources.	C	
5.3.a Management practices are employed to	C	Inspections of harvesting operations revealed good

<p>minimize the loss and/or waste of harvested forest products.</p>		<p>recovery of merchantable material. In particular, CAF engaged in a large-scale salvage operation from the Chips fire, attempting to minimize loss of merchantable logs from post fire degrade.</p>
<p>5.3.b Harvest practices are managed to protect residual trees and other forest resources, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • soil compaction, <i>rutting</i> and erosion are minimized; • residual trees are not significantly damaged to the extent that health, growth, or values are noticeably affected; • damage to NTFPs is minimized during management activities; and • techniques and equipment that minimize impacts to vegetation, soil, and water are used whenever feasible. 	<p>C</p>	<p>Collins uneven-aged management system requires more frequent entries than a predominantly even-aged system but, despite this, inspected harvesting sites did not show excessive rutting or soil damage.</p>
<p>5.4. Forest management should strive to strengthen and diversify the local economy, avoiding dependence on a single forest product.</p>		
<p>5.4.a The forest owner or manager demonstrates knowledge of their operation’s effect on the local economy as it relates to existing and potential markets for a wide variety of timber and non-timber forest products and services.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Although CAF is an important contributor to the local/regional economy, it is primarily driven by the timber products. OBS 2013.4 was issued.</p>
<p>5.4.b The forest owner or manager strives to diversify the economic use of the forest according to Indicator 5.4.a.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>See 5.4.b; more efforts could be made to diversify products coming from the forest.</p>
<p>5.5. Forest management operations shall recognize, maintain, and, where appropriate, enhance the value of forest services and resources such as watersheds and fisheries.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>5.5.a In developing and implementing activities on the FMU, the forest owner or manager identifies, defines and implements appropriate measures for maintaining and/or enhancing forest services and resources that serve public values, including municipal watersheds, fisheries, carbon storage and sequestration, recreation and tourism.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>CAF provides opportunities for public recreation on the forest. The forest is largely not gated. CAF participates in the Almanor Basin Watershed Advisory Committee, which is aimed at maintaining water quality in the basin for habitat and recreation.</p>
<p>5.5.b The forest owner or manager uses the information from Indicator 5.5.a to implement appropriate measures for maintaining and/or</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>See 5.5.a</p>

enhancing these services and resources.		
5.6. The rate of harvest of forest products shall not exceed levels which can be permanently sustained.	C	
<p>5.6.a In FMUs where products are being harvested, the landowner or manager calculates the sustained yield harvest level for each sustained yield planning unit, and provides clear rationale for determining the size and layout of the planning unit. The sustained yield harvest level calculation is documented in the Management Plan.</p> <p>The sustained yield harvest level calculation for each planning unit is based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • documented growth rates for particular sites, and/or acreage of forest types, age-classes and species distributions; • mortality and decay and other factors that affect net growth; • areas reserved from harvest or subject to harvest restrictions to meet other management goals; • silvicultural practices that will be employed on the FMU; • management objectives and desired future conditions. <p>The calculation is made by considering the effects of repeated prescribed harvests on the product/species and its ecosystem, as well as planned management treatments and projections of subsequent regrowth beyond single rotation and multiple re-entries.</p>	C	<p>CAF operates under a Sustained Yield Plan approved by Cal Fire, which requires analysis of the factors identified in this Indicator. The current SYP expires in 2014 and CAF is working on a renewal.</p> <p>Data for the harvest projections are fed by a continuous forest inventory system on the property. Unanticipated loss of timber, such as through large fire events, is considered in sustainable yield calculations by removing the volume of lost timber from the allowable harvest.</p>
5.6.b Average annual harvest levels, over rolling periods of no more than 10 years, do not exceed the calculated sustained yield harvest level.	C	Harvesting levels are below the calculated sustained yield harvest level.
5.6.c Rates and methods of timber harvest lead to achieving desired conditions, and improve or maintain health and quality across the FMU. Overstocked stands and stands that have been depleted or rendered to be below productive potential due to natural events, past management,	C	Silvicultural methods on the forest are aimed at improving health and quality throughout the stand. Poorly formed or low vigor trees are targeted for removal in order to promote growth on larger trees.

<p>or lack of management, are returned to desired stocking levels and composition at the earliest practicable time as justified in management objectives.</p>		
<p>5.6.d For NTFPs, calculation of quantitative sustained yield harvest levels is required only in cases where products are harvested in significant commercial operations or where traditional or customary use rights may be impacted by such harvests. In other situations, the forest owner or manager utilizes available information, and new information that can be reasonably gathered, to set harvesting levels that will not result in a depletion of the non-timber growing stocks or other adverse effects to the forest ecosystem.</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>NTFPs are not harvested by the company at commercial levels though there is some unauthorized collecting that is likely commercial in nature.</p>
<p>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.</p>		
<p>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.</p>		
<p>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</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>At a landscape level, portions of the required assessment is been completed as part of the SYP. In addition, timber harvest plans prepared prior to each harvest evaluate the same information. Forest communities are mapped as part of the SYP. RTE species are handled by A staff biologist, through checking relevant state databases prior to each harvest, and surveying for known populations. Rare ecological plant communities have been identified through the HCVF and RSA process. A general assessment of riparian and soil conditions is contained in the CAF management plan, and more detailed assessments are a part of THPs. Historic conditions on the forest are considered in the</p>

