

**Forest Management and Stump-to-Forest Gate Chain-of-Custody  
Pilot Test Certification Evaluation Report for the:**

**Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit**

**Conducted under auspices of the SCS Forest Conservation Program  
SCS is an FSC Accredited Certification Body**

**Submitted to:**

**USDA Forest Service  
Lakeview, Oregon**

**Lead Auditor: Robert J. Hrubes, Ph.D.**

**Date of Field Audit: June 6-9, 2006**

**Date of Report: Draft- August 10, 2006; Final- February 2, 2007**

**By:**

**SCIENTIFIC CERTIFICATION SYSTEMS  
2200 Powell St. Suite Number 725  
Emeryville, CA 94608, USA  
[www.scs-certified.com](http://www.scs-certified.com)**

**SCS Contact: Dave Wager [dwager@scs-certified.com](mailto:dwager@scs-certified.com)  
Client Contact: Jerry Haugen [jhaugen@fs.fed.us](mailto:jhaugen@fs.fed.us)**

This report contains the results of a special pilot evaluation of the Lakeview FSU as part of a multi-unit pilot study undertaken by the USDA Forest Service to better understand the process and implications of forest management certification. **Award of certification was not a possible outcome of this pilot evaluation.**

This report 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 B contains more detailed results and information and is made available only to the client, who is free to make it publicly available if they choose to do so.

## **FOREWORD**

Scientific Certification Systems, a certification body accredited by the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC), was retained by the Pinchot Institute for Conservation to conduct a pilot study (simulated certification evaluation) of the USDA Forest Service management of the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit (LFSU). The goal of the case study was to provide the Forest Service with a better understanding of the certification process and how their management aligns with the FSC standards for responsible forestry. By pre-arranged agreement, the test cannot result in the possible award of certification.

In June 2006, an interdisciplinary team of natural resource specialists was empanelled by SCS to conduct the evaluation. The team collected and analyzed written materials, conducted interviews, and completed a 4 day field and office audit of the subject property as part of the certification evaluation. Upon completion of the fact-finding phase of the evaluation, the team evaluated conformance to the 56 FSC Criteria.

The report below details the process that was undertaken and the audit team's findings. Of particular interest, the report identifies several non-conformances relative to the FSC Pacific Coast Regional Standard. As well, the report discusses identified non-conformances relative to a set of "additional considerations" that were developed through a consultative process by SCS prior to the field audit. These "additional considerations" attempt to anticipate what might be promulgated by the FSC as supplemental indicators applicable to National Forest management. That is, in the event that a bona fide certification evaluation were to be conducted on the Lakeview FSU (or any other National Forest System unit), the certification standard would entail both a pertinent FSC regional standard as well as a set of endorsed supplemental indicators applicable to the management of National Forests.

Foreword.....	3
Section A- Public Summary and Background Information .....	6
1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION.....	6
1.1 FSC Data Request.....	6
1.2 Management Context.....	7
1.2.1 Environmental Context.....	8
1.2.2 Socioeconomic Context .....	8
1.3 Forest Management Enterprise .....	9
1.3.1 Land Use .....	9
1.3.2 Land Outside Scope of Evaluation .....	9
1.4 Management Plan.....	9
1.4.1 Management Objectives.....	10
1.4.2 Forest Composition.....	11
1.4.3 Silvicultural Systems .....	11
1.4.4 Management Systems .....	12
1.4.5 Monitoring System.....	12
1.4.6 Estimate of Maximum Sustainable Yield .....	13
1.4.7 Estimated, Current and Projected Production.....	13
1.4.8 Chemical Pesticide Use.....	14
2.0 Guidelines/Standards Employed.....	14
3.0 THE CERTIFICATION ASSESSMENT PROCESS.....	14
3.1 Assessment Dates.....	14
3.2 Assessment Team.....	15
3.3 Assessment Process .....	17
3.3.1 Itinerary.....	17
3.3.2 Stakeholder Consultation.....	21
3.4 Total Time Spent on audit.....	25
3.5 Process of Determining Conformance .....	25
4.0 Results of the Evaluation .....	26
Table 4.1 Notable strengths and weaknesses of the forest management enterprise relative to the P&C.....	26
4.2 Preconditions.....	33
4.3 Initial Corrective Action Requests.....	34
5.0 Certification Decision .....	38
5.1 Certification Recommendation .....	39
6.0 Surveillance Evaluations.....	39
Section B Detailed Results of the Full Evaluation.....	40
1.0 Detailed Evaluation of Conformance.....	40
1.1 Evaluation of Additional Considerations.....	74
1.2 Controversial Issues .....	78
2.0 TRACKING, TRACING AND IDENTIFICATION OF FOREST PRODUCTS .....	78
Appendix 1 Forest Service Statues .....	79
Appendix 2 Preliminary Evaluation Report .....	85
Introduction.....	86
Format Used to Address Assessment Issues.....	87

SCS Background Information.....	88
Summary of Events.....	88
Format of Findings.....	91
Findings.....	92
General Overview .....	92
Findings Relative to the FSC P&C/Pacific Coast Regional Standard .....	93
FSC Principle 1: Compliance with Laws and FSC Principles.....	94
FSC Principle 2: Tenure and Use Rights and Responsibilities.....	95
FSC Principle 3: Indigenous Peoples’ Rights.....	96
FSC Principle 5: Benefits from the Forest.....	98
FSC Principle 6: Environmental Impact.....	100
FSC Principle 8: Monitoring and Assessment.....	105
FSC Principle 9: Maintenance of High Conservation Value Forests .....	106
FSC Principle 10: Plantations .....	107
Final Comments .....	113

## SECTION A- PUBLIC SUMMARY AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION

### 1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION

#### 1.1 FSC Data Request

Applicant entity	USDA Forest Service – Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit
Contact person	Jerry Haugen, Environmental Coordinator/Planner, Fremont-Winema National Forest
Address	1301 South G Street Lakeview, OR 97630
Telephone	541-947-2151
E-mail	<a href="mailto:jhaugen@fs.fed.us">jhaugen@fs.fed.us</a>
Certificate Type	Single FMU
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	491,860 ac
Location of certified forest area	
Latitude	42:10:23N
Longitude	120:20:51W
Forest zone	Temperate
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is included in FMUs that:	
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
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is:	
privately managed <sup>1</sup>	0
government managed	491,860 ac
community managed <sup>2</sup>	0
Number of forest workers (including contractors) working in forest within scope of certificate	395
Area of forest and non-forest land protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for conservation objectives	82,100 ac
Area of forest protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for the production of NTFPs or services	0
Area of forest classified as 'high conservation value forest'	82,100 ac
List of high conservation values present <sup>3</sup>	Yet to be determined
Chemical pesticides used	See section 1.4.8
Total area of production forest (i.e. forest from which timber may be harvested)	390,000 ac

---

<sup>1</sup> The category of 'private management' includes state owned forests that are leased to private companies for management, e.g. through a concession system.

<sup>2</sup> A community managed forest management unit is one in which the management and use of the forest and tree resources is controlled by local communities.

<sup>3</sup> High conservation values should be classified following the numbering system given in the ProForest High Conservation Value Forest Toolkit (2003) available at [www.ProForest.net](http://www.ProForest.net)

Area of production forest regenerated primarily by replanting <sup>4</sup>	0 (Burned areas are replanted; all other silvicultural prescriptions rely on natural regeneration)
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by natural regeneration	390,000 ac
List of main commercial timber and non-timber species included in scope of certificate (botanical name and common trade name)	Ponderosa pine ( <i>Pinus ponderosa</i> ), white fir ( <i>Abies concolor</i> ), lodgepole pine ( <i>Pinus contorta ssp. murrayana</i> )
Approximate annual allowable cut (AAC) of commercial timber	55.5 mmbf total (43.9 mmbf Ponderosa Pine)

## Conversion Table English Units to Metric Units

### Length Conversion Factors

<u>To convert from</u>	<u>to</u>	<u>multiply by</u>
mile (US Statute)	kilometer (km)	1.609347
foot (ft)	meter (m)	0.3048
yard (yd)	meter (m)	0.9144

### Area Conversion Factors

<u>To convert from</u>	<u>to</u>	<u>multiply by</u>
square foot (sq ft)	square meter (sq m)	0.09290304
acre (ac)	hectare (ha)	0.4047

### Volume Conversion Factors

#### Volume

<u>To convert from</u>	<u>to</u>	<u>multiply by</u>
cubic foot (cu ft)	cubic meter (cu m)	0.02831685
gallon (gal)	liter	4.546

1 acre	= 0.404686 hectares
1,000 acres	= 404.686 hectares
1 board foot	= 0.00348 cubic meters
1,000 board feet	= 3.48 cubic meters
1 cubic foot	= 0.028317 cubic meters
1,000 cubic feet	= 28.317 cubic meters

Breast height = 1.4 meters, or 4 1/2 feet, above ground level

Although 1,000 board feet is theoretically equivalent to 2.36 cubic meters, this is true only when a board foot is actually a piece of wood with a volume 1/12 of cubic foot. The conversion given here, 3.48 cubic meters, is based on the cubic volume of a log 16 feet long and 15 inches in diameter inside bark at the small end.

## 1.2 Management Context

As part of the Fremont-Winema National Forest, management of Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit is subject to a host of federal regulations. The principal regulations of greatest relevance to forest managers in Oregon are associated with the following statutes:

- National Environmental Policy Act
- Endangered Species Act
- Clean Water Act

<sup>4</sup> The area is the *total* area being regenerated primarily by planting, *not* the area which is replanted annually. NB this area may be different to the area defined as a 'plantation' for the purpose of calculating the Annual Accreditation Fee (AAF) or for other purposes.

- National Forest Management Act
- Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act
- Wilderness Act
- Wild and Scenic Rivers Act
- Organic Act
- CFR, Title 7

For a complete list of federal statutes applying to National Forest Management, see Appendix 1. Forest Service activities are also governed through administrative requirements such as the Forest Service Manual and Forest Service Handbooks.

### **1.2.1 Environmental Context**

The Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit (FSU), or “the Unit,” is an administrative unit lying within the Fremont National Forest, located in south central Oregon, beginning at the Oregon-California border. The Unit’s eastern boundary includes part of the Warner Mountains, a fault-block mountain range overlooking Nevada’s Great Basin Desert. The Unit is bounded by National Forests to the north and west.

Lying within the rain shadow created by the Cascades, this predominately mature forest is characterized by drought-tolerant tree species such as juniper and ponderosa pine, although abundant stands of white fir and lodgepole pine also occur at higher elevations. Roughly 44,000 acres of the Fremont National Forest have been specifically designated as Old-Growth, and part of the Gearhart Mountain Wilderness area also falls within the Unit.

The Unit is an important source of water for the agricultural lands and municipalities located in the surrounding, relatively arid valleys. Numerous small lakes, wetlands, springs, and stockponds and reservoirs also occur on the Unit.

Several threatened and endangered species can be found on the forest, including bald eagles, spotted owls, spotted frogs, Lost River, shortnose, and Warner suckers, bull trout, and pumice grape fern. Other major animal species on the forest include mule deer, black bear, mountain lion, Rocky mountain elk, and pronghorn antelope.

### **1.2.2 Socioeconomic Context**

Lake County, in which most of the Unit is located, is one of Oregon’s least populated areas. While it is one of Oregon’s largest counties, it has a population density of less than 0.9 persons per square mile based on the 2000 census. Lakeview, population 2,474 is the county seat and largest town. Forest products, agriculture, and, increasingly, outdoor recreation are the main economic drivers of the small, scattered communities in the county, although a new state prison in Lakeview has caused a recent influx of government jobs.

The Lakeview Federal Sustained Yield Unit was established on the Fremont National Forest in 1950. The Unit is an administrative designation of Forest lands, encompassing roughly the

eastern 40 percent of the Forest. The objective of the Unit is to maintain the economic stability of the community by requiring that all timber from the Unit be offered for sale first to purchasers who will process the timber within the unit. Currently there is only one purchaser of timber products in the Unit, the Collin's Pine Fremont Sawmill in Lakeview. The Unit was reauthorized in 2001 as the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit, with a focus on restoration oriented goals instead of purely timber production.

The Native American Tribe most active in the region is the Klamath Tribes, a federally recognized tribe comprised of the Klamath, Modoc, and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians. However, the Klamath Tribes are not particularly active on the Unit itself, preferring to stay involved with the Winema side of National Forest (which includes land of their former tribal reservation).

### **1.3 Forest Management Enterprise**

#### **1.3.1 Land Use**

The Lakeview FSU is a subset of the Fremont-Winema National Forest. The Fremont National Forest itself is one of the oldest national forests, having been established in 1906. By federal mandate, national forests are required to be managed for multiple uses, including timber, recreation, wildlife habitat, water, minerals, wilderness, non-timber forest product gathering, and other uses. These land use activities are all present to varying degrees on the unit. As with many National Forests, grazing was the primary economic activity early in the Fremont's history, and continues to be a major aspect of its modern land use. Timber production is no longer the primary land use objective on the forest. The creation of the Federal Stewardship Unit redefined the land management goals around ecosystem restoration, watershed management, and community benefits.

#### **1.3.2 Land Outside of the Scope of Evaluation**

The Lakeview FSU is a subset of the Fremont-Winema National Forest, which is in turn part of the United States Department of Agriculture's National Forest system. The Fremont and the adjacent Winema National Forests were administratively joined in 2002, but the area under the scope of the evaluation is entirely within the former Fremont National Forest. This evaluation considered only the management of the Lakeview FSU, not the entire Fremont-Winema National Forest. This decision was made primarily to reflect the Unit's unique restoration focus and level of community involvement. Forest Service staff believed that the Unit represents a way to focus on "what is going right" in the National Forest system.

### **1.4 Management Plan**

The "management plan" for the Lakeview Unit is, on a de facto basis, comprised of a collection or body of numerous documents, some more current than others, associated with an array of planning processes at multiple spatial and temporal scales, some of which

represent integrated plans for defined land units while other planning processes are focused on single issues, topics or uses.

The primary overarching management planning document is the Fremont Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (1989). While the original plan is now over 15 years old, over 25 amendments have been made (most recently in 2005) in an effort to adapt the plan to new information and changing circumstances. The plan is scheduled to undergo a revision which will reflect the administrative joining of the Fremont and the Winema. Current estimates place the timeline for a completed combined plan in 2010. The Lakeview Unit itself is also guided by the “Long Range Strategy for the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit,” prepared by the Lakeview Stewardship Group in 2005.