<p>habitats and hydrologic functions; 5) Soil resources; and 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>		<p>management plan (Collins has had a long term tenure over the forest, with original ownership beginning in the early 1900s).</p>
<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>	<p>C</p>	<p>On an operational basis, THPs required before harvesting provide a site level environmental impact assessment.</p>
<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.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Management is altered in order to minimize negative effects of management. Examples include altering harvesting near RTE sites, and riparian management zones. At a general level, CAF's management philosophy of promoting healthy late seral stands is aimed at maintaining the high level of ecological viability on the forest.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>NA</p>	
<p>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 established, appropriate to the scale and intensity of forest management and the uniqueness of the</p>	<p>C</p>	

<p>affected resources. Inappropriate hunting, fishing, trapping, and collecting shall be controlled.</p>		
<p>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.</p> <p>Surveys are conducted by biologists with the appropriate expertise in the species of interest and with appropriate qualifications to conduct the surveys. If a species is determined to be present, its location should be reported to the manager of the appropriate database.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>CAF has a Ph.D.-level biologist on staff to manage ecology and wildlife issues.</p> <p>As part of THP process, an initial database search of the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) is conducted. Surveys are conducted by the biologist and field staff to locate populations of species.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Modifications to management plans are made when an RTE species is located or assumed to be present. Examples include limiting the operational season near wet meadow habitats containing threatened bird species.</p>
<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.</p>	<p>NA</p>	
<p>6.2.d Within the capacity of the forest owner or manager, hunting, fishing, trapping, collecting and other activities are controlled to avoid the risk of impacts to vulnerable species and communities (See Criterion 1.5).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Recreational hunting and fishing does occur on CAF lands. Prevention of collection of RTE species is largely enforced by state government.</p>
<p>6.3. Ecological functions and values shall be maintained intact, enhanced, or restored, including: a) Forest regeneration and succession.</p>	<p>C</p>	

<p>b) Genetic, species, and ecosystem diversity. c) Natural cycles that affect the productivity of the forest ecosystem.</p>		
<p>6.3.a. Landscape-scale indicators</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>CAF’s silviculture practices enhance late-seral stand structure by growing older, large-diameter trees. This focus on maintaining older stands has created an unusual situation for a private forest where early successional forests could be considered under-represented. CAF has addressed this by experimenting with group openings in order to provide some variability in their forest.</p> <p>Examples of other under-represented ecosystems include mountain meadows, which CAF actively maintains through removing encroaching trees.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Rare ecological communities have been identified through the HCVF and RSA processes. Examples include Mud Lake, a large wet meadow, and vernal pools scattered throughout the ownership.</p>
<p>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.</p> <p>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 species, conduct controlled burning, and thinning from below in dry forest types when and where restoration is appropriate).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Approximately 600 acres of Type I and Type II OG forests have been identified and are being managed to maintain their old growth values. Note that some Type II was recently lost as part of a highway expansion.</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 characteristic of forest ecosystems within the landscape.</p>	C	<p>Specific examples include meadow restoration projects for protected species such as sandhill cranes. Their particular style of managed forest also promotes habitat for late seral species. In particular CAF has participated in the fisher relocation project.</p>
<p>6.3.c Management maintains, enhances and/or</p>	C	<p>Riparian zones are strictly maintained that provide</p>

<p>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. 		<p>habitat for aquatic and riparian species. Active wet meadow restoration is taking place through removal of encroaching conifers.</p>
<p>Stand-scale Indicators 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>	<p>C</p>	<p>Silvicultural practices aim at promoting the natural species composition of the site.</p>
<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>	<p>C</p>	<p>Collins’ uneven-aged management reduces the need for planting. When planting is required, seed collected on the forest or nearby sources is used.</p>
<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 the site.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Large live trees are promoted throughout the stand. Snags are maintained for wildlife purposes when they do not pose a safety threat.</p> <p>CAF’s strategy of promoting large trees throughout the stand for eventual harvest makes the legacy tree concept inapplicable, as there are no individual old trees providing a habitat <i>refuge</i>, as envisioned by the definition. The presence of these trees throughout the stand mean that the structural habitat provided by these trees is well distributed.</p>
<p>6.3.g.1 In the Southeast, Appalachia, Ozark-Ouachita, Mississippi Alluvial Valley, and Pacific</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Even-aged silviculture is not practiced, except for cases of salvage in stand replacing fire events. Even</p>

<p>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>		<p>in those cases, surviving trees are maintained when possible.</p>
<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 biology, hydrology, and landscape ecology, to confirm the preceding findings. 	<p>NA</p>	<p>CAF has not pursued this option.</p>
<p>6.3.h The forest owner or manager assesses the</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>After analysis of the issue, invasive species risk was</p>

<p>risk of, prioritizes, and, as warranted, develops and implements a strategy to prevent or control invasive species, including:</p> <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. 		<p>been determined to be low, and thus a comprehensive strategy was not developed. Limited occurrences of invasive species have been addressed in meadow restoration projects.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>A fire risk assessment study was conducted, analyzing areas of the ownership that had higher risk and fuel loading. These areas are targeted for fuels treatment, and have fared better in recent large scale events like the Chips fire.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>6.4.a 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 assessment for medium and large forests include some or all of the following: a) GAP analyses; b) collaboration with state natural heritage programs and other public agencies; c) regional, landscape, and watershed planning efforts; d) collaboration with universities and/or local conservation groups.</p> <p>For an area that is not located on the FMU to qualify as a Representative Sample Area (RSA), it</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>An RSA analysis was produced “Protocol for Selection of Forest Stewardship Council Representative Sample Areas and High Conservation Value Forests for the Collins Almanor Forest”. As part of this process, CAF staff consulted the California Gap Analysis Project, Sierra Nevada Ecosystem Project, and other landscape level conservation efforts. The scope of the analysis was the two counties in which CAF is located, Plumas and Tehama.</p>