The next level of management planning consists of watershed assessments, which break the forest into planning watersheds in order to identify key issues and offer management suggestions at a smaller scale. Actual “on the ground” management is covered by NEPA planning documents (e.g., Environmental Assessments, Environmental Impact Statements, Categorical Exclusions (CE)) prepared prior to commencement of land management activities.

#### **1.4.1 Management Objectives**

As stated in the Long Range Strategy for the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit, the management objectives are as follows:

- 1) Sustain and restore a healthy, diverse, and resilient forest ecosystem that can accommodate human and natural disturbances.
  - Restore stand-maintenance fire regimes where they historically occurred.
  - Maintain and restore habitat for focal species.
  - Sustain and restore healthy soils.
  - Restore forest conditions that approximate historical species composition and stand ages.
  - Eliminate, where possible, and control the spread of invasive, non-native species (especially noxious weeds).
- 2) Sustain and restore the land’s capacity to absorb, store, and distribute quality water.
  - Manage upland vegetation to maintain and restore water and moisture absorption, retention, and release capacity over time.
  - Reduce road density and improve remaining roads to minimize impacts on water quality and flow.
  - Maintain and improve aquatic and riparian habitat for native species.
  - Lower stream temperature and sediment loads.
  - Improve biophysical structure of soils.
- 3) Provide opportunities for people to realize their material, spiritual, and recreational values and relationships with the forest.
  - Provide opportunities for local people to realize economic benefits from innovative

contractual mechanisms and technologies focused on linking stewardship activities and community well-being.

- Pursue compensation of local workers at a state-average family wage or higher to accomplish ecosystem management.
- Design contracts to promote opportunities for year-round, long-duration, stable employment.
- Design unit product sales and service contracts to promote participation (e.g. bidding and contract awards) by local vendors, purchasers, and contractors.
- Promote a local business environment that can take advantage of the products and services of ecosystem management (e.g. small diameter and under-utilized species).
- Protect and maintain areas of cultural significance within the forest.
- Improve opportunities for people to fish, hunt, and view nature.
- Promote environmentally responsible recreation.

### **1.4.2 Forest Composition**

The forest within the management unit is primarily composed of three major forest types, ponderosa pine, mixed conifer and lodgepole pine at higher elevations, with ponderosa pine and white fir being the most common timber species on the Unit. Historical policies of fire suppression and intense harvesting have led to an increase of white fir and juniper species. Late seral age stand structure dominates the unit, although the lack of regular fire has created thick stands composed of older ponderosa pine and younger white fir instead of the widely spaced, open forest historically found in the region. Hardwood species can be found on the forest in limited distributions, particularly aspen populations in riparian areas.

A variety of shrub/bunchgrass and meadow ecosystems also occur within the forest boundaries. A common plant association on non-forested land is shrubs, such as sagebrush, bitterbrush, interspersed with native fescues. As fire suppression has caused an increase in white fir in the forested regions, western juniper has spread heavily into these regions, creating juniper woodlands and significantly increasing the fire danger. Historically juniper was restricted to rocky bluffs and shrub communities with low fire return intervals.

### **1.4.3 Silvicultural Systems**

Forest management within the unit is oriented towards restoration. Decades of fire suppression and selective harvests have created an overstocked stand condition across much of the forest. These overstocked stands are highly susceptible to fire, and the region has been increasingly affected by infestations of mountain pine beetle, *Dendroctonus ponderosae*. The restoration objective for these stands manifests itself in a silvicultural system aimed primarily at thinning from below to accelerate the progression to late seral conditions and to reduce fire hazard. The most common harvesting operation on the forest is a low thin followed by mechanical ground fuel reduction and prescribed fire. Roughly 300,000 acres out of 500,000 acres on the Unit are in need of these fuel reduction treatments, and it is estimated that it will take at least 25 years to work these stands at current harvest levels.

The most pervasive management document governing timber management in the Unit is the 1995 plan amendment “Interim Management Direction Establishing Riparian, Ecosystem and Wildlife Standards for Timber Sales”, commonly known as the “Eastside Screens”. This plan amendment introduced a number of silvicultural guidelines aimed at increasing late seral habitat on the forest, including a prohibition on harvesting live trees larger than 21” dbh.

#### **1.4.4 Management Systems**

As stated on the Fremont-Winema National Forest Website:

“The Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit is managed within the context of the Fremont-Winema National Forests and the Forests' Ranger District and Zone management structure. Certain decision-making authority is retained by the Forest Supervisor (Karen Shimamoto, Lakeview), Regional Forester (Linda Goodman, Portland, Oregon) and Chief (Dale Bosworth, Washington, DC) in accordance with delegations of authority stated in the Directive System.

Four District Rangers normally hold decision-making authority in separate portions of the Stewardship Unit. These Districts and the acreages they manage within the Unit are Lakeview (316,130 acres), Bly (21,680 acres), Paisley (153,500 acres) and Silver Lake (550 acres). Presently, the Lakeview District Ranger (Terry Sodorff) is also the Acting District Ranger for the Bly Ranger District and the Silver Lake District Ranger (Carolyn Wisdom) is also the Acting District Ranger for the Paisley Ranger District.

The Ranger Districts share support staff in two zones. The Silver Lake and Paisley Ranger Districts comprise the NE Zone and the Lakeview and Bly Ranger Districts comprise the SE Zone. Zone personnel may be located at either Ranger District in the zone and include specialists in fields such as biology, fisheries, hydrology, silviculture, engineering and environmental analysis. Specialists at the Forest level (located in Lakeview or Klamath Falls) provide additional support.”

In addition to Forest Service staff, the Lakeview Stewardship Group was created as part of the reauthorization of the Unit. This group of conservationists, timber workers, local government officials, and other civic leaders work in cooperation with the Forest Service, guiding policy within the unit and acting as a sounding board during the NEPA process.

#### **1.4.5 Monitoring System**

Consistent with the multiple layers of management planning on the Lakeview FSU, comprehensive monitoring on the Unit takes many different forms. Monitoring of implementation of the forest plan is required by statute, and each year individual projects are selected for monitoring through watershed assessments and the environmental assessment process. Topics covered through various monitoring projects include, but are not limited to:

- Implementation of FS procedures
- Timber inventory, growth and yield (through FIA);

- Species specific fauna and flora populations, as well as coarser scale habitat changes (both rare, threatened, and endangered species and general wildlife monitoring)
- Effects of grazing on meadow and riparian areas
- Aquatic habitat
- Road conditions
- Presence of invasive exotic species
- Illegal activities on the forest (through law enforcement)
- Recreation use of the forest
- Economic and social affects of forest management

Monitoring projects differ from year to year based on available funding, but some take place at fixed intervals, such as the FIA. In addition to direct monitoring by the Forest Service, third party, community based monitoring is conducted in the Unit by the Lake County Resources Initiative (LCRI). This monitoring arrangement was initiated as part of the re-authorization of the Unit, and addresses selected issues, such as invasive species presence. An annual summary of monitoring efforts is prepared every year, both at the National Forest level and as part of a Northwest Forest Plan Implementation Monitoring report.

#### 1.4.6 Estimate of Maximum Sustainable Yield

Harvesting on the Lakeview Unit is not guided by the Maximum Sustained Yield concept, as timber production is not the primary driver of management activities. Timber is only offered for sale as a by product of the restoration and fuel treatment projects occurring on the Unit. Timber volume growth can be calculated using CFI (Continuous Forest Inventory) data from permanent plots re-inventoried on a 10 year rolling average. However, it is misleading to consider this data from a production forestry sense because harvest timing is not based on any peak in mean annual increment or financial maturity. As is shown in section 1.4.7, salvage from wildfires has made up a large percentage of the overall timber harvested from the unit in the past five years.

#### 1.4.7 Estimated, Current and Projected Production

##### Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit Timber Volume Offered for Sale 2002-2006\*

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Green	5,481	4,982	0	354	10,352
Salvage	5,351	11,925	10,053	4,229	95
TOTAL	10,432	16,907	10,053	4,583	10,447

\* all figures in MBF

##### Lakeview FSU Expected Saw Timber Volumes Offered 2007-2011

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Harvest Area (Acres)	3,712	3,660	4,800	3,400	3,200
Saw Timber (MBF)*	12,000	11,700	12,850	10,500	10,000

\*A percentage of the harvest volume will be salvage.

The above tables display both the actual harvest rates for the most recent five-year period, as well as estimated volumes through 2011 for lands within the Lakeview Unit. The future harvest estimates are based on expected outputs from restoration and fuel treatment projects; it is also anticipated that a certain percentage of the volume will originate from salvage projects.

#### **1.4.8 Chemical Pesticide Use**

Overall chemical use in the Unit is extremely low. Chemical control is only used for combating invasive exotic species, and never for the silvicultural intent of controlling competing vegetation in stand establishment activities, often associated with chemical use in forestry. The following chemicals are legally available to the forest managers on the unit:

- Glyphosate
- Picloram
- Dicamba

Of these three pesticides used on the Unit, dicamba appears on the FSC's prohibited/highly hazardous list. Prior to award of certification the FS would need to cease use of this chemical, unless a derogation were first issued by FSC International. A derogation seems likely considering the restoration use of this chemical on Lakeview FSC in treating invasive exotic plants.

## **2.0 GUIDELINES/STANDARDS EMPLOYED**

As the Lakeview FSU is located in Oregon, the certification case study which is the subject of this report was conducted against the duly approved FSC Pacific Coast (USA) Regional Forest Stewardship Standard, v9.0.

In addition to the regional standard, the forest management operation was evaluated against a set of "National Forest Additional Considerations (AC's)" developed for the project. These AC's were meant to simulate one of the thresholds established by FSC-US prior to the possible certification of federal lands, the development of indicators supplemental to the regional standards reflecting federal land management. In the pilot audit, these requirements were termed "Additional Considerations," to avoid confusion or the appearance that pilot auditors are usurping the role of FSC-US in developing duly approved supplemental indicators. The AC's were developed through a peer review and public participation process prior to the start of the field evaluation.

The final version of the regional standard, with the additional considerations, is available on the SCS website ([http://scscertified.com/forestry/forest\\_nfac.html](http://scscertified.com/forestry/forest_nfac.html)).

## **3.0 THE CERTIFICATION ASSESSMENT PROCESS**

### **3.1 Assessment Dates**

**Preliminary Evaluation:** A preliminary evaluation (also known as a “scoping visit”) of the Lakeview FSU took place from November 8 through November 10, 2005.

(See Appendix 2 of this report for the Preliminary Evaluation Audit Report)

**Main Evaluation:** The main evaluation took place Tuesday July 6 through Friday July 9, 2006.

### **3.2 Assessment Team**

#### **Robert Hrubes, Ph.D. Forest Economist and Registered Professional Forester**

##### **Project Role: FSC Team Leader on Scoping and Full Assessment**

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 Senior Vice-President of Scientific Certification Systems. 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 forests, 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 (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.

#### **Mike Ferrucci, Master of Forestry.**

##### **Project Role: SFI Team Leader Scoping and Full Assessments, FSC Team Member**

Michael Ferrucci is a founding partner and President of Interforest, LLC, and a partner in Ferrucci & Walicki, LLC, a land management company that has served private landowners in southern New England for 25 years. He has a B.Sc. degree in forestry from the University of Maine and a Master of Forestry degree from the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies. Mr. Ferrucci’s primary expertise is in management of watershed forests to provide timber, drinking water, and the protection of other values; in forest inventory and timber appraisal; hardwood forest silviculture and marketing; and the ecology and silviculture of natural forests of the eastern United States. He also lectures on private sector forestry, leadership, and forest resource management at the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies. Mr. Ferrucci has participated in forest management assessments in 27 states, and has conducted joint FSC-SFI Certification Assessments on over 14 million acres of forestland in the United States. For this project, Mr. Ferrucci functioned as an employee of NSF.

**David Vesely, M.Sc.**

**Project Role: Audit Team Member; Wildlife Specialist**

David Vesely is the President and a co-founder of the Pacific Wildlife Research Institute based in Corvallis, OR. PWRI is a firm which provides consulting services in wildlife surveys, habitat assessment, watershed assessment, conservation planning, and forestry. Mr. Vesely has an MS in Forest Science from Oregon State University. His background in wildlife research and inventories include: small mammal trapping in western Oregon, winter surveys for forest birds in Alaska, radio-telemetry of sage grouse in the Great Basin, among many other projects. Mr. Vesely's current research interests include model-based assessments of wildlife populations and habitats, habitat selection by terrestrial salamanders, and wildlife-land management interactions.

**David Perry, Ph.D. Ecology, MS Forest Economics, MS Physics, BS Forest Management**

**Project Role: Audit Team Member, Forest Ecology specialist**

David Perry is a Professor Emeritus of Ecosystem Studies and Ecosystem Management in the Department of Forest Science at Oregon State University. His research interests include ecosystem management, and ecosystem structure and function - particularly the role of ecological diversity in system stability. Dr. Perry has spent much of his career researching and publishing on forest science topics such as structure and function of ecosystems and landscapes, the role of biodiversity in ecosystem processes, interactions among ecological scales, sustainable resource management, and restoration ecology

**Jim Spitz, BS Forest Management, MBA Forest Industries**

**Project Role: Audit Team Member, Forestry specialist**

Mr. Spitz has been a forest industries consultant for over 25 years, and has worked throughout the Pacific Northwest and beyond with large businesses and small landowners. Notably, since 1988 Mr. Spitz has served as the primary advisor to the CEO and Tribal Council of the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs on management of their 400,000 acre forest and associated sawmilling, manufacturing, and merchandizing operations. Prior to his work as an independent consultant, Mr. Spitz was employed by the USDA Forest Service for 17 years as a systems analyst, forest management planner, timber sale administrator, and forest pathology research technician (among other appointments). Mr. Spitz' business is based out of Bend, Oregon.

**Kathryn Fernholz, BS Forest Resources**

**Project Role: Adjunct Audit Team Member, Stakeholder consultation specialist**

Kathryn has worked on development and forest management issues in a range of roles. Since 2004 Kathryn has served as a Forestry Program Director for Dovetail Partners, Inc. With a consulting firm, Kathryn was a member of the environmental department and assisted with natural resource inventories, reporting, and environmental impact assessments including the use of Geographic Information Systems (GIS). While working with the Community Forestry Resource Center, Kathryn managed a group certification project for family forests and worked to increase local capacity to provide forest management and marketing services that are compatible with certification standards. Kathryn has been a leader within the forestry community through her service as Chair of the Minnesota Chapter of the Society of

American Foresters and her appointment to the Minnesota Forest Resources Council. Kathryn has a B.S. in Forest Resources from the University of Minnesota, College of Natural Resources and also studied at the College of Saint Benedict in St. Joseph, MN and Sheldon Jackson College in Sitka, Alaska.

**Brendan Grady, BS Forestry Certification Forester:**

**Project Role: Audit Team Member, Forestry Specialist**

Brendan Grady is a staff forester with Scientific Certification Systems, focusing on the Forest Conservation Program. He received his B.S. in Forestry from the University of California, Berkeley, in 2004. His previous experience includes forestry work with the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection and research on tropical plantations in Moorea, French Polynesia, with the Service du Developement Rurale. During his time with SCS, he has participated on over 10 audits throughout the Western United States.

### **3.3 Assessment Process**

#### **3.3.1 Itinerary**

The Lakeview FSU is comprised of land within 4 Ranger Districts, although 95% of the land is within two of these districts, the Paisley and the Lakeview. As such, these two districts were the primary subjects of the field inspection portion of the audit. Specific field sites were chosen by the audit team with assistance from Forest Service staff in order to provide the team with a broad section of land management activities, including, but not limited to, timber sales, prescribed burns, fuel reduction treatments, recreation areas, fire salvage operations, grazing allotments, riparian restoration, wildlife management, old-growth protection, road management, and insect control. The management systems of the Lakeview FSU were evaluated through office inspections and interviews in the three main administrative centers in the region, the Fremont-Winema National Forest Headquarters at the Lakeview Interagency Office, the Lakeview Ranger District Office and the Paisley Ranger District Office.

#### **June 6 Tuesday**

*Morning Fremont-Winema National Forest Headquarters*

**Full Audit Team Present**

**FS Personnel Present:** Karen Shimamoto, Carolyn Wisdom, Norm Michaels, Allan Hahn, Jerry Haugen, Doug MacCleary, Rich Kerr, Matt Webb, Lisa Sweeney, Dave Hogan, Rick Rind

Opening Meeting, staff interviews

*Afternoon Lakeview Ranger District, South Warner Mountains Tour*

**Full Audit Team Present**

**FS Personnel Present:** Karen Shimamoto, Carolyn Wisdom, Norm Michaels, Allan Hahn, Jerry Haugen, Doug MacCleary, Jim Leal, Bill Patla, Martina Kyle, Terry Sodorff, Mike Ramsey, Brian Watt, Rachelle Huddleston-Lorton, Jody Perozzi, Lora Volpondo

Stop	Location and Topics Discussed
1	Roger Meadow – grazing allotments and management, meadow restoration
2	Old-growth Management Area 14 – Silvicultural strategy area (thin from below, underburn), terrestrial wildlife management, and Burnt Willow Restoration Project; riparian habitat management and restoration.
3	Little Creek Campground – Recreation management, campground facilities and maintenance.
4	Crane Mountain Semi-Primitive Motorized Use Area – recreation management, wilderness and semi-primitive areas.

*Evening Fremont-Winema National Forest Headquarters*

**Full Audit Team Present**

**FS Personnel Present:** Karen Shimamoto, Allan Hahn, Jerry Haugen, Doug MacCleary

**Outside Stakeholders Present:** Paul Harlan (Collins Pine), Bill Duke (LCRI), Jim Walls (LCRI), Deanna Johnston (LCDC, LSG), Ryan Bonham (Lake County Examiner), Neal Richards (LCRI),

Public meeting, Stakeholder consultation

**June 7 Wednesday**

*Morning Paisley Community Center*

**Audit Team Present:** Robert Hrubes, Mike Ferrucci, Dave Perry, Dave Vesely, Jim Spitz, Brendan Grady

**FS Personnel Present:** Amy Markus, Allan Hahn, Lee Bowers, Rick Elston, Carolyn Wisdom, Sue Paddy, Kori O’Leary, Rich Pyzik, Michael Haddock, Norm Michaels, Jerry Haugen, Michael Nevill, Doug MacCleary,

Paisley Ranger District overview, field plan for the day

*Morning Field Tour – Paisley Ranger District*

**Audit Team Present:** Robert Hrubes, Mike Ferrucci, Dave Perry, Dave Vesely, Jim Spitz, Brendan Grady

**FS Personnel Present:** Amy Markus, Allan Hahn, Lee Bowers, Rick Elston, Carolyn Wisdom, Sue Paddy, Kori O’Leary, Rich Pyzik, Michael Haddock, Norm Michaels, Jerry Haugen, Michael Nevill, Doug MacCleary, Michelle da Luz, Jack Sheehan

Stop	Location and Topics Discussed
1	Jakabe Restoration Project, Juniper Treatment – juniper removal and fuel treatment from scrub area around Wildland Urban Interface
2	Jakabe Aspen/Juniper Meadow Project – juniper removal and aspen restoration in meadow recreation area
3	Kava Timber Sale – marked, but not cut, commercial thinning in ponderosa pine forest, thinning designed to maintain large old structure stands
4	Kava Timber Sale – another unit of sale visited above, this one in a mixed conifer zone

5	Kava Timber Sale, MA 14 Old-growth Area – obligate goshawk habitat area, discussed fuels reduction treatment and old-growth habitat improvement projects
6	Jakabe Road Closures – road closure as part of Jakabe project, road ripped and earth berm placed to prevent access
7	Dairy Point Campground – lunch, discussed grazing management and monitoring on the Paisley district through the Chewaucan Grazing Analysis
8	Grasshopper Flat – Headwaters Fuels treatment, 10,000 acres of mechanical and fire treatments

*Afternoon Field Tour Group 1          Joker II Restoration Project*

**Audit Team Present:** Mike Ferrucci, Dave Vesely, Brendan Grady

**FS Personnel Present:** Lee Bowers, Amy Markus, Rich Pyzik, Mike Nevill, Allan Hahn, Norm Michaels, Jerry Haugen, Michelle da Luz

Stop	Location and Topics Discussed
1	Joker II Restoration Project – 600 acre treatment to thin and remove middle and lower strata from ponderosa pine and mixed conifer forests, discussed possible use of stewardship contracts in future projects
2	Bald Eagle Management Area – Forest Plan Amendment to re-designate 1000 acres of timber production area to endangered species habitat, discussed alterations to silvicultural prescription around Bald Eagle habitat
3	Aspen release project – juniper and pine removal in riparian area to promote aspen growth

*Afternoon Field Tour Group 2*

**Audit Team Present:** Robert Hrubes, Jim Spitz, Dave Perry

**FS Personnel Present:** Carolyn Wisdom, Sue Puddy, Mike Haddock, Rick Elston, Jack Sheehan

Stop	Location and Topic Discussed
1	Winter Fire Reforestation – 506 acre snag felling and tree planting project in a 37 year old plantation that burned in the Winter Fire. Discussed reforestation difficulties including grass competition, high soil temperatures, porcupines, and deer.
2	Winter Fire Salvage – Viewed 1,205 acres of primarily helicopter logging from nearby ridgetop, due to falling snag hazard. Discussed utilization standards, set-aside areas, and reforestation measures.
3	Slide Mountain Pine Beetle Epidemic – Viewed mountain pine beetle epidemic in on the upper slopes of Slide Mountain. Discussed likely expansion of the epidemic and possibilities for reducing tree mortality and fuel buildup.

*Evening          Paisley District Office*

**Audit Team Present:** Robert Hrubes, Mike Ferrucci, Dave Perry, Dave Vesely, Jim Spitz, Brendan Grady

**FS Personnel Present:** Amy Markus, Allan Hahn, Lee Bowers, Rick Elston, Carolyn Wisdom, Sue Paddy, Kori O’Leary, Rich Pyzik, Michael Haddock, Norm Michaels, Jerry Haugen, Michael Nevill, Doug MacCleary, Michelle da Luz, Jack Sheehan

Discussed monitoring systems, set aside reserve areas, land management designations, etc.

**June 8 Thursday**

*Morning Lakeview Ranger District Office*

**Full Audit Team Present**

**FS Personnel Present:** Karen Shimamoto, Ric Rine, Doug MacCleary, Mike Ramsey, Ron Perozzi, Michelle da Luz, Barry Hausen, Norm Michaels, Terry Sodorff, Jerry Haugen, Bill Patla

**Lakeview Stewardship Group Present:** Mike Anderson (Wilderness Society), Rick Brown (Defenders of Wildlife), Jim Walls (LCRI), Deanna Johnston (LSG), Clair Thomas (LSG/LCRI), Andy Kerr (ONRC), Neal Richards (LCRI), Tynan Granberg (LCRI), Jacob Denbrook (LCRI)

Met with Lakeview Stewardship Group

*Field Tour Group 1 Cub Fire Tour*

**Audit Team Present:** Mike Ferrucci, Dave Perry, Brendan Grady

**FS Personnel Present:** Ron Perozzi, Rachelle Huddleston-Lorton, Brian Watt, Margaret Smart, Al Hahn, Norm Michaels, Mike Haddock

**Contractor Interviewed at Stop 3:** John Brown (John Brown and Son)

Stop	Location and Topics Discussed
1	Cub Fire – post fire salvage and replanting, Helphenstein Creek rehabilitation
2	Upper Thomas Creek Timber sale – viewed fuel treated area, commercially thinned, slash treatment, but not yet underburned
3	UTC timber sale – Active slashbuster, interviewed contractor
4	Debris Flow – recent landslide event, reviewed road maintenance procedures

*Field Tour Group 2 Stateline Tour*

**Audit Team Present:** Robert Hrubes, Jim Spitz, Dave Vesely, Katie Fernholz

**FS Personnel Present:** Terry Sodorff, James Price, Jack Sheehan, Jerry Haugen, Sara Elabey, Rick Elgan, Walen Yee

Stop	Location and Topics Discussed
1	Barry Point Underburn – Pre-commercial thinning on 1,500 acres and underburning on 31,545 acres. Discussed sources of funding, fuel and stocking reductions, aspen resprouting, and noxious weed treatments.
2	Barry Point Precommercial Thinning – Viewed a hillside, which had been precommercially thinned and would be underburned. Discussed burning procedures, current fuel loads, and target fuel loads after burning.
3	Wildhorse Allotment – Viewed a stream which had banks shaved and enclosure fencing in 1996. Discussed vegetation recovery, grazing management, and

	monitoring compliance.
4	Stateline Underburn – Viewed an area, which had up to 3 underburns to maintain desired fuel loads and stocking. Discussed frequency of burns and how to treat sites where desired results had not been achieved.
5	Wildhorse Creek Restoration – Viewed a restoration project, which used check dams to restore the water table and juniper placement to reduce bank erosion. Discussed range monitoring and stream surveys.
6	Old-Growth Reserves – Stopped in an old-growth reserve and discussed the old-growth reserve system, fuel hazards, replacement stands, and wildlife objectives.

**June 9 Friday**

*Fremont-Winema National Forest Headquarters*

**Full Audit Team Present**

**FS Personnel Present:** Carolyn Wisdom, Ric Rine, Richard Kehr, Jerry Haugen, Karen Shimamoto, Doug MacCleary

Team deliberations and closing meeting

**3.3.2 Stakeholder Consultation**

Pursuant to SCS protocols, consultations with key stakeholders were an integral component of the evaluation process. Consultation took place prior to, concurrent with, and following the field evaluation. The following were distinct purposes of the consultations:

- To solicit input from key stakeholders as to the applicability of the National Forest Additional Considerations developed as part of this project (see section 2.0).
- To solicit input from affected parties as to the strengths and weaknesses of the Forest Service’s management, relative to the standard, and the nature of the interaction between the agency and the surrounding communities of place and of interest.
- To solicit input on whether the Lakeview FSU managers have consulted with stakeholders regarding identifying possible high conservation value forest areas within the Unit.

Principal stakeholder groups of relevance to this evaluation were identified based upon results from the scoping evaluation, lists of stakeholders provided by Forest Service, and additional stakeholder contacts from other sources (e.g., regional FSC working group). The following types of groups and individuals were determined to be principal stakeholders:

- current and former Forest Service employees, including headquarters and field
- contractors
- lease holders
- adjacent property owners
- Pertinent Tribal members and or representatives
- Members of the Pacific Coast FSC Working Group and FSC-US

- FSC International
- Local and regionally-based environmental organizations and conservationists
- Local and regionally-based social interest organizations
- Forest industry groups and organizations
- Purchasers of logs harvested on the LFSU
- Local, State and Federal regulatory agency personnel
- User groups, such as hunters, ATV users, and others
- Other relevant groups

Stakeholder input was gathered through several distinct methods, including:

- A public notification of the evaluation, invitation for comment, and receipt of written comments
- A public meeting held during the first night of the audit
- A meeting with the Lakeview Stewardship Group
- A survey sent out to stakeholders with an identified interest in either the Lakeview Unit or the certification case studies
- Direct in-person and phone interviews with available stakeholders

### 3.3.2.1 Summary of Stakeholder Concerns and Perspectives and Responses from the Team Where Applicable

A summary of the major perspectives and concerns expressed by the stakeholders that were consulted during the course of this evaluation is included below

#### Economic Concerns

<b>Comment/Concern</b>	<b>Response</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Region 6 needs to get leadership at the Regional office and get timber sales rolling. They had everything they needed to make this happen, but they failed and so their funding has been cut.</li> </ul>	Noted during deliberations, but largely outside the scope of this evaluation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Lack of funding causing a myriad of problems, FS unable to meet recreational interests, will be closing campgrounds</li> </ul>	Management issues resulting from a lack of funding were observed frequently throughout the audit, See Minor CAR 2006.5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Very important to support the timber industry – has been important historically and will continue to be. Forest provides positive economic impacts – employment, businesses, contractors, etc.</li> </ul>	Noted during deliberations, economic benefits to local communities from forest management plays a key role in the standard
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ FS is not offering enough timber to the local sawmill to justify a two shift operation; Only about 10 million board feet per year – need</li> </ul>	Noted during deliberations

twice that and they are offering lower grade materials (too small). Reduction in timber harvest is really hurting the whole county... need sales to increase	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There has been a positive relationship between the local communities and the FS and has been good through the years</li> </ul>	Noted during deliberations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would love to see a biomass energy facility located within the unit</li> </ul>	Noted during deliberations, the audit team concurs that a biomass facility in the region would be of great benefit
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FS is behind in facilities maintenance (due to reductions in funding and staffing)</li> </ul>	Noted, see Minor CAR 2006.5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to clear out undergrowth, reduce fire danger and cut some good sawlogs for mill</li> </ul>	Noted, see Minor CAR 2006.7