<p>should be under permanent protection in its natural state.</p>		
<p>6.4.b Where existing areas within the landscape, but external to the FMU, are not of adequate protection, size, and configuration to serve as representative samples of existing ecosystems, forest owners or managers, whose properties are conducive to the establishment of such areas, designate ecologically viable RSAs to serve these purposes.</p> <p>Large FMUs are generally expected to establish RSAs of purpose 2 and 3 within the FMU.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The RSA identification process resulted in identification of several underrepresented ecosystems such as barren areas, montane chaparral, and aspen. RSAs have been designated on CAF where a deficiency in existing protection areas was noted.</p>
<p>6.4.c Management activities within RSAs are limited to low impact activities compatible with the protected RSA objectives, except under the following circumstances:</p> <p>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</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>In response to CAR 2012.1, the RSA protocols were clarified to state that any management would be limited to low impact activities compatible with protected RSA objectives.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>In response to CAR 2012.2, the RSA protocols were amended to include a statement that they would be revised at a minimum every 10 years. In practice new RSAs are being identified on an ongoing basis.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>NA</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>C</p>	

<p>6.5.a The forest owner or manager has written guidelines outlining conformance with the Indicators of this Criterion.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>CAF has a written Road Management Plan covering the requirements in this criterion.</p>
<p>6.5.b Forest operations meet or exceed Best Management Practices (BMPs) that address components of the Criterion where the operation takes place.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Road management takes state minimum requirements under the forest practices rules as a minimum (California does not have state level BMPs).</p>
<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. 	<p>C</p>	<p>Harvesting sites visited during the audit confirmed that management meets the elements of this indicator. Compaction and soil disturbance on active sites was minimized. No instances of excessive rutting were observed during the audit.</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</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>CAF managers are tracking total number of road miles constructed or reconstructed, and road miles of abandoned. The way the data was presented to the auditors made it appear that road density is increasing, although conversations with staff revealed that this is not the case. OBS 2013.5 was issued.</p>

<p>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 off-road travel, is controlled, as possible, to minimize ecological impacts; • 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 Streamside Management Zone (SMZ) buffer 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	CAF employs streamside buffer zones that comply with the requirements of this indicator. In particular, the dominant use of single tree selection silviculture means all harvesting complies with the requirements for the inner buffer zone.
<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</p>	NA	CAF is not pursuing this option.

<p>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 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.</p>		
<p>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.</p>	C	<p>Crossings are constructed in order to allow movement of aquatic species. CAF road monitoring program evaluates crossings in order to identify areas that require repair.</p>
<p>6.5.g Recreation use on the FMU is managed to avoid negative impacts to soils, water, plants, wildlife and wildlife habitats.</p>	C	<p>Recreation occurs throughout the FMU, and CAF staff manage it when potential impacts arise. In particular, an off-road bike area on forest land near Chester has been a concern due to a nearby eagle nest. After bike paths began to expand closer to the nest, a portion of the area was shut down.</p>
<p>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.</p>	C	<p>Grazing does occur by third parties who own grazing rights on the forest. Impacts have been managed by fencing off riparian habitats in heavy use areas to stimulate recovery of riparian vegetation.</p>
<p>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</p>	C	

<p>pesticides; pesticides that are persistent, toxic or whose derivatives remain biologically active and accumulate in the food chain beyond their intended use; as well as any pesticides banned by international agreement, shall be prohibited. If chemicals are used, proper equipment and training shall be provided to minimize health and environmental risks.</p>		
<p>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).</p>	C	No prohibited chemicals are being used.
<p>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. Whenever feasible, an eventual phase-out of chemical use is included in the strategy. The written strategy shall include an analysis of options for, and the effects of, various chemical and non-chemical pest control strategies, with the goal of reducing or eliminating chemical use.</p>	C	Prior to using chemicals, experimental plots were used to determine whether alternate control methods were available, such as mechanical control. Chemical use was determined to be the only effective means. However, the dominant CAF silvicultural strategy means that openings are small enough that competing vegetation does not pose a large issue.
<p>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-</p>	C	Application is always done by hand spraying. Chemicals are selected to minimize impacts.

target species and sites, the comparative risk of worker exposure, and the overall amount and type of chemicals required.		
<p>6.6.d Whenever chemicals are used, a written prescription is prepared that describes the site-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.</p> <p>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.</p>	NC	Site-specific prescriptions and maps are not produced prior to use of pesticides. CAR 2013.6 was issued.
<p>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.</p>	NC	Monitoring of pesticide use is not occurring with sufficient structure to understand where opportunities exist to decrease use; e.g., whether desired effects can be achieved with lower application levels. CAR 2013.7 was issued.
<p>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.</p>	C	
<p>6.7.a The forest owner or manager, and employees and contractors, have the equipment and training necessary to respond to hazardous spills</p>	C	Staff and contractors have training on handling hazardous spills.
<p>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.</p>	C	No reported spills have occurred since the last audit, but interviews with field staff revealed knowledge of spill clean-up procedures.
<p>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.</p>	C	Hazardous materials are stored outside of riparian zones. No evidence of fuel leaks arose during review of active operations.
<p>6.8. Use of biological control agents shall be</p>	C	

<p>documented, minimized, monitored, and strictly controlled in accordance with national laws and internationally accepted scientific protocols. Use of genetically modified organisms shall be prohibited.</p>		
<p>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.</p>	C	No biological control agents are used.
<p>6.8.b If biological control agents are used, they are applied by trained workers using proper equipment.</p>	NA	
<p>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.</p>	NA	
<p>6.8.d Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) are not used for any purpose</p>	C	No GMOs are used on CAF
<p>6.9. The use of exotic species shall be carefully controlled and actively monitored to avoid adverse ecological impacts.</p>		
<p>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.</p>	C	No exotic species are used on CAF.
<p>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.</p>	NA	
<p>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</p>	NA	