**Social Concerns**

<b>Comment/Concern</b>	<b>Response</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a union for non-supervisory employees; benefits include retirement, union-rep, wages are greater or equal to regional standards; have collective bargaining</li> </ul>	Noted during deliberations, respect for the right to organize is required by the standard
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Used to have a Fremont-Winema Partnership Council that helped resolve issues/disputes – now concerns go to the Union President or Karen Shimamoto. The process has become more formal and this seems like a step back.</li> </ul>	Noted during deliberations, an unfortunate development but not something that rises to the level of a non-conformance
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lots of employee training and info sharing workshops; topics include sales prep &amp; admin, the first Stewardship Contract, cultural diversity</li> </ul>	Noted during deliberations, properly trained employees are required by the standard
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There have been conflicts over diversity in the workplace in the past, but these have been addressed.</li> </ul>	Noted during deliberations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>People are not giving recreation a fair shake – last thing on the list – needs a hands-on approach, investment, and representation; there should be better outreach to recreational (Off-Highway Vehicle, OHV) users at all Districts</li> </ul>	Noted during deliberations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recreational users have a Good relationship with the FS, have worked on trail maintenance together; FS is more than happy to accommodate uses</li> </ul>	Noted during deliberations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FS needs to listen first to the advisory groups and then formulate ideas and plans (not preconceived) -- these forests are supposed to belong to all of us and we should have input</li> </ul>	Noted during deliberations

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Closing campgrounds impacts recreation management/dispersion (campgrounds receive heavy use at certain times e.g., hunting season)</li> </ul>	Noted during deliberations, the audit team visited a campground scheduled to be closed and discussed the possible impacts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Recreation as a whole has not been very well supported by the agencies; not only in the Lakeview area, but throughout the agencies. The agencies appear to take the position that if there are not adequate funds or other resources to manage an area, then it is easier to just close it. There are many areas where our access has been limited by this mentality.</li> </ul>	Noted during deliberations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Partnerships with recreational users are wonderful and helps with goal of serving the public</li> </ul>	Noted during deliberations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ FS has been a good community partner – have helped with winter snow removal</li> </ul>	Noted during deliberations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There is a dispute resolution process for contractors, but if you have a poor result there’s no recourse besides the court (not worth it if &lt;\$100,000 problem)</li> </ul>	Noted during deliberations, in itself, the presence of a separate dispute resolution process prior to reaching the courts is noteworthy
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Some disgruntled local people due to competition with migrant workers for jobs/contracts</li> </ul>	Noted during deliberation, the condition and treatment of migrant workers was a focus of the audit teams evaluation

**Environmental Concerns**

<b>Comment/Concern</b>	<b>Response</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Grazing practices are declining in quality due to policy drivers and lack of staff to adequately implement grazing program that protects that resource</li> </ul>	Noted during deliberations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Current grazing practices on the forest are a major hindrance to the restoration goals of the unit</li> </ul>	Noted during deliberations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Ownership boundaries are unclear – poor grazing practices on private lands may be assumed to be occurring on fed lands</li> </ul>	Noted during deliberations, the audit team inspected methods for identifying FS boundaries and is not concerned about boundaries being violated
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Grazing is well monitored but there is a perception of a lack of monitoring perhaps due to lack of awareness of what the Forest Service is doing, and the protocols</li> </ul>	Noted during deliberations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The level of grazing is appropriate and the FS is doing reassessments and always updating</li> </ul>	Noted during deliberations

allowed capacities;	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Thinnings open landscape to OHV riders that then have impacts on the land and wildlife</li> </ul>	Noted during deliberations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ BLM/FS/private landowner partnerships on juniper removal are good to see (reduce water use and fire hazards)</li> </ul>	Noted during deliberations, juniper removal projects were inspected during the audit

### 3.4 Total Time Spent on Audit

Time spent on the audit, including the preliminary evaluation, audit preparation, document review, stakeholder consultation, staff interviews, field inspections, and deliberations totaled roughly 50 person-days.

### 3.5 Process of Determining Conformance

FSC accredited forest stewardship standards consist of a three-level hierarchy: principles, then the criteria that make up each principle, then the indicators that elaborate upon 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 non-conformance must be evaluated to determine whether it constitutes a major or minor non-conformance 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 non-conformance. The team must use their collective judgment to assess each criterion and determine if it is in conformance. If the forest management operation is determined to be in non-conformance at the criterion level, then at least one of the indicators must be in major non-conformance.

Corrective action requests (CAR's) are issued for every instance of non-conformance. Major non-conformances trigger Major CAR's and minor non-conformances trigger Minor CAR's

#### *Interpretations of Major CAR's (Preconditions), Minor CARs and Recommendations*

*Major CARs/Preconditions:* Major non-conformances, either alone or in combination with non-conformances of other 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 prior to award of the certificate. If major CAR's arise after an operation is certified, the timeframe for correcting these non-conformances is typically shorter than for minor CAR's. Certification is contingent on the certified operations response to the CAR within the stipulated time frame.

*Minor CARs:* These are corrective action requests in response to minor non-conformances, which are typically limited in scale or can be characterized as an unusual lapse in the system. Corrective actions must be closed out within a specified time period of award of the

certificate.

*Recommendations:* These are suggestions that the audit team concludes would help the company move even further towards exemplary status. Action on the recommendations is voluntary and does not affect the maintenance of the certificate. Recommendations can be changed to CARs if performance with respect to the criterion triggering the recommendation falls into non-conformance.

### **3.6 Peer Review**

This report, prior to being finalized, was peer reviewed by two independent experts with credentials in pertinent natural resource disciplines:

- John Gordon, Ph.D - Yale Pinchot Professor of Forestry and Environmental Studies (retired)
- Dennis Becker, Ph.D – Assistant Professor- Dept of Forest Resources, University of Minnesota

The evaluation team carefully considered the comments provided by the peer reviewers and made changes, as deemed appropriate.

## **4.0 RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION**

Table 4.1 below, contains the audit team’s findings as to the strengths and weaknesses of the Forest Service’s management of the Lakeview FSU relative to the FSC Pacific Coast Regional Standard as well as the “Additional Considerations.” The table also presents the corrective action request (CAR) numbers related to each FSC Principle.

**Table 4.1 Notable strengths and weaknesses of the forest management enterprise relative to the P&C**

Principle/Subject Area	Strengths Relative to the Standard	Weaknesses Relative to the Standard	CAR/REC #s
<b>P1: FSC Commitment and Legal Compliance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Management on the Unit has consistently been upheld through the appeal and litigation process as legal.</li> <li>▪ Strong and well practiced public involvement mechanisms allow for vigorous oversight of management activities by outside stakeholder groups</li> <li>▪ Washington office sets policy for ensuring compliance with international agreements</li> <li>▪ Permanent law enforcement on staff to secure the forest, also have cooperative agreements with local sheriffs</li> <li>▪ Field inspections showed very little evidence of illegal activity (e.g., dumping) compared with other forests of similar size.</li> <li>▪ No evidence of significant adverse impacts from OHV use</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Management activities on the Unit are periodically challenged through the FS appeal process and occasionally subsequent litigation. However, courts have routinely upheld the FS actions as in conformance with applicable statutes and regulations</li> <li>▪ The Lakeview FSU is an administrative subset of the Fremont-Winema National Forest (which is in turn a subset of the National Forest system). If the Unit were ever to be certified, it would represent a “partial-estate certification”.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Major CAR 2006.1</li> <li>▪ Minor CAR 2006.4</li> <li>▪ Rec 2006.1</li> </ul>
<b>P2: Tenure &amp; Use Rights &amp; Responsibilities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Legal claim to the land in the Unit is not in doubt. The Fremont NF was created directly out of existing federal domain land in 1906</li> <li>▪ Land boundaries are clearly marked prior to commencement of management activities, or activities are offset from boundaries if needed.</li> <li>▪ Nation to nation Memorandum of Agreement with the Klamath Tribes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No significant weaknesses were observed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No CAR’s were issued in relation to this Principle</li> </ul>

	<p>ensures that local tribes maintain traditional use rights</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No evidence that legal tenure rights (e.g., easements, public use rights) are being violated.</li> <li>▪ Administrative appeals are addressed through open communication, frequently resolving them prior to legal action</li> </ul>		
<b>P3: Indigenous Peoples' Rights</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Open and active dialogue maintained with local tribes (Klamath Tribes and Fort Bidwell Reservation).</li> <li>▪ 1999 Memorandum of Agreement with Klamath Tribes formalizes rights of tribal members on the forest; nation to nation status of this agreement is made explicit, ensuring the tribes have a greater level of input than the general public</li> <li>▪ Quarterly meeting with tribal staff to review upcoming projects and invite tribal members to participate in monitoring</li> <li>▪ Archeological surveys occur prior to every project as part of the NEPA process; results are confidential and identified sites are protected</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No significant weaknesses were observed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No CAR's were issued in relation to this Principle</li> </ul>
<b>P4: Community Relations &amp; Workers' Rights</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Employee relationships are long term and stable</li> <li>▪ Contractors express satisfaction in working with the FS; long term relationships with contractors</li> <li>▪ Stewardship Unit is designed to maintain local industry by offering timber to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Contractors felt that moving complaints beyond the contracting officer was difficult unless they wanted to go to court (usually cost prohibitive).</li> <li>▪ Some employees were concerned over the fact that the process for</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Rec 2006.2</li> </ul>

	<p>processors within the unit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ FS is heavily invested in local economy, largely due to the isolated nature</li> <li>▪ Forest supports a variety of educational programs, involvement in local schools, fire safety educational programs</li> <li>▪ Recent increase in active monitoring of treatment of migrant workers due to bad press on other National Forests</li> <li>▪ Rigorous safety program, including daily safety briefings, record keeping, equipment inspections</li> <li>▪ Contractors can (and have been) shut down for safety violations</li> <li>▪ Non-supervisory employees can be members of a union</li> <li>▪ Frequent and affirmative opportunities for public input into management planning process</li> <li>▪ Level involvement of outside stakeholders is truly exemplary</li> <li>▪ Appeals reform act provides for multiple levels of formal and informal dispute resolution</li> </ul>	<p>resolving a grievance has become more formalized</p>	
<p><b>P5: Benefits from the Forest</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Land management is not driven by a need to generate revenue off the forest</li> <li>▪ Benefits of forest management are kept local through the preferential bidding mechanism in the stewardship unit</li> <li>▪ Harvesting contract specifications are designed to maximize revenue from</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Evidence of lack of necessary funding is readily apparent throughout the organization</li> <li>▪ Backlogs in deferred maintenance, road repairs, and fuel treatments are reaching critical levels</li> <li>▪ Non-timber forest products are</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Minor CAR 2006.5</li> <li>▪ Minor CAR 2006.6</li> <li>▪ Minor CAR 2006.7</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>harvested material</li> <li>▪ Forest provides a diverse array of services (timber, recreation, grazing, water, etc.)</li> <li>▪ Harvest levels are far below forest growth</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>actively collected, but are not adequately addressed in the management plan</li> <li>▪ Large percentage of the forest is in an overstocked, unhealthy state</li> </ul>	
<b>P6: Environmental Impact</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ NEPA process and watershed assessments provide thorough analysis of forest conditions prior to commencement of management activities</li> <li>▪ Landscape level cumulative effects analysis done as part of an EIS</li> <li>▪ Affirmative protection measures are taken for identified endangered species (habitat management zones, restoration projects, etc.)</li> <li>▪ Overall management is focused on restoration and recruiting late seral stands, not production forestry</li> <li>▪ Harvests are focused on small scale treatments and things</li> <li>▪ A wide diversity of native species and habitats are managed for</li> <li>▪ Aggressive fuels management program aimed, with priorities for the wildland-urban interface</li> <li>▪ Old-growth protection and recruitment is a key facet of the management</li> <li>▪ Even-aged management not used</li> <li>▪ Mechanical operations use precautions to guard against damaging soil, such as seasonal moisture and slope limits</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A number of species that have been identified as sensitive or are candidates for listing by other agencies (FWS, ODFW) are not specifically managed for. Examples include flamulated owls, Oregon spotted frog, white-headed woodpecker, and others.</li> <li>▪ Prescriptions are far too limited to achieve their desired future conditions on a landscape level; currently over 70% of the forest is overstocked</li> <li>▪ Overstocking and forest health problems could serve as a detriment to their long term management goals, such as old-growth protection</li> <li>▪ Plans for future thinnings in old-growth stands could be in violation of the standard</li> <li>▪ Backlogged road maintenance in the \$10's of millions</li> <li>▪ Poor road management could have contributed to a landslide observed during the audit</li> <li>▪ Fish barrier removal process</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Minor CAR 2006.8</li> <li>▪ Minor CAR 2006.9</li> <li>▪ Minor CAR 2006.11</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No new roads are planned, and the forest is actively reducing their road network</li> <li>▪ Riparian protection measures are of a very high standard, guided by Inland Native Fish requirements</li> <li>▪ Grazing is actively managed to protect stream and meadow areas through measures such as rotational grazing, herd size reduction, combined allotments, and closing off sensitive areas</li> <li>▪ Active program to remove barriers to fish passage</li> <li>▪ Pesticides are used exclusively for invasive species control, not silvicultural objectives</li> <li>▪ Invasive species control program is active and well funded across the forest</li> <li>▪ No exotic or GMO species are used on the forest</li> <li>▪ Natural forestland is not being converted plantations or non-forest use.</li> </ul>	<p>scheduled to take 30 years to fully complete</p>	
<b>P7: Management Plan</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Public availability of management planning information is unparalleled</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Forest management plan is far overdue for a revision, although frequent plan amendments are made to keep it current</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Minor CAR 2006.6</li> <li>▪ Minor CAR 2006.10</li> </ul>
<b>P8: Monitoring &amp; Assessment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Forest inventory takes place as part of Forest Service wide FIA on a rolling 10 year basis</li> <li>▪ Post operational assessments are standard</li> <li>▪ Regular water quality surveys</li> <li>▪ Tribes have opportunities to jointly monitor</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Opportunities for monitoring may be lost due to staff turnover and lost institutional memory</li> <li>▪ A number of species of concern are not being actively monitored (see P6)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Major CAR 2006.2</li> <li>▪ Minor CAR 2006.11</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ cultural sites</li> <li>▪ Annual monitoring report summarizes results of monitoring, including economic effects on local communities</li> </ul>		
<p><b>P9: Maintenance of High Conservation Value Forest</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A myriad of land use policies and restrictions are in place which may lead to de facto protection of high conservation values on the Unit (e.g. old-growth management designations, wilderness areas, semi-primitive areas, endangered species protection zones, archeological site protections, etc.)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ An assessment of how the management of the Unit addresses the FSC concept of High Conservation Value Forests has not been completed using established HCVF procedures (such as the FSC HCVF Tool Kit).</li> <li>▪ Areas that would likely qualify as HCVF have not been officially designated as such (e.g. wilderness areas, old-growth stands, municipal water supplies, roadless areas larger than 500 acres)</li> <li>▪ Because such an assessment has not taken place, the audit team cannot confirm that all high conservation values on the forest are being adequately protected.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Major CAR2006.3</li> </ul>

## 4.2 Corrective Action Requests

Note: Recall that the following Corrective Action Requests, both Major and Minor, are written as if this pilot project were a bona fide certification audit, which of course it is not. The logic for stipulating simulated CARs is to provide all interested parties with a better sense of the corrective actions that the Forest Service might need to undertake, were an actual certification of LFSU conducted.