<p>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 Conservation Value Forest areas; and c) Will enable clear, substantial, additional, secure, long-term conservation benefits across the forest management unit.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>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).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>No forest conversion is occurring on CAF.</p>
<p>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).</p>	<p>NA</p>	
<p>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).</p>	<p>NA</p>	
<p>6.10.d Natural or semi-natural stands are not converted to plantations. Degraded, semi-natural stands may be converted to restoration plantations.</p>	<p>NA</p>	
<p>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)</p>	<p>NA</p>	
<p>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</p>	<p>NA</p>	

<p>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 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.</p>		
<p>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.</p>		
<p>7.1. The management plan and supporting documents shall provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Management objectives. b) description of the forest resources to be managed, environmental limitations, land use and ownership status, socio-economic conditions, and a profile of adjacent lands. b. Description of silvicultural and/or other management system, based on the ecology of the forest in question and information gathered through resource inventories. d) Rationale for rate of annual harvest and species selection. e) Provisions for monitoring of forest growth and dynamics. f) Environmental safeguards based on environmental assessments. g) Plans for the identification and protection of rare, threatened and endangered species. b) h) Maps describing the forest resource base including protected areas, planned management activities and land ownership. i) Description and justification of harvesting techniques and equipment to be used. 	<p>C</p>	
<p>7.1.a The management plan identifies the ownership and legal status of the FMU and its resources, including rights held by the owner and rights held by others.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Addressed in management plan summary and SYP</p>

<p>7.1.b The management plan describes the history of land use and past management, current forest types and associated development, size class and/or successional stages, and natural disturbance regimes that affect the FMU (see Indicator 6.1.a).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Addressed in management plan summary and SYP</p>
<p>7.1.c The management plan describes: a) current conditions of the timber and non-timber forest resources being managed; b) desired future conditions; c) historical ecological conditions; and d) applicable management objectives and activities to move the FMU toward desired future conditions.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Extensively covered in SYP</p>
<p>7.1.d The management plan includes a description of the landscape within which the FMU is located and describes how landscape-scale habitat elements described in Criterion 6.3 will be addressed.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Covered in SYP</p>
<p>7.1.e The management plan includes a description of the following resources and outlines activities to conserve and/or protect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • rare, threatened, or endangered species and natural communities (see Criterion 6.2); • plant species and community diversity and wildlife habitats (see Criterion 6.3); • water resources (see Criterion 6.5); • soil resources (see Criterion 6.3); • Representative Sample Areas (see Criterion 6.4); • High Conservation Value Forests (see Principle 9); • Other special management areas. 	<p>C</p>	<p>Requirements covering management of RTE species, plant community diversity, wildlife habitats, water and soil resources are all addressed in the SYP.</p> <p>RSA and HCVF descriptions are contained in the management plan summary and supporting protocol document.</p>
<p>7.1.f If invasive species are present, the management plan describes invasive species conditions, applicable management objectives, and how they will be controlled (see Indicator 6.3.j).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Risk of invasive species has been analyzed as low enough not to warrant a specific management plan.</p>
<p>7.1.g The management plan describes insects and diseases, current or anticipated outbreaks on forest conditions and management goals, and how insects and diseases will be managed (see Criteria 6.6 and 6.8).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Individual THPs discuss pest and pathogen threat.</p>
<p>7.1.h If chemicals are used, the plan describes what</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>A description of chemical use strategies has been</p>

<p>is being used, applications, and how the management system conforms with Criterion 6.6.</p>		<p>prepared for inclusion in THPs, although the audit team found that written prescriptions prior to pesticide use were not being prepared, see 6.6.d</p>
<p>7.1.i If biological controls are used, the management plan describes what is being used, applications, and how the management system conforms with Criterion 6.8.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>No bio-controls are used.</p>
<p>7.1.j The management plan incorporates the results of the evaluation of social impacts, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • traditional cultural resources and rights of use (see Criterion 2.1); • potential conflicts with customary uses and use rights (see Criteria 2.2, 2.3, 3.2); • management of ceremonial, archeological, and historic sites (see Criteria 3.3 and 4.5); • management of aesthetic values (see Indicator 4.4.a); • public access to and use of the forest, and other recreation issues; • local and regional socioeconomic conditions and economic opportunities, including creation and/or maintenance of quality jobs (see Indicators 4.1.b and 4.4.a), local purchasing opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.e), and participation in local development opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.g). 	<p>C</p>	<p>CAF has produced a summary document “Sociological Impacts of the Collins Almanor Forest,” which describes the elements named in this indicator.</p>
<p>7.1.k The management plan describes the general purpose, condition and maintenance needs of the transportation network (see Indicator 6.5.e).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>CAF has a standalone forest roads management plan.</p>
<p>7.1.l The management plan describes the silvicultural and other management systems used and how they will sustain, over the long term, forest ecosystems present on the FMU.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Descriptions of silvicultural systems are briefly presented in the summary management plan, and in more detail in the SYP.</p>
<p>7.1.m The management plan describes how species selection and harvest rate calculations were developed to meet the requirements of Criterion 5.6.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Contained in SYP</p>
<p>7.1.n The management plan includes a description of monitoring procedures necessary to address the requirements of Criterion 8.2.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Summary of monitoring activities is contained in the summary plan.</p>
<p>7.1.o The management plan includes maps</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Maps at various levels of detail are included in</p>