### 4.2.1. Major Corrective Action Requests

Major Corrective Action Requests (also known as pre-conditions) are associated with substantial non-conformances relative to the applicable certification standard. Certification cannot be awarded if open Major CARs exist. For most audits<sup>5</sup> such as this pilot project on Lakeview FSU, Major CARs arise under two possible circumstances:

- When the audit team finds inadequate conformance (i.e., non-conformance) at the level of an entire FSC Criterion
- When the audit team finds inadequate conformance (i.e., non-conformance) relative to a “fatal flaw” Indicator; that is, an Indicator for which it is expressly stated in standard that conformance is required for the award of certification.

Three Major CARs were stipulated as a result of the audit conducted of the Lakeview FSU.

<b>Background/Justification:</b> The Forest Service has not provided a written statement of commitment to the FSC Principles and Criteria, and such a statement of commitment is not incorporated into an official Lakeview FSU plan or document. The Forest Service has not documented the reasons for seeking partial certification.	
<b>Major CAR 2006.1</b>	Prior to award of certification, the Forest Service must provide a written statement of commitment to the FSC Principles and Criteria, and such a statement of commitment must be incorporated into the management plan or another official document. Prior to award of certification, the Forest Service must document the reasons for seeking partial certification for only a subset of the National Forests.
<b>Deadline</b>	Prior to award of certification
<b>Reference</b>	FSC Criterion 1.6, Indicators 1.6.1., and 1.6.2

<b>Background/Justification:</b> Criterion 8.3 requires that a forest management operation seeking FSC-endorsed certification develop and document a procedure for tracing the flow of forest
---

<sup>5</sup> Per FSC guidance promulgated in April 2005, audits in regions with a duly accredited regional standard, *and for which the administrative record clearly demonstrates that the regional standard was developed on the understanding that Principle-level conformance was to be the decision rule for the award of certification*, Major CARs are issued when there is a finding of Principle-level rather than Criterion-level non-conformance. But for U.S. National Forests, there is not presently an approved standard so this guidance would not apply; that is, Criterion-level conformance would be the decision rule for award of certification, were a bona fide certification evaluation to be conducted.

products harvested from the certified forest management unit. The scope of this procedure is for the “stump to forest gate” beyond which chain-of-custody control is the responsibility of the purchasers of products from a National Forest.	
<b>Major CAR 2006.2</b>	Prior to award of certification, the Forest Service will need to develop and submit to SCS a written description of the procedures it will employ to trace each category of forest product that it wishes to sell as certified product. The procedure must assure that SCS can readily monitor volumes of forest products harvested and sold, by reasonable time periods such as monthly as well as by purchaser. As part of this procedure, the Forest Service should develop additional written guidance to its purchasers informing them that the certified status of products leaving the Lakeview FSU will be maintained only so long as the purchaser and subsequent purchasers hold their own or covered by another valid FSC Chain of Custody certificate.
Reference	FSC Criterion 8.3

<b>Background/Justification:</b> Principle 9 addresses the issue of “high conservation value forests.” In brief, the 4 Criteria comprising this Principle require that the managers of a certified forest must: a) define those regionally relevant attributes that merit classification as of high conservation value, b) complete an assessment of the forest for the possible presence of areas possessing one or more of these high conservation values, c) design and implement management prescriptions/measures intended to conserve the salient values in these identified areas, d) monitor the efficacy of these prescriptions, and e) consult with outside stakeholders and experts at each of these four stages. It is the judgment of the audit team that the Forest Service is, in fact, managing the Lakeview FSU in a manner such that it is quite unlikely that high conservation values are being systematically lost. But the fact remains that the Forest Service has not completed an HCVF process that expressly conforms with the requirements of Principle 9. As such and at present, it is therefore not possible to reach a finding of adequate conformance to Criteria 9.1, 9.2, 9.3 and 9.4.	
<b>Major CAR 2006.3</b>	Prior to award of certification, the Forest Service must submit to SCS a detailed document that clearly yet concisely “cross walks” the activities undertaken on the Lakeview Unit that demonstrate functional conformance to each of the action requirements found in FSC Criteria 9.1 through 9.4. Where current activities do not adequately address any specific requirement found in these Criteria, the Forest Service must also provide a written action plan for how those gaps will be addressed. Based upon analysis of this action plan, SCS will determine if the follow-up activities must be completed prior to or subsequent to award of certification.
Reference	FSC Principle 9

#### 4.2.2. Minor Corrective Action Requests

On the basis of the information gathered and analyzed during the course of the field audit, the SCS audit team concluded that there were 8 non-conformances at the level of specific Regional Indicators. Because these non-conformances are at the Indicator level, the appropriate response is specification of Minor Corrective Action

Requests.

<b>Background/Justification:</b> FSC guidelines relative to Criterion 1.4 are that certificate holders should formalize a policy of bringing any conflicts between legal requirements and the applicable FSC certification standard to the attention of the certification body or the FSC, itself, for the purpose of determining the appropriate resolution.	
<b>(Minor) CAR 2006.4</b>	Within three months after award of certification, the Forest Service will need to develop and memorialize a written policy that any conflicts between legal requirements and the obligations found in the FSC Pacific Coast Regional Standard (as augmented by any supplemental indicators promulgated by FSC) will be brought to the attention of SCS.
<b>Deadline</b>	Within three months after award of certification.
<b>Reference</b>	FSC Criterion 1.4, Regional Indicator 1.4.a

<b>Background/Justification:</b> In the judgment of the audit team, the current funding situation for LFSU constitutes a non-conformity with respect to Pacific Coast Regional Indicator 5.1.a, which invokes an expectation that certified forest operations are financially able to support long-term management and restoration such as planning, resource protection and post-harvest management activities. The indicator further states that funding should be sufficient to fulfill management objectives and maintain and/or restore forest health and productivity. Funding for Fremont-Winema/LFSU, which has been declining for some time, is presently not at a level that, in the judgment of the audit team, will enable fulfillment of the Unit's management goals.	
<b>(Minor) CAR 2006.5</b>	The Forest Service must undertake appropriate budgetary and staffing decisions necessary to reverse the pattern of reduction in available resources. Funding must be enhanced to achieve the Unit's management goals, and to manage in full conformance with the FSC Pacific Coast Regional Standard. At the time of the 1 <sup>st</sup> surveillance audit, the Forest Service will need to provide SCS with a status report detailing the actions taken to secure additional funding and the results of those actions.
<b>Deadline</b>	By the time of the first annual surveillance audit after award of certification.
<b>Reference</b>	FSC Criterion 5.1, Regional Indicator 5.1.a.

<b>Background/Justification:</b> FSC Pacific Coast Regional Indicators 5.2.d. and 7.1.b.1 require that when non-timber products are harvested/removed that the management and use of those products are incorporated into the "management strategy." In light of the additional guidance provided by Regional Indicator 7.1.b.1, the audit team construes the written manifestation of a management strategy to be the Land and Resource Management Plan (LRMP) and we are unable to find sufficient reference to non-timber products within the LRMP to constitute "incorporation." As such, there is presently a non-conformity with respect to this Regional Indicator	
<b>(Minor) CAR</b>	A plan amendment or supplement must be developed that addresses

<b>2006.6</b>	the management of non-timber forest resources that are extracted from the LFSU.
<b>Deadline</b>	By the time of the first annual surveillance audit after award of certification.
<b>Reference</b>	FSC Criterion 5.2, Regional Indicator 5.2.d; FSC Criterion 7.1 and Regional Indicator 7.1.b.1.

**Background/Justification:** FSC Pacific Coast Regional Indicator 5.6.c. states that the rate and method of timber harvest should lead to well-stocked stands, neither understocked nor overstocked. Stands not optimally stocked are expected to be adjusted towards proper (i.e., full) stocking levels “at the earliest practicable time.” Due to ongoing budgetary shortfalls as well as appeals and litigation, the LFSU, like all National Forest Units, has a problem with overstocked stands, particularly of small and mid-diameter stands, typically of shade tolerant species. By the Forest Service’s own estimates, 72% of the Lakeview stands are overstocked. In the judgment of the audit team, this pattern of overstocked stands constitutes a non-conformance relative to Regional Indicator 5.6.c.

<b>(Minor) CAR 2006.7</b>	The Forest Service must secure additional funds sufficient to underwrite a focused, multi-pronged strategy for returning overstocked stands to more appropriate stocking levels. This strategy should seek the involvement of a range of stakeholders and be designed so as to demonstrate significant progress in achieving more ecologically appropriate stocking levels over the next 10 years. A written strategy and briefing memorandum should be prepared for review at the time of the first annual surveillance audit.
<b>Deadline</b>	By the time of the first annual surveillance audit after award of certification.
<b>Reference</b>	FSC Criterion 5.6, Regional Indicator 5.6.c.

**Background/Justification:** FSC Regional Indicator 6.5.g requires that the transportation system is managed (e.g., designed, developed, maintained) so as to minimize the extent and impact of the system and its potential cumulative effects. Roads, landings and skid trails are to be minimized and permanent roads are to be managed year-round under a winter-maintenance plan. On LFSU, there is a order of magnitude disconnect between the level of maintenance effort, as measured by annual road maintenance budgets, and the overall magnitude of the road maintenance backlog. As such, the audit team concludes that there exists a non-conformity with respect to this Indicator.

<b>(Minor) CAR 2006.8</b>	The Forest Service must seek and secure additional funding that will enable a substantially faster rate of eliminating the backlog of road system maintenance actions/projects. The Forest Road Analysis must be completed by the time of the first annual surveillance audit, resulting in the resolution of the appropriate road network that should be maintained on the Unit; an overall road management plan, which includes decommissioning surplus roads, must also be developed.
<b>Deadline</b>	By the time of the first annual surveillance audit after award of

	certification.
<b>Reference</b>	FSC Criterion 6.5, Regional Indicators 6.5.g, j, & k

<b>Background/Justification:</b> Though chemical use is very limited on LFSU, Forest managers have not put a policy/plan in place to further reduce use of chemical pesticides over time. LFSU has not documented a <b>nonuse</b> policy for chemicals on or proposed for the FSC prohibited list.	
<b>(Minor) CAR 2006.9</b>	A policy must be developed and put in place that commits LFSU managers to actively seek means of further reducing chemical use over time and to immediately cease use of any chemical on the FSC prohibited chemical list.
<b>Time Frame</b>	Three months after award of certification.
<b>Reference</b>	FSC Criterion 6.6, Regional Indicator 6.6.a.

<b>Background/Justification:</b> FSC Regional Indicator 7.2.a. requires that the relevant provisions of the management plan are modified/updated at least every 10 years; the revisions/updates should incorporate results of periodic monitoring as well as new scientific and technical information. As well, the updates should respond to the effect of illegal/unauthorized activities and changes in the forest caused by natural disturbances. The Fremont-Winema Land and Resource Management Plan is now approaching 20 years of age without a major plan revision, roughly twice as long as originally intended. This situation unavoidably amounts to a non-conformance. But due to the fact that there have been 26 plan amendments since the LRMP was adopted in 1989 which have collectively maintained the currency of the key components of the plan, the audit team concludes that a finding of non-conformance at the Criterion level is not warranted. That is, the audit team finds that the non-conformity justifies the specification of a Minor CAR.	
<b>(Minor) CAR 2006.10</b>	The Forest Service must take the necessary decisions at the regional level to assure that the Fremont-Winema plan revision is placed at the top of the priority queue for funding and implementation. Evidence must be presented to SCS that Fremont-Winema plan revision funding has been secured and that the full complement of staff resources have been committed to the process such that the plan revision process is completed by the current target date of the end of 2008. Utilizing the Fremont-Winema web site or another appropriate mechanism, the public should be informed of the status of the plan revision process and the commitment to complete the process by the end of 2008.
<b>Deadline</b>	No later than 3 months after award of certification.
<b>Reference</b>	FSC Criterion 7.2, Regional Indicator 7.2.a.

<b>Background/Justification:</b> FSC Pacific Coast Regional Indicator 8.2.c.1. requires that forest owners or managers periodically monitor and assess: a) the contribution of their management activities toward recovery goals for threatened and endangered species in relation to changes in major habitats and populations, b) changes in major habitat elements on the forest management unit, and c) presence and/or absence of and changes	
--	--

in the occurrence of Rare species. While managers of the Lakeview FSU do engage in a variety of monitoring activities that are relevant and responsive to this requirement, in the judgment of the audit team the Forest Service is focusing on too limited and narrow of a set of wildlife species than what would be expected to demonstrate adequate conformance with this Indicator. Another aspect of this non-conformity is that greater attention should be placed on monitoring population dynamics of selected species of concern to compliment the current focus on habitat impacts.	
<b>(Minor) CAR 2006.11</b>	After internal and external consultation with appropriate experts, the Forest Service must expand the list of species of concern that it will focus on with respect to monitoring the wildlife impacts of management activities within the Lakeview FSU. A briefing report should be prepared for submittal to SCS that provides the rationale for the additional species of concern that are selected, and that provides an overview of the type and design of population monitoring that it will undertake.
<b>Deadline</b>	At the time of the first annual surveillance audit after award of certification.
<b>Reference</b>	FSC Criterion 8.2, Regional Indicator 8.2.c.1.

### 4.2.3 Recommendations

Note: Recommendations are non-binding opportunities for improvement that are noted by the audit team during the course of a certification audit.