describing the resource base, the characteristics of general management zones, special management areas, and protected areas at a level of detail to achieve management objectives and protect sensitive sites.		management planning documents.
7.1.p The management plan describes and justifies the types and sizes of harvesting machinery and techniques employed on the FMU to minimize or limit impacts to the resource.	C	Description of logging methods and equipment types is described in the summary plan.
7.1.q Plans for harvesting and other significant site-disturbing management activities required to carry out the management plan are prepared prior to implementation. Plans clearly describe the activity, the relationship to objectives, outcomes, any necessary environmental safeguards, health and safety measures, and include maps of adequate detail.	C	Individual Timber Harvest Plans are prepared prior to site-disturbing activities, which lay out objectives, environmental safeguards, and maps at an operational level.
7.1.r The management plan describes the stakeholder consultation process.	C	Opportunities for public comment are described in the summary plan, and occur as part of the THP process.
7.2 The management plan shall be periodically revised to incorporate the results of monitoring or new scientific and technical information, as well as to respond to changing environmental, social and economic circumstances.		
7.2.a The management plan is kept up to date. It is reviewed on an ongoing basis and is updated whenever necessary to incorporate the results of monitoring or new scientific and technical information, as well as to respond to changing environmental, social and economic circumstances. At a minimum, a full revision occurs every 10 years.	C	Management plans are kept periodically up to date. Currently CAF is revising its Sustained Yield Plan for approval by the state in 2014.
7.3 Forest workers shall receive adequate training and supervision to ensure proper implementation of the management plans.		
7.3.a Workers are qualified to properly implement the management plan; All forest workers are provided with sufficient guidance and supervision to adequately implement their respective components of the plan.	C	Interviews with staff indicated that training was occurring, both on-boarding for newer employees and continuing education for more experienced staff. However, training records of employee training/education activities are not being kept. OBS 2013.8 was issued.

<p>7.4 While respecting the confidentiality of information, forest managers shall make publicly available a summary of the primary elements of the management plan, including those listed in Criterion 7.1.</p>		
<p>7.4.a While respecting landowner confidentiality, the management plan or a management plan summary that outlines the elements of the plan described in Criterion 7.1 is available to the public either at no charge or a nominal fee.</p>	C	Public summary of the CAF management plan is available on the Collins website.
<p>7.4.b Managers of public forests make draft management plans, revisions and supporting documentation easily accessible for public review and comment prior to their implementation. Managers address public comments and modify the plans to ensure compliance with this Standard.</p>	NA	
<p>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></p>		
<p>8.1 The frequency and intensity of monitoring should be determined by the scale and intensity of forest management operations, as well as, the relative complexity and fragility of the affected environment. Monitoring procedures should be consistent and replicable over time to allow comparison of results and assessment of change.</p>		
<p>8.1.a Consistent with the scale and intensity of management, the forest owner or manager develops and consistently implements a regular, comprehensive, and replicable written monitoring protocol.</p>	C	CAF employs a variety of monitoring techniques based on the applicable resource being monitored. Monitoring techniques follow established protocols, such as the CFI plots for forest inventory, and road surveys for the transportation network.
<p>8.2. Forest management should include the research and data collection needed to monitor, at a minimum, the following indicators: a) yield of all forest products harvested, b) growth rates, regeneration, and condition of the forest, c) composition and observed changes in the flora and fauna, d) environmental and social impacts of harvesting and other operations, and e) cost, productivity, and efficiency of forest management.</p>	C	

<p>8.2.a.1 For all commercially harvested products, an inventory system is maintained. The inventory system includes at a minimum: a) species, b) volumes, c) stocking, d) regeneration, and e) stand and forest composition and structure; and f) timber quality.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>A continuous forest inventory system is set up to capture traditional timber growth and yield information, including species, volume, stocking, etc.</p>
<p>8.2.a.2 Significant, unanticipated removal or loss or increased vulnerability of forest resources is monitored and recorded. Recorded information shall include date and location of occurrence, description of disturbance, extent and severity of loss, and may be both quantitative and qualitative.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Loss of this type occurs most frequently due to fires. When fires occur on CAF, impacts are evaluated in detail and incorporated into inventory calculations.</p>
<p>8.2.b The forest owner or manager maintains records of harvested timber and NTFPs (volume and product and/or grade). Records must adequately ensure that the requirements under Criterion 5.6 are met.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Detailed records of timber removal are kept and required under state law for tax purposes.</p>
<p>8.2.c The forest owner or manager periodically obtains data needed to monitor presence on the FMU of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6) Rare, threatened and endangered species and/or their <i>habitats</i>; 7) Common and rare plant communities and/or habitat; 8) Location, presence and abundance of invasive species; 9) Condition of protected areas, set-asides and buffer zones; 10) High Conservation Value Forests (see Criterion 9.4). 	<p>C</p>	<p>The primary method for monitoring these elements occurs during the timber harvest planning process. While setting up harvesting plans, the biologist and other field staff survey areas for signs of RTE species, and update their locations if found.</p> <p>A complete habitat typing of the forest under the California Wildlife Habitat System (CWHR) occurred in 1994, which mapped plant communities on the forest. This typing is updated during CFI and preharvest reviews.</p> <p>Monitoring of water quality protection measures occur on a routine basis as part of harvest inspections.</p> <p>HCVF and RSA areas have their own monitoring protocols described in the HCVF document, with different monitoring regimes applied based on the identified habitat type.</p>
<p>8.2.d.1 Monitoring is conducted to ensure that site specific plans and operations are properly implemented, environmental impacts of site disturbing operations are minimized, and that harvest prescriptions and guidelines are effective.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Ongoing monitoring of timber harvest operations occurs. Stakeholder interviews noted that CAF foresters are on-site during operations significantly more frequently than compared to other landowners.</p>

<p>8.2.d.2 A monitoring program is in place to assess the condition and environmental impacts of the forest-road system.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The road management plan includes a standard annual monitoring requirement. Audit team reviewed the “CAF Roads Management Plan Verification Element – 2012” which detailed maintenance activities and updates to the road system.</p>
<p>8.2.d.3 The landowner or manager monitors relevant socio-economic issues (see Indicator 4.4.a), including the social impacts of harvesting, participation in local economic opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.g), the creation and/or maintenance of quality job opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.b), and local purchasing opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.e).</p>	<p>NC</p>	<p>CAF managers were not able to demonstrate that the socio-economic effects of their management activities on the CAF are being monitored. CAR 2013.9 was issued.</p>
<p>8.2.d.4 Stakeholder responses to management activities are monitored and recorded as necessary.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Stakeholder comments are recorded as part of the public notice process in the THP and SYP process. Comments are also recorded when comments are made on the CAF website.</p>
<p>8.2.d.5 Where sites of cultural significance exist, the opportunity to jointly monitor sites of cultural significance is offered to tribal representatives (see Principle 3).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Opportunity for joint monitoring has been provided as part of THP notice process, although such monitoring has not taken place.</p>
<p>8.2.e The forest owner or manager monitors the costs and revenues of management in order to assess productivity and efficiency.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Collins managers maintain standard cost and revenue information to assess the financial viability of the operation.</p>
<p>8.3 Documentation shall be provided by the forest manager to enable monitoring and certifying organizations to trace each forest product from its origin, a process known as the "chain of custody."</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>8.3.a When forest products are being sold as FSC-certified, the forest owner or manager has a system that prevents mixing of FSC-certified and non-certified forest products prior to the point of sale, with accompanying documentation to enable the tracing of the harvested material from each harvested product from its origin to the point of sale.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>CAF has a CoC system designed to track logs and prevent mixing of uncertified material. The risk for this mixing is low, as the entire forest is certified.</p>
<p>8.3.b The forest owner or manager maintains documentation to enable the tracing of the harvested material from each harvested product from its origin to the point of sale.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Log load tickets are used to identify the origin of harvested material. Unique tracking numbers are assigned to each timber sale.</p>

<p>8.4 The results of monitoring shall be incorporated into the implementation and revision of the management plan.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>8.4.a The forest owner or manager monitors and documents the degree to which the objectives stated in the management plan are being fulfilled, as well as significant deviations from the plan.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>An annual monitoring and accomplishments report is produced, which sums the monitoring activities undertaken in order to compare them against the plan.</p>
<p>8.4.b Where monitoring indicates that management objectives and guidelines, including those necessary for conformance with this Standard, are not being met or if changing conditions indicate that a change in management strategy is necessary, the management plan, operational plans, and/or other plan implementation measures are revised to ensure the objectives and guidelines will be met. If monitoring shows that the management objectives and guidelines themselves are not sufficient to ensure conformance with this Standard, then the objectives and guidelines are modified.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Monitoring results are incorporated into revisions of the management plan. One present example is how the results of past monitoring are being incorporated into the draft SYP currently being prepared.</p>
<p>8.5 While respecting the confidentiality of information, forest managers shall make publicly available a summary of the results of monitoring indicators, including those listed in Criterion 8.2.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>8.5.a While protecting landowner confidentiality, either full monitoring results or an up-to-date summary of the most recent monitoring information is maintained, covering the Indicators listed in Criterion 8.2, and is available to the public, free or at a nominal price, upon request.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>An annual summary document has been prepared and is available upon request.</p>
<p>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.</p> <p>High Conservation Value Forests are those that possess one or more of the following attributes:</p> <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).

Examples of forest areas that *may have* high conservation value attributes include, but are not limited to:

Central Hardwoods:

- Old growth – (see Glossary) (a)
- Old forests/mixed age stands that include trees >160 years old (a)
- Municipal watersheds –headwaters, reservoirs (c)
- Rare, Threatened, and Endangered (RTE) ecosystems, as defined by GAP analysis, Natural Heritage Inventory, and/or the World Wildlife Fund’s Forest Communities of Highest Conservation Concern, and/or Great Lakes Assessment (b)
- Intact forest blocks in an agriculturally dominated landscape (refugia) (a)
- Intact forests >1000 ac (valuable to interior forest species) (a)
- Protected caves (a, b, or d)
- Savannas (a, b, c, or d)
- Glades (a, b, or d)
- Barrens (a, b, or d)
- Prairie remnants (a, b, or d)

North Woods/Lake States:

- Old growth – (see Glossary) (a)
- Old forests/mixed age stands that include trees >120 years old (a)
- Blocks of contiguous forest, > 500 ac, which host RTEs (b)
- Oak savannas (b)
- Hemlock-dominated forests (b)
- Pine stands of natural origin (b)
- Contiguous blocks, >500 ac, of late successional species, that are managed to create old growth (a)
- Fens, particularly calcareous fens (c)
- Other non-forest communities, e.g., barrens, prairies, distinctive geological land forms, vernal pools (b or c)
- Other sites as defined by GAP analysis, Natural Heritage Inventory, and/or the World Wildlife Fund’s Forest Communities of Highest Conservation Concern (b)

Note: In the Lake States-Central Hardwoods region, old growth (see Glossary) is both rare and invariably an HCVF.

In the Lake States-Central Hardwoods region, cutting timber is not permitted in old-growth stands or forests.

Note: Old forests (see Glossary) may or may not be designated HCVFs. They are managed to maintain or recruit: (1) the existing abundance of old trees and (2) the landscape- and stand-level structures of old-growth forests, consistent with the composition and structures produced by natural processes.