<b>Background/Justification:</b> Though it is not yet an acute problem, ORV use is on the rise across National Forests, as are other unauthorized activities.	
<b>REC 2006.1</b>	LFSU managers should explore and pursue funding and other resource allocation strategies that will lead to an enhanced organizational capacity to control unauthorized ORV use, before the problem rises to a level of non-conformance with Criterion 1.5.
<b>Reference</b>	FSC Criterion 1.5

<b>Background/Justification:</b> Greater attention could be paid to capacities and training needs associated with contractors that perform services on the Forest. The Forest Service should not assume that all responsibilities beyond immediate worksite safety will be borne by the Department of Labor, as is generally the practice.	
<b>REC 2006.2</b>	LFSU managers should perform a local workforce assessment for both contractors & subcontractors, to allow the FS to gain a better understanding of local capacities, equipment available, interests, training needs, etc.
<b>Reference</b>	FSC Criterion 4.1, Regional Indicators 4.1.b & d.

## 5.0 CERTIFICATION DECISION (SIMULATED)

## **5.1 Certification Recommendation (Simulated)**

As determined by the full and proper execution of the SCS *Forest Conservation Program* evaluation protocols, the audit team recommends that FSC-endorsed forest management certification not be offered to the Forest Service for its management of the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit until the three Major Corrective Action Requests are closed or until they can be downgraded to Minor Corrective Action Requests on the basis of evidenced submitted on the steps taken by the Forest Service in response to these Major CARs. Once the Major CARs have been closed or downgraded, and on the assumption that the Forest Service contractually commits to closing the 7 additional Minor Corrective Action Requests within the stipulated time frames, the audit team recommends that FSC-certification be offered.

## **6.0 SURVEILLANCE AUDITS**

Were, at some point in the future, FSC-endorsed certification to be offered to the USDA Forest Service for its management of the Lakeview FSU, surveillance audits would need to take place at least annually to monitor the status of any open corrective action requests and review the continued conformance the FSC Pacific Coast Regional Standards. Given the high profile that any certification of a National Forest unit would no doubt have, we anticipate that there would likely be a special surveillance audit scheduled for sometime within the first 6 months after award of certification, augmenting the normal annual surveillance audits. Public summaries of all surveillance audits would be posted on the SCS website ([www.scscertified.com](http://www.scscertified.com)).

## SECTION B: DETAILED RESULTS OF THE (SIMULATED) FULL EVALUATION

### 1.0 DETAILED EVALUATION OF CONFORMANCE TO THE FSC PACIFIC COAST REGIONAL STANDARD

The findings and observations of the evaluation team are presented in this section, structured according to the 9 applicable FSC Principles. Note: Principle 10 was determined by the audit team to be non-applicable to this forest management operation because the timber management regimes employed on the LFSU clearly meet the FSC’s definition of natural forest management. To follow are descriptions of each Principle, Criterion, and Indicator and the team’s findings and judgments at the Criterion and Indicator levels.

Note: “C” = Conformance

“N” = Non-conformance

Requirement	C/N/C	Comment/CAR
<b>P1 Forest management shall respect all applicable laws of the country in which they occur, and international treaties and agreements to which the country is a signatory, and comply with all FSC Principles and Criteria.</b>		
<b>C1.1 Forest management shall respect all national and local laws and administrative requirements.</b>	C	<b>Over the breadth of Indicators that elaborate this Criterion, the audit team concludes that the LFSU operations can be considered to be in adequate conformance.</b>
<p>1.1.a. The applicant’s forest management plans and operations in the region demonstrate compliance with federal, state, county, municipal, and tribal laws, as well as case law and regulations.</p> <p><i>For example: Records are on file documenting any instances of violations (whether actual or purported) of any applicable laws and regulations as listed above, including actions that were taken by the forest owner or manager to address these violations.</i></p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appeals are not prima facie evidence of non-conformance unless they subsequently lead to adverse court decisions.</li> <li>• There are currently three lawsuits pertaining to the management of the Lakeview FSU: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bill Marlet, Oregon Natural Desert Association; motivation for suing FS is that plaintiffs have not convinced the FS to retire grazing allotments</li> <li>• Toolbox Fire salvage lawsuit: plaintiffs unsuccessfully sought restraining orders in two courts; technically, case is still open, but plaintiffs haven’t moved it along</li> <li>• Grazing lawsuit: Response to motion for reconsideration; plaintiffs requested the court to reconsider dropping 6 of 7 points, court refused; still at contention as to whether the FS adequately consulted with FWS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Some environmental community stakeholder comments asserted that the FS is broadly in violation of law</li> <li>• The FS process of forest management planning clearly addresses laws that govern their activities; the FSC endeavors to comply with many state laws in spirit, even though they are not required. With OSHA, the FS has developed specific safety plans to comply with law, same with archeological resources; the agency submits plans to the State Historic Preservation Office;</li> </ul>

		<p>precautionary about meeting law safety criterion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FS is subject to focused scrutiny from stakeholder groups which are sensitive to matters of statutory and regulatory compliance.</li> </ul>
1.1.b. Forestry operations meet or exceed the current state forest-practice regulations, best management practices for forestry, roads, wildlife, and/or water quality that exist within the state(s) or other appropriate jurisdiction(s) in which the operations occur.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FS management practices exceed Oregon state forest practices rules</li> <li>• Federal land management is generally not subject to lower court jurisdiction</li> <li>• Evidence suggests that LFSU practices generally exceed Oregon BMPs, with the exception of road system maintenance (see Criterion 6.5)</li> </ul>
1.1.c. Where required by law, forest ( <i>see Glossary</i> ) owners and managers share public information, provide open records, and conduct procedures for public participation.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are strong and actively employed public involvement mechanisms</li> <li>• The Lakeview Stewardship Group is an effective ongoing means of obtaining public input</li> <li>• Stakeholder comment reflects sense of informal familiarity and openness with FS staff</li> </ul>
<b>C1.2. All applicable and legally prescribed fees, royalties, taxes and other charges shall be paid.</b>	C	<b>Over the breadth of Indicators that elaborate this Criterion, the audit team concludes that the LFSU operations can be considered to be in adequate conformance.</b>
1.2.a. Taxes on forestland and timber, and other fees related to forest management, are paid in a timely manner and in accordance with federal, state, county, municipal, and tribal laws.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As a federal agency, the Forest Service doesn't pay state and local property taxes; however, there are payments in lieu of taxes and there is no evidence that the Forest Service does not pay these in a timely manner; Regional Advisory Committee's (RAC) have spent \$4.5 million on forest just last year</li> <li>• There are instances where contractors are not being paid in a timely manner; eventually, they get paid with interest; reorganization of the FS central administration to Albuquerque has caused problems</li> </ul>
<b>C1.3. In signatory countries, the provisions of all binding international agreements such as CITES, ILO Conventions, ITTA, and Convention on Biological Diversity, shall be respected.</b>	C	<b>Over the breadth of Indicators that elaborate this Criterion, the audit team concludes that the LFSU operations can be considered to be in adequate conformance.</b>
1.3.a. Forest owners or managers comply with treaties, including those with American Indian tribes, and other international agreements that have been signed by the President of the United States, ratified by the Senate and have entered into force. (Note: see Analysis of US Government Procedures for Abiding with Treaties, FSC-US, 3/10/03)	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Memorandum of Agreement between Klamath Tribes and FS provides positive evidence of conformance, as well as the fact that FS personnel engage in regular and extensive discussions with tribal representatives</li> <li>• The Fremont-Winema website includes a posted list of international agreements</li> <li>• International treaty compliance is ensured through national policies from the Washington D.C. office of the Forest Service. This office is in charge of analyzing international treaties and setting land use policies throughout the National Forest System to address such requirements</li> </ul>
<b>C1.4. 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 by the involved or affected parties.</b>	C	<b>The audit team has found a minor non-conformance that triggers the specification of a Minor CAR. Despite this minor non-conformance, overall conformance to this Criterion is deemed to be adequate. This finding is in large part a reflection of the advisory nature of the Criterion. However, closure of the Minor CAR prior to award of certification is advised.</b>

1.4.a. Any perceived, possible conflict between US law and FSC P&C shall be referred to FSC ABU.	N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As yet, no formal policy exists to refer conflicts to the FSC or the certifier</li> <li>Minor CAR 2006.4 – There must be a policy that any circumstances of conflict between US law and FSC will be brought to the attention of SCS and/or the FSC</li> </ul>
<b>C1.5. Forest management areas should be protected from illegal harvesting, settlement and other unauthorized activities.</b>	C	<b>Over the breadth of Indicators that elaborate this Criterion, the audit team concludes that the LFSU operations can be considered to be in adequate conformance.</b>
<p>1.5.a. Forest owners or managers implement measures to prevent illegal and unauthorized activities in the forest.</p> <p><i>For example, efforts may include posting boundary notices, using gates, making periodic inspections, and reporting suspected illegal or unauthorized activities to the proper authorities.</i></p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FS has its own law enforcement staff and also maintains cooperative agreements with local law enforcement</li> <li>Little trash or dumping on the forest was observed by the auditors</li> <li>FS management presence and control are obvious throughout the management area</li> <li>Only one timber trespass has occurred in the past 5 years (the Elder case), in which a few Forest Service trees were harvested across the property line.</li> <li>There is good compliance with NTFP permitting process</li> <li>Grazing allotments are fenced to minimize trespassing</li> <li>There has been only one campground overstay in recent times; very short list of arrests on the forest</li> <li>Social pressure of the tight knit community discourages illegal activity on the forest</li> </ul>
<p><b>C1.6. Forest managers shall demonstrate a long-term commitment to adhere to the FSC Principles and Criteria.</b></p> <p><i>Applicability note to Criterion 1.6.: Assessment of this criterion is guided by both FSC Policy and Guidelines: Partial Certification for Large Ownerships (BM19.24, May 2000 available at <a href="http://www.fsc.org/en/whats_new/documents/Docs_cent/2">http://www.fsc.org/en/whats_new/documents/Docs_cent/2</a> and the FSC Guidelines for Certification Bodies FSC STD 20-001 (version 2.1).</i></p>	NC	<b>The audit team has found a major non-conformance that triggers the specification of a Major CAR.</b>
1.6.a Forest owners or managers provide written statements of commitment to the FSC Principles and Criteria. The commitment is stated in the management plan [see 7.1], a document prepared for the certification process, or another official document.	N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Currently, the FS is still exploring certification. Actual FSC certification is not a possible outcome of this pilot test, and the FS is currently unable to commit to the FSC Principles and Criteria.</li> <li>Major CAR 2006.1 was issued in response to this non-conformance</li> </ul>
1.6.b Forest owners or managers document the reasons for seeking partial certification.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A certification of the Lakeview Stewardship Unit would represent a partial estate certification, as the unit is an administrative subset within the larger Fremont-Winema NF. It would also be considered a partial estate certification in the sense that the LFSU represents only one of the 155 forests in the National Forest System (Major CAR 2006.1)</li> <li>A documented explanation for the reasons for the partial estate is available online. In brief, the high level of community involvement in the forest leads to different management strategies within the unit</li> </ul>

1.6.c Forest owners or managers document strategies and silvicultural treatments for several harvest entries that meet the FSC Principles and Criteria (see Principle 7)	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The forest managers engage in long range planning</li> <li>• Current entries meet FSC harvesting operational requirements</li> <li>• Management plans are in broad conformance with FSC Principles</li> <li>• Past even-aged harvest entries (such as those done in the 1980's) would not be in conformance</li> </ul>
<b>P2 Long-term tenure and use rights to the land and forest resources shall be clearly defined, documented and legally established.</b>		
<b>C2.1. Clear evidence of long-term forest use rights to the land (e.g., land title, customary rights, or lease agreements) shall be demonstrated.</b>	C	<b>Over the breadth of Indicators that elaborate this Criterion, the audit team concludes that the LFSU operations can be considered to be in adequate conformance.</b>
2.1.a. Forest owners or managers make available information on legal and customary rights associated with the forest. These rights include both those held by the party seeking certification and those held by other parties.  <i>For example, tribal claims to customary uses, non-timber forest products (NTFPs), such as firewood and botanical products, hunting and fishing, and recreational uses, are addressed.</i>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Legal claims to the land are not in doubt</li> <li>• Tribal customary claims are described in the Klamath Tribes Memorandum of Agreement (MOA)</li> <li>• An array of forest products are allowed to be recovered on forest, such as firewood, hunting and fishing, grazing, and specialty forest products</li> </ul>
2.1.b. Land boundaries are clearly identified on the ground by the forest owner or manager prior to commencement of management activities adjacent to the boundary.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Either land boundaries are marked prior to timber sales, or harvesting is offset from border to avoid accidental encroachment</li> </ul>
<b>C2.2. 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.</b>	C	<b>Over the breadth of Indicators that elaborate this Criterion, the audit team concludes that the LFSU operations can be considered to be in adequate conformance.</b>
2.2.a. Forest owners or managers allow lawful customary uses of the forest to the extent they are consistent with the conservation of forest resources and the stated objectives in the management plan, and do not present a legal liability.  <i>Examples of legally recognized rights include:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>public rights of way</i></li> <li>▪ <i>public use of water</i></li> <li>▪ <i>established easements</i></li> <li>▪ <i>treaty rights</i></li> </ul>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Treaty rights are described in the MOA, Klamath Tribes have treaty right to mule deer anywhere on forest</li> <li>• There is no evidence of violation of legal tenure rights (public rights of way; easements)</li> </ul>
2.2.b. The forest owner or manager allows customary and lawful uses of the forest to the extent they are consistent with conservation of the forest resource, forest management objectives, and do not present a legal liability.  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>collecting firewood for personal use or sale</i></li> <li>▪ <i>collecting non-timber forest products for personal use or sale</i></li> <li>▪ <i>recreation</i></li> <li>▪ <i>gathering plant materials for traditional cultural purposes by American Indians</i></li> <li>▪ <i>use of water</i></li> <li>▪ <i>hiking, hunting, and fishing on non-posted property</i></li> <li>▪ <i>visiting ancestral gravesites</i></li> </ul>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See 2.2.b, Indicator is redundant</li> </ul>

2.2.c. On ownerships where customary use rights and traditional and cultural areas/sites exist, forest owners or managers consult with stakeholders in the planning and implementation of forest management activities.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exemplary and extensive consultation takes place with tribes, cattle ranchers, OHV users, and others.</li> </ul>
<b>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.</b>	C	<b>Over the breadth of Indicators that elaborate this Criterion, the audit team concludes that the LFSU operations can be considered to be in adequate conformance.</b>
2.3.a. The forest owner or manager maintains relations with community stakeholders and/or American Indian groups to identify disputes in their early stages. If disputes arise, the forest owner or manager initially attempts to resolve them through open communication, negotiation, and/or mediation. If negotiation fails, federal, state, local, and/or tribal laws are employed to resolve land tenure ( <i>see Glossary</i> ) claims.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholder consultation clearly occurs as part of day-to-day operations on the forest.</li> <li>Appeals are addressed through open communication, with the aim of resolution prior to lawsuits being filed.</li> </ul>
2.3.b. The forest owner or manager provides information regarding disputes over tenure and use rights to the certifying body.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SCS was able to review information on disputes; we are satisfied that the FSC would provide full disclosure on an ongoing basis if LFSU were to be certified</li> </ul>
<b>P3The legal and customary rights of indigenous peoples to own, use and manage their lands, territories, and resources shall be recognized and respected.</b>		
<b>C3.1. Indigenous peoples shall control forest management on their lands and territories unless they delegate control with free and informed consent to other agencies.</b>		<b>N/A; The scope of the evaluation does not include tribal lands</b>
3.1.a. Managers of tribal forests secure informed consent regarding forest management activities from tribes or individuals (such as allottees ( <i>see Glossary</i> )) whose forest is being considered for management.		
3.1.b. When requested to do so by the tribal landowner, forest owners or managers use tribal experience, knowledge, practices, and insights in forest management planning and operations on tribal lands.		
3.1.c. Areas of restricted access are delineated with the consent of affected tribal people and in accordance with their laws and customs on legally recognized tribal lands and/or customarily used non-tribal.		
<b>C3.2. Forest management shall not threaten or diminish, either directly or indirectly, the resources or tenure rights of indigenous peoples.</b>	C	<b>Over the breadth of Indicators that elaborate this Criterion, the audit team concludes that the LFSU operations can be considered to be in adequate conformance.</b>
3.2.a. Forest owners or managers identify and contact American Indian groups that have current legal or customary rights to use the management area.  The recommended priority for tribal contacts is: 1) Tribal government, such as tribal chairpersons of federally recognized tribes and traditional cultural and religious leaders. 2) Tribal contact persons identified by tribal governments. 3) Representatives of non-recognized tribes or tribal groups with no formal governments. 4) Lineal descendants of American Indians with ties to the land.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regular programmatic quarterly meetings occur with the Klamath Tribes to review upcoming projects with ID (interdisciplinary) teams.</li> <li>Open and active dialogue is maintained with local tribes (Klamath; Fort Bidwell)</li> </ul>

Unsuccessful attempts to contact tribal representatives are documented.		
3.2.b. Forest owners or managers invite the participation of tribal representatives in jointly planning forestry operations that affect tribal and other American Indian resources.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mule deer populations are jointly managed with tribes.</li> <li>• Tribes are always invited to comment on management planning as part of the NEPA process.</li> <li>• Input provided by Tribes is held in higher regard than input from the general public given the nation-to-nation status of the relationship.</li> </ul>
3.2.c. On lands adjacent to tribal lands, and on other lands where operations might affect tribal lands or resources, steps are taken by the forest owner or manager to ensure that tribal resources are protected from adverse effects of management activities.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Archeological sites are surveyed for and protected prior to any operations as part of NEPA process.</li> <li>• Mule deer population is jointly managed.</li> </ul>
<b>C3.3. 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.</b>	C	<b>Over the breadth of Indicators that elaborate this Criterion, the audit team concludes that the LFSU operations can be considered to be in adequate conformance.</b>
3.3.a. Forest owners or managers request the participation of tribal representatives in identifying sites of current or traditional significance within the property proposed for certification.  <i>For example, areas of special significance may include:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ ceremonial, burial, or village sites</li> <li>▪ areas used for hunting, fishing, or trapping</li> <li>▪ current areas used for gathering culturally important or ceremonial materials, such as basket materials, medicinal plants, or plant materials used in dances</li> <li>▪ current areas used for subsistence gathering, such as mushrooms, berries, or acorns</li> </ul>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Archeological surveys occur prior to every project as part of the NEPA process.</li> <li>• A meeting with the Klamath Tribes takes place quarterly as part of the MOA.</li> <li>• The Tribes receive a draft schedule of proposed actions one month before they are publicized; if desired they may opt to participate on the identification team.</li> <li>• A FS staff archeologist is responsible for ensuring that forest management activities do not adversely affect archeological or cultural resources.</li> <li>• Tribes have a special use right for gathering of NTFPs.</li> </ul>
3.3.b. Forest owners or managers and tribal representatives jointly develop measures to protect or enhance areas of special significance.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Archeological surveys occur prior to every project as part of the NEPA process.</li> <li>• Klamath tribe meeting occurs quarterly, as part of MOA. Tribe gets draft schedule of proposed action a month before it is publicized; the tribe can choose to have tribal members participate on ID teams, if desired</li> <li>• Tribe is more than general public, have a higher level of input by virtue of their nation to nation status</li> <li>• Arch sites are surveyed for and protected prior to any operations as part of the NEPA process</li> </ul>
3.3.c. Confidentiality of disclosures is maintained in keeping with applicable laws and requirements of tribal representatives.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Locations of archeological and cultural sites are kept confidential, as required by law (e.g., Indian Sacred Sites-Executive Order 13007 (1996))</li> <li>• When a site is identified, light marking takes place to warn operators away from sites but at the same time not draw attention to them.</li> <li>• Cultural resource maps are not included in the EA, and are exempted from FOIAs.</li> </ul>
<b>C3.4. 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.</b>		<b>Over the breadth of Indicators that elaborate this Criterion, the audit team concludes that the LFSU operations can be considered to be in adequate conformance.</b>

3.4.a. Forest owners or managers respect the confidentiality of tribal knowledge and assist in the protection of tribal intellectual property rights.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confidentiality of tribal knowledge is maintained by law</li> <li>Tribe has not identified any intellectual property rights in need of protection</li> </ul>
3.4.b. A written agreement is reached with individual American Indians and/or tribes prior to commercialization of their indigenous intellectual property, traditional ecological knowledge, and/or forest resources. The individuals and/or tribes are fairly compensated when such commercialization takes place.	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No commercialization of tribal knowledge has taken place</li> <li>No expression of concern from the tribes over the issue</li> </ul>
<b>P4 Forest management operations shall maintain or enhance the long-term social and economic well-being of forest workers and local communities.</b>		
<b>C4.1. The communities within, or adjacent to, the forest management area should be given opportunities for employment, training, and other services.</b>	C	<b>Over the breadth of Indicators that elaborate this Criterion, the audit team concludes that the LFSU operations can be considered to be in adequate conformance.</b>
<p>4.1.a. Forest work is packaged and offered in ways that create a high-quality work environment for employees, contractors, and their employees.</p> <p><i>For example, a high quality work environment may include the following attributes:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>employee and contractor relationships that are long term and stable</i></li> <li><i>a mixture of diverse tasks that require varying levels of skill</i></li> <li><i>opportunities for advancement</i></li> <li><i>a comprehensive package of benefits</i></li> <li><i>opportunities for employee and contractor participation in decision-making</i></li> <li><i>forest owners or managers provide and/or support training opportunities for workers to improve their skills</i></li> </ul>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Employee relationships are long term and stable; clear opportunities for advancement exist (although technicians advance at a slower rate)</li> <li>Federal pay and benefits are very competitive</li> <li>Contractors expressed satisfaction with working with the FS, especially regarding compensation and their long term relationships with FS</li> <li>Hub zone contracting system allows for preferentially selecting local contractors</li> <li>Stewardship contracts allow for a diverse mix of work by a single contractor</li> <li>Some opportunities for forest work cannot be performed by local workers (e.g., the closest slashbuster is based out of Klamath Falls, not Lakeview)</li> <li>Training opportunities for staff are mixed. Training varies by specialty (e.g., fire staff has the most opportunities for training; some biologist training may be inadequate).</li> <li>File review showed extensive training and collaboration records</li> <li>Some decrease in general employee morale was noted, due to budget cutbacks, staff reductions, political controversy, etc.</li> </ul>
4.1.b. The conditions of employment are as good for non-local workers as they are for local workers doing the same job (e.g., remuneration, benefits, safety equipment, training, and workman’s compensation).	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FS has recently received adverse press due to allegations of poor treatment of migrant workers on other national forests, resulting in heightened attention to the issue by the Washington Office.</li> <li>There is now a high level of sensitivity and awareness to migrant worker issues</li> <li>OSHA is notified of all contract awards, and provides safety inspections.</li> <li>Contractors comment that there have been increased inspections to ensure migrant worker health and safety (under the Migrant and Seasonal Workers Protection Act)</li> <li>Requirements exist for contractor licensing, onsite inspections and follow up to ensure proper payment</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The only significant issue is long commuting times for some non-local workers</li> </ul>
4.1.c. Employee compensation and hiring practices meet or exceed standards for comparable forest workers within the region.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Compensation is as good as or greatly exceeds regional standards</li> <li>• Excellent benefits and pension package to FS employees</li> </ul>
4.1.d. Forest owners or managers use qualified local foresters, loggers, and contractors. Forest managers and their contractors give preference to qualified local workers.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Within the Stewardship Unit, preference for timber sales goes first to bidders within the Unit; Collins is now the only local bidder. The mill then contracts with local loggers.</li> <li>• No program exists for ensuring that loggers and contractors are certified or qualified</li> <li>• Interviews with contractors and technicians confirmed they were regionally based</li> <li>• Timber sales not sold within the Unit go to highest qualified non-local bidder</li> <li>• There is no competency requirement for timber harvesters. Fire contractors must prove their credentials. Other types of service contractors are beginning to include the ability to look at past performance, and consider training claims (performance-based contracting). This is becoming a new priority, as the Fremont-Winema National Forests move towards more and more restoration contracting.</li> <li>• Employees do not have primary responsibility for contractor safety but can comment or refer situations to staff safety specialists. Safety provisions are part of all contracts and in bid forms.</li> </ul> <p>See Rec 2006.2</p>
4.1.e. Forest owners or managers demonstrate a preference for the local procurement of goods and services.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FS is heavily invested in local economy largely due to the isolated nature of the county</li> <li>• Some national procurement guidelines force the FS to purchase rolling stock from outside the region, but otherwise purchases are made locally</li> </ul>
4.1.f. Forest owners or managers and their contractors comply with the letter and intent of applicable state and federal labor laws and regulations ( <i>see also 1.1.a</i> ).	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safety is a major emphasis in daily operations</li> <li>• Hazard avoidance policies are in place to close down jobs if they are determined to be unsafe</li> <li>• Daily safety briefings occur prior to field visits</li> <li>• The FS works to comply with State OSHA, even though they are not required to do so</li> </ul>
4.1.g. Forest owners and managers contribute to public education about forest ecosystems and their management.  <i>For example, forest managers use forests as a training and educational resource.</i>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Forest supports a variety of educational programs, including local school events and fire safety education programs</li> <li>• FS provides tours to locals in an effort to better educate public so they may provide more useful feedback on management planning</li> <li>• FS employees give Earth Day talks at local schools and events</li> <li>• Supports Free Fishing Day and Fun with Fungi</li> <li>• Educational brochures are provided in the office</li> </ul>
<b>C4.2. Forest management should meet or exceed all applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of employees and their families.</b>	C	<b>Over the breadth of Indicators that elaborate this Criterion, the audit team concludes that the LFSU operations can be considered to be in adequate conformance.</b>

<p>4.2.a. The forest owner or manager and their contractors develop and implement safety programs and procedures.</p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ well-maintained machinery and equipment</li> <li>▪ use of safety equipment appropriate to each task</li> <li>▪ documentation and posting of safety procedures in the workplace</li> <li>▪ educational efforts (such as Forest Industry Safety Training Alliance and Game of Logging)</li> <li>▪ contracts with safety requirements</li> <li>▪ safety records, training reports, and certificates</li> </ul>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rigorous safety program</li> <li>• Daily safety briefings prior to field work</li> <li>• Procedures and policies are in place for inspecting contracting machines</li> <li>• Rolling stock is well maintained</li> <li>• Contracts clearly have safety requirements; including development of safety plan</li> <li>• Contractor sites have been shut down in the past for safety concerns</li> <li>• Safety records are kept (sprains and falls are the most frequent incidents)</li> </ul>
<p><b>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 Labour Organization (ILO).</b></p> <p><i>Applicability Note for 4.3: Compliance with this criterion can be accomplished with guidance from: FSC Certification and the ILO Conventions, FSC Policy Paper and Guidelines, 20 May 2002.</i></p>	C	<p><b>Over the breadth of Indicators that elaborate this Criterion, the audit team concludes that the LFSU operations can be considered to be in adequate conformance.</b></p>
<p>4.3.a. Forest owners or managers and their contractors develop effective mechanisms to resolve disputes between workers and management.</p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Language translators and cultural interpreters are employed as needed.</li> <li>▪ Cross-cultural training is employed as needed to integrate the workforce.</li> </ul>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-supervisory employees can be members of the union</li> <li>• Disputes go to union head or forest supervisor</li> <li>• If a worker employed by contractor has a grievance, they can come to the Contracting Officer's Representative, but moving beyond the contracting officer is difficult unless they want to go to court (grievances have included fuel costs and timely payments).</li> <li>• Federal law guarantees right of contractors to organize</li> <li>• A civil rights impact analysis will be completed as part of the new union proposal</li> </ul>
<p><b>4.4. Management planning and operations shall incorporate the results of evaluations of social impact. Consultations shall be maintained with people and groups directly affected by management operations.</b></p> <p><i>Applicability Note: People and groups directly affected by management operations may include: employees and contractors of the landowner; neighbors; fishers and hunters, as well as other recreational users; local water users; processors of forest products; and representatives of local and regional organizations concerned with social impacts.</i></p>	C	<p><b>Over the breadth of Indicators that elaborate this Criterion, the audit team concludes that the LFSU operations can be considered to be in adequate conformance.</b></p>
<p>4.4.a. Forest owners or managers of large-scale operations provide opportunities for people, as individuals and/or groups, to offer input into management planning when they are affected by forestry operations.</p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are frequent opportunities for proactive public input into management planning (NEPA, management plans)</li> </ul>
<p>4.4.b. People and groups affected by management operations are apprised of proposed forestry activities (e.g., logging, burning, spraying, and traffic) and associated environmental and aesthetic effects in order to solicit their comments or concerns. Such concerns are documented and addressed in management plans and operations.</p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The FS provides a notice of proposed projects to apprise the public of upcoming actions</li> <li>• Any comments received are documented and responded to as part of the EA</li> <li>• The Klamath Tribes MOA provides an express form of this consultation with Tribes</li> <li>• Some amendments to forest plan have been driven by stakeholder input</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some projects are done as Categorical Exclusions (CE's), where there has been a finding of no significant impact. When a CE is invoked, a project only goes through scoping, including listing on the annual schedule of activities, notification of interested stakeholders, and allowing for public comments which are documented and addressed.</li> <li>Recent court case (Earth Island Case), determined the subset of CE activities require formal public notification and opportunity for comment, and also makes CE's eligible for Appeals</li> </ul>
4.4.c. Significant archeological sites and sites of cultural, historical, or community significance, as identified through consultation with state archeological offices, tribes, universities, and local expertise, are designated as special management zones or otherwise protected during harvest operations.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Archeological and cultural sites have been protected through NEPA and other federal statutes</li> <li>Any site older than 50 years needs to be surveyed, mapped, and protected</li> <li>FS must consult with State Historic Preservation Office (SHIPO) during the EA process.</li> </ul>
<b>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.</b>	C	<b>Over the breadth of Indicators that elaborate this Criterion, the audit team concludes that the LFSU operations can be considered to be in adequate conformance.</b>
4.5.a. The forest owner or manager attempts to resolve grievances and mitigate damage resulting from forest management activities through open communication and negotiation prior to legal action.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If direct action by FS results in damage (e.g., escaped fire, bad fire retardant drop) to neighboring landowner, FS compensates for damage, prior to legal action</li> <li>Road safety improvements have occurred because FS is liable for vehicle accidents on their land</li> </ul>
4.5.b. Forest owners or managers and their contractors have adequate liability insurance.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The federal government is self insured</li> <li>There is a common clause in all contracts requiring liability insurance, contractors are required to present a certificate of insurance</li> </ul>
<b>P5 Forest management operations shall encourage the efficient use of the forest's multiple products and services to ensure economic viability and a wide range of environmental and social benefits.</b>		
<b>C5.1. 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.</b>	C	<b>Over the breadth of Indicators that elaborate this Criterion, the audit team concludes that the LFSU operations can be considered to be in adequate conformance. The audit team observed one Indicator-level non-conformance, resulting in the stipulation of a Minor CAR.</b>
5.1.a. The forest owner or manager is financially able to support long-term (i.e., decades rather than quarter-years or years) forest management (and if necessary restoration), such as planning, inventory, resource protection, and post-harvest management activities.  <i>For example, investment and reinvestment in forest management are sufficient to fulfill management objectives and maintain and/or restore forest health and productivity.</i>	N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of under-funding is readily apparent</li> <li>Funding level is not adequate to fully achieve goals of management plan</li> <li>Backlogs in road maintenance, thinning, etc. have reached severe levels</li> <li>FS staff is doing the best it can, given the available funding</li> <li>CAR 2006.5 was issued in response to this non-conformance.</li> </ul>
5.1.b. Responses (e.g., increases in harvests or debt load) to short-term financial factors, such as fluctuations in the market, requirements for immediate cash flow, need for sawmill	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Management is not driven by revenue maximization.</li> </ul>

equipment and log supplies, are limited to levels that enable fulfillment of the management plan.		
<p><b>C5.2. Forest management and marketing operations should encourage the optimal use and local processing of the forest's diversity of products.</b></p> <p><i>Applicability note to C5.2: Optimal use is a balance of activities that allows the continual use of resources, while maintaining the ecological, social, and economic potentials of the system from which these resources are drawn.</i></p>	C	<p><b>Over the breadth of Indicators that elaborate this Criterion, the audit team concludes that the LFSU operations can be considered to be in adequate conformance. The audit team observed one Indicator-level non-conformance, resulting in the stipulation of a Minor CAR.</b></p>
5.2.a. Preference is given to local, financially competitive, value-added processing and manufacturing facilities.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The very purpose of the stewardship unit is, in fact, to support the local economy.</li> </ul>
5.2.b. New markets are explored and developed for common, but less-used, species (e.g., alder, tanoak, and madrone), grades of lumber, and/or an expanded diversity of forest products (e.g., small diameter logs, flooring).	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biomass energy initiative, limited juniper processing</li> </ul>
5.2.c. The technical and financial specifications of some sales of forest products are scaled to promote successful competition by small businesses.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are sales of NTFP to small businesses</li> <li>There is a Small Business Administration program for contractors</li> </ul>
5.2.d. When non-timber products are harvested or utilized, the management and use of those products are incorporated into the management strategy.	N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A grazing strategy exists for the forest, providing management for one NTFP.</li> <li>NTFP's are handled by permits, but not addressed in the plan.</li> <li>CAR 2006.6 was issued in response to this non-conformance</li> </ul>
<p><b>C5.3. Forest management should minimize waste associated with harvesting and on-site processing operations and avoid damage to other forest resources.</b></p>	C	<p><b>Over the breadth of Indicators that elaborate this Criterion, the audit team concludes that the LFSU operations can be considered to be in adequate conformance.</b></p>
5.3.a. Felling, skidding/yarding, bucking, sorting, and handling are carried out in a way that maximizes volume and value.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contract specifications are designed to maximize value of sales</li> </ul>
<p>5.3.b. Harvest is implemented in a way that conserves the integrity of the residual stand. Provisions concerning acceptable levels of residual damage are included in operational contracts.</p> <p><i>For example, bumper trees are used and equipment is selected and used in a way that minimizes unintentional damage to crop trees.</i></p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contracts include provisions for acceptable residual damage, including a penalty if needed</li> <li>Observed stand damage was very low during the field reconnaissance</li> </ul>
<p>5.3.c. Tree limbs, tops, snags, down logs, and other biomass are retained on site in adequate quantities and quality for ecosystem function, wildlife habitat, and future forest productivity. After adequate woody debris has been left on site to provide nutrient cycling and habitat, additional byproducts of harvest and in-the-field milling operations are considered for use in other productive processes.</p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chips and sawdust are used for mulch, filler, or fuel.</li> <li>Small diameter boles are used for fence posts, flooring, and furniture stock.</li> </ul>	C	See 6.3c
<p><b>C5.4. Forest management should strive to strengthen and diversify the local economy, avoiding dependence on a single forest product.</b></p>	C	<p><b>Over the breadth of Indicators that elaborate this Criterion, the audit team concludes that the LFSU operations can be considered to be in adequate conformance.</b></p>
5.4.a. Forest uses and products are diversified through	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Multiple Use Sustained Yield Account requires</li> </ul>

management, while maintaining forest composition, structures, and functions.  <i>For example, compatible uses may include recreation, ecotourism, hunting, fishing, and specialty products.</i>		management of a variety of forest products
5.4.b The forest owner or manager reinvests in the local economy and the community through both active civic engagement and ongoing capital investment.  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Facilities and equipment are regularly maintained and updated.</li> <li>▪ Absentee owners maintain a local office.</li> <li>▪ The owner or manager supports local business development by working with organizations, such as the chamber of commerce.</li> </ul>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facilities are well maintained</li> <li>• FS offices are local, both Lakeview and Paisley</li> <li>• According to town manager, FS actively reinvests in local economy.</li> <li>• If timber sales go unsold within the unit, they are usually modified and then sold within the unit, rather than outside the unit. This occurs, even when it is to the detriment of the overall harvest planning objectives.</li> <li>• FS is a member of the local chamber of commerce</li> </ul>
<b>C5.5. Forest management operations shall recognize, maintain, and, where appropriate, enhance the value of forest services and resources such as watersheds and fisheries.</b> <i>Note: The Working Group considers this criterion sufficiently explicit and measurable. Indicators are not required.</i>	C	<p><b>Over the breadth of Indicators that elaborate this Criterion, the audit team concludes that the LFSU operations can be considered to be in adequate conformance.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A very substantial ongoing investment in improving fish habitat</li> <li>• Thinnings are designed to increase water flow (especially juniper removal projects)</li> </ul>
<b>C5.6. The rate of harvest of forest products shall not exceed levels that can be permanently sustained.</b>		<p><b>Over the breadth of Indicators that elaborate this Criterion, the audit team concludes that the LFSU operations can be considered to be in adequate conformance. The audit team observed one Indicator-level non-conformance, resulting in the stipulation of a Minor CAR.</b></p>
5.6.a. The level of sustainable harvest is based on clearly documented projections that use growth and regeneration data, site index models, and the classification of soils. The level of documentation is determined by the scale and intensity of the operation. <i>(see also 7.1.d)</i>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Harvest levels are far below growth. See sections 1.4.6 and 1.4.7</li> </ul>
5.6.b. Growth rates equal or exceed average harvest rates over rolling periods of no more than 10 years. In cases where owners or managers harvest timber at intervals longer than ten years, the allowable harvest is determined by the target stocking levels and the volume of re-growth since the previous harvest.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Harvest levels are far below growth. See sections 1.4.6 and 1.4.7</li> </ul>
5.6.c. The rate and methods of harvest lead to well-stocked stands across the forest management unit (FMU). Under-stocked and over-stocked stands are returned to fully stocked levels at the earliest practicable time.	N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Serious overstocking problem on the Unit is increasing risks of stand replacing fire and forest health deterioration</li> <li>• The extent and severity of overstocked stands constitutes a non-conformity relative to this Indicator;</li> <li>• CAR 2006.7 has been issued in response to this non-conformance</li> </ul>
<b>P6 Forest management shall conserve biological diversity and its associated values, water resources, soils, and unique and fragile ecosystems and landscapes, and, by so doing, maintain the ecological functions and the integrity of the forest.</b>		
<b>C6.1. Assessments of environmental impacts shall be completed -- appropriate to the scale, intensity of forest</b>	C	<p><b>Over the breadth of Indicators that elaborate this Criterion, the audit team concludes that the LFSU</b></p>

<p><b>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.</b></p> <p><i>Applicability Note: Small landowners that practice low-intensity forestry may meet this requirement with brief, less rigorous assessments. More extensive and detailed assessments (e.g., formal assessments by experts) are expected from large landowners and/or those who practice more intensive forestry (see Glossary) management.</i></p>		<p><b>operations can be considered to be in adequate conformance.</b></p>
<p>6.1.a. Using available science and local expertise, forest owners and managers identify and describe:  (1) ecological processes, such as disturbance regimes;  (2) common plants, animals, and their habitats;  (3) rare plant community types (<i>see Glossary and Appendix D</i>);  (4) rare species and their habitats (<i>see Glossary</i>);  (5) water resources; and  (6) soil resources  (<i>see also 7.1.a and b</i>).</p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NEPA assessments cover all required subject matter documentation</li> <li>• Watershed analyses address ecological processes, disturbance regimes, and common plants &amp; animals</li> <li>• Project-level plans assess conditions at a smaller scale</li> </ul>
<p>6.1.b. Using available science and local expertise, current ecological conditions are compared to the historical conditions within the landscape context, considering the elements identified in 6.1.a.</p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessments are conducted relative to the “Historic Range of Variation (HRV)”</li> <li>• In Eastside screens, current conditions for riparian, ecosystem, and wildlife are compared against historic conditions,</li> <li>• Field biologists are readily aware of sources of information; watershed analysis, historic inventory data</li> <li>• The institutional capacity of the FS to move the LFSU towards HRV is in serious doubt</li> <li>• In the FS regionally, but not in the Unit, some misuse of scale of HRV has occurred, where a regional HRV is applied at a watershed level. There has also been temporal scale misuse, i.e. manipulating how far back HRV extends</li> <li>• Stakeholder are concerned that the HRV concept could be manipulated to justify any management approach and/or outcome</li> </ul>
<p>6.1.c. Prior to the commencement of management activities, potential environmental impacts and their cumulative effects are evaluated.</p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NEPA covers extensive pre-activity reviews</li> <li>• CE’s don’t include pre-activity reviews, but have previously been determined not to have significant impact</li> <li>• EA’s occur prior to vegetative management and ground disturbing activities</li> </ul>
<p>6.1.d. Using assessments derived from the above information, options are developed and implemented to maintain and/or restore the long-term ecological functions of the forest (<i>see also 7.1.c</i>). Actions needed to avoid and mitigate negative environmental impacts are identified, and a mitigation plan is formulated (<i>see also criterion 7.1</i>).</p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The alternative system exists under NEPA</li> <li>• If there is a finding of significant impact, then a full EIS occurs</li> </ul>
<p>6.1.e. Assessments developed under 6.1.a. – d. for public lands are made available to the public.</p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All assessments are publicly available, either proactively or by FOIA</li> </ul>
<p><b>C 6.2. Safeguards shall exist which protect rare, threatened</b></p>	C	<p><b>Over the breadth of Indicators that elaborate this</b></p>

<p><b>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 affected resources. Inappropriate hunting, fishing, trapping, and collecting shall be controlled.</b></p>		<p><b>Criterion, the audit team concludes that the LFSU operations can be considered to be in adequate conformance.</b></p>
<p>6.2.a. If consultation of databases for rare species and/or plant community types (<i>see Glossary and 6.1</i>) indicate the likely presence of a rare species (see Glossary), then either a survey is conducted prior to the commencement of management activities (to verify the species' presence or absence) or the forest owner or manager manages as though the species were present. If a rare species is determined to be present, its location is reported to the manager of the species' database.</p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sensitive status plants and animal species are considered and safeguarded prior to management activities</li> <li>• When surveys or databases show existence of species, proper safeguards are incorporated into management activities</li> </ul>
<p>6.2.b. When a rare species and/or plant community type is present or assumed to be present, modifications are made in both the management plan and its implementation in order to maintain, improve, or restore the species and its habitat.</p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Management activities are routinely modified in order to protect rare plant and animal species</li> <li>• Examples include Bald Eagle Management Areas (BEMA's), old-growth management areas, meadow protections, etc.</li> </ul>
<p>6.2.c. Conservation zones (<i>see Glossary</i>) and other protected areas for existing rare species and/or plant community types are created and/or maintained to enhance the viability of populations and their habitats, including their connectivity within the landscape. Forest managers consult recovery plans and specialists, such as biologists or ecologists, to determine species' habitat needs.</p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation zones have been created (BEMA's, Goshawk protection zones, rare plant community protection zones, etc.)</li> <li>• Designated old-growth areas are obligated for certain species (Marten, etc.)</li> <li>• Forest managers manage for downstream fish species (Warner sucker, red banded trout)</li> <li>• Biologists and experts are on staff for consultation</li> </ul>
<p><b>6.3. Ecological functions and values shall be maintained intact, enhanced, or restored, including:</b>  <b>a) Forest regeneration and succession.</b>  <b>b) Genetic, species, and ecosystem diversity.</b>  <b>c) Natural cycles that affect the productivity of the forest ecosystem.</b>  <b>d) Old-growth stands and forests</b>  <b>e) Retention</b>  <b>f) Even-aged silvicultural systems</b>  <i>Applicability note: Indicators under 6.3.a. &amp; b. may have limited applicability for managers