Old forests that either have or are developing old-growth attributes, but which have been previously harvested, may be designated HCVFs and may be harvested under special plans that account for the ecological attributes that make it an HCVF.

Forest management maintains a mix of sub-climax and climax old-forest conditions in the landscape.

9.1 Assessment to determine the presence of the

C

<p>attributes consistent with High Conservation Value Forests will be completed, appropriate to scale and intensity of forest management.</p>		
<p>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.</p> <p>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 requirements for legacy trees in Indicator 6.3.f.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>HCVF forests have been identified according to the HCVF classifications set out by the FSC. see <i>Protocol for selection of HCVF on Collins Almanor Forest.</i></p>
<p>9.1.b In developing the assessment, the forest owner or manager consults with qualified specialists, independent experts, and local community members who may have knowledge of areas that meet the definition of HCVs.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>HCV areas were determined in consultation with state databases such as the CA GAP and CNDDDB, and relevant independent experts and specialists including as local NGOs, regulatory agencies, university staff.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>A summary of HCVF areas is found in the public management plan summary available of the CAF website.</p>
<p>9.2 The consultative portion of the certification process must place emphasis on the identified conservation attributes, and options for the maintenance thereof.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>HCV areas were determined in consultation with state databases such as the CA GAP and CNDDDB, and relevant independent experts and specialists including as local NGOs, regulatory agencies, university staff.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>NA</p>	

<p>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.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>In HCVF Protocols document, management recommendations and precautions are described for each identified HCVF type.</p>
<p>9.3.b All management activities in HCVFs must maintain or enhance the high conservation values and the extent of the HCVF.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>When management activities are proposed for HCVF areas, they are done in a way to at a minimum maintain the HCVF value.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Outreach has been done in cases of HCVF areas that cross ownerships. One example includes the mud lake wet meadow, where ownership is shared with SPI. Efforts were made to coordinate restoration activities, although the interest from the neighboring owner was low.</p>
<p>9.4 Annual monitoring shall be conducted to assess the effectiveness of the measures employed to maintain or enhance the applicable conservation attributes.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>HCVF monitoring takes a variety of forms. Photo point monitoring is used for some HCVF areas. Forest inventory data captures the HCVs that are found within the normal stands. When harvesting or other activities occur in HCVF areas, normal post-harvest monitoring procedures are employed.</p>
<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.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>This situation has not occurred yet, but the HCVF protocol includes a possibility that management measures will be adjusted based on results of monitoring.</p>
<p>Principle #10: Plantations shall be planned and managed in accordance with Principles and Criteria 1-9, and Principle 10 and its Criteria. While plantations can provide an array of social and economic benefits,</p>		

and can contribute to satisfying the world's needs for forest products, they should complement the management of, reduce pressures on, and promote the restoration and conservation of natural forests.

As Collins Almanor Forest's management practices do not meet the definition of a plantation, this principle is inapplicable.

Appendix 6 – Tracking, Tracing and Identification of Certified Products

SCS FSC Chain of Custody Indicators for Forest Management Enterprises, Version 5-0

REQUIREMENT	C/NC	COMMENT / CAR
1. Quality Management		
1.1 The organization shall appoint a management representative as having overall responsibility and authority for the organization’s compliance with all applicable requirements of this standard.	C	Jay Francis has responsibility for the CoC system.
1.2 The FME shall maintain complete records of all FSC-related COC activities, including sales and training, for at least 5 years.	C	Sales documentation and records are maintained.
1.3 The FME shall define its forest gate(s) (check all that apply): <i>The forest gate is defined as the point where the change in ownership of the certified-forest product occurs.</i>		<p>Stump <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Stumpage sale or sales of standing timber; transfer of ownership of certified-forest product occurs upon harvest.</i></p> <p>On-site concentration yard <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Transfer of ownership of certified-product occurs at concentration yard under control of FME.</i></p> <p>Off-site Mill / Log Yard <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Transfer of ownership occurs when certified-product is unloaded at purchaser’s facility.</i></p> <p>Auction house / Brokerage <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Transfer of ownership occurs at a government-run or private auction house / brokerage.</i></p> <p>Lump-sum sale / Per Unit / Pre-Paid <input type="checkbox"/> Agreement <i>A timber sale in which the buyer and seller agree on a total price for marked standing trees or for trees within a defined area before the wood is removed — the timber is usually paid for before harvesting begins. Similar to a per-unit sale.</i></p> <p>Log landing <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Transfer of ownership of certified-product occurs at landing / yarding areas.</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other (Please describe):</p>

<p>1.4 The FME shall have sufficient control over its forest gate(s) to ensure that there is no risk of mixing of FSC-certified forest products covered by the scope of the FM/COC certificate with forest products from outside of the scope prior to the transfer of ownership.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>CAF uses a paint and brand hammer system to individually mark logs coming from them forest. Each log load has a unique tracking code that enables it to be traced to a particular sale.</p>
<p>1.5 The FME and its contractors shall not process FSC-certified material prior to transfer of ownership at the forest gate without conforming to applicable chain of custody requirements. <i>NOTE: This does not apply to log cutting or debarking units, small portable sawmills or on-site processing of chips / biomass originating from the FMU under evaluation.</i></p>	<p>C</p>	<p>No processing occurs within the FMU.</p>
<p>2. Product Control, Sales and Delivery</p>		
<p>2.1. Products from the certified forest area shall be identifiable as certified at the forest gate(s).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>All logs coming from CAF forest are certified, and identified as such based on the log brands and trip ticket system.</p>
<p>2.2 The FME shall maintain records of quantities / volumes of FSC-certified product(s).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Records of harvested volume are maintained.</p>
<p>2.3. The FME shall ensure that all sales documents issued for outputs sold with FSC claims include the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) name and contact details of the organization; b) name and address of the customer; c) date when the document was issued; d) description of the product; e) quantity of the products sold; f) the organization’s FSC Forest Management (FM/COC) or FSC Controlled Wood (CW/FM) code; g) clear indication of the FSC claim for each product item or the total products as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the claim “FSC 100%” for products from FSC 100% product groups; ii. the claim “FSC Controlled Wood” for products from FSC Controlled Wood product groups. h) If separate transport documents are 	<p>C</p>	<p>See 2.4</p>

<p>issued, information sufficient to link the sales document and related transport documentation to each other.</p>		
<p>2.4 The FME shall include the same information as required in 2.3 in the related delivery documentation, if the sales document (or copy of it) is not included with the shipment of the product. Note: 2.3 and 2.4 above are based on FSC-STD-40-004 V2-1 Clause 6.1.1 and 6.1.2</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>CAF is using this exemption. Load tickets that travel with the loads have unique identifying numbers tying them to sales documentation, which includes all the required information in section 2.3.</p>
<p>2.5 When the FME has demonstrated it is not able to include the required FSC claim as specified above in 6.1.1 and 6.1.2 in sales and delivery documents due to space constraints, through an exception, SCS can approve the required information to be provided through supplementary evidence (e.g. supplementary letters, a link to the own company’s webpage with verifiable product information). This practice is only acceptable when SCS is satisfied that the supplementary method proposed by the FME complies with the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) There is no risk that the customer will misinterpret which products are or are not FSC certified in the document; b) The sales and delivery documents contain visible and understandable information so that the customer is aware that the full FSC claim is provided through supplementary evidence; c) In cases where the sales and delivery documents contain multiple products with different FSC Claims, a clear identification for each product shall be included to cross-reference it with the associated FSC claim provided in the supplementary evidence. <p><i>FSC-ADVICE-40-004-05</i></p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Chance of misinterpreting which material is certified or not certified is legible. The entire CAF estate is certified as FSC 100%, so loads coming from this forest would never be in a position of having logs with different claims in the same load. Most harvested logs are delivered to Collins own mill, which has its own CoC systems in place.</p>
<p>3. Labeling and Promotion</p>		<p><input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>
<p>3.1 Describe where / how the organization uses the SCS and FSC trademarks for promotion.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Collins uses the FSC and SCS trademarks widely on their website and other marketing materials.</p>

3.2 The FME shall request authorization from SCS to use the FSC on-product labels and/or FSC trademarks for promotional use.	NC	Collins is not regularly asking for approval from SCS for use of FSC or SCS trademarks. The Collins website contains a non-conforming logo in the footer of its webpage. CAR 2013.10 was issued.
3.3 Records of SCS and/or FSC trademark use authorizations shall be made available upon request.	NC	See 3.2
4. Outsourcing		<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
4.1 The FME shall provide the names and contact details of all outsourced service providers.	C	Logging and trucking is outsourced, and details were reviewed during the audit.
4.2 The FME shall have a control system for the outsourced process which ensures that: a) The material used for the production of FSC-certified material is traceable and not mixed with any other material prior to the point of transfer of legal ownership; b) The outsourcer keeps records of FSC-certified material covered under the outsourcing agreement; c) The FME issues the final invoice for the processed or produced FSC-certified material following outsourcing; d) The outsourcer only uses FSC trademarks on products covered by the scope of the outsourcing agreement and not for promotional use.	C	CAF presented evidence of outsourcing contracts with their logger contractors that include requirements listed here.
5. Training and/or Communication Strategies		
5.1 All relevant FME staff and outsourcers shall be trained in the FME's COC control system commensurate with the scale and intensity of operations and shall demonstrate competence in implementing the FME's COC control system.	C	Informal training on CoC procedures occurs, although this could be formalized as part of an overall training program.
5.2 The FME shall maintain up-to-date records of its COC training and/or communications program, such as a list of trained employees, completed COC trainings, the intended frequency of COC training (i.e. training plan), and related program materials (e.g., presentations, memos, contracts, employee handbooks, etc).	NC	Training records are not being kept. CAR 2013.11 was issued.

Appendix 7 – Peer Review and SCS Evaluation Team Response to Peer Review

N/A; Re-certification Evaluation.

Appendix 8 – SLIMF Eligibility Criteria

An FMU qualifies as a 'SLIMF' if it is either a 'small' FMU OR managed as a 'low intensity' FMU. Any SLIMF FMU under the scope of the FME under evaluation must meet at least one of the following criteria:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A – none of the FMU(s) under evaluation qualify as a SLIMF according to the criteria below.	
<input type="checkbox"/> 'Small' FMU(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> The scope of the certificate includes FMU(s) of 100 ha (247 acres) or less.
	<input type="checkbox"/> The scope of the certificate includes FMU(s) located in a country for which the definition for maximum size of "small" is larger than 100 ha (247 acres), but does not exceed 1,000 ha (2,471 acres).
	<input type="checkbox"/> The scope of the certificate includes FMU(s) of 1000 ha (2,471 acres) or less where there is no FSC-accredited national initiative and the national stakeholders support the larger size-limit proposed by the certification body.
<input type="checkbox"/> 'Low intensity' FMU(s) – The scope of the certificate includes FMU(s) in which the rate of harvest is less than 20% of the mean annual increment (MAI) AND these FMUs meet one of the following additional criteria:	<input type="checkbox"/> The annual harvest from the total production forest area is less than 5000 cubic meters (2.1 million board feet).
	<input type="checkbox"/> The average annual harvest from the total production forest is less than 5000 m ³ / year (2.1 million board feet / year) during the period of validity of the certificate as verified by harvest reports and surveillance audits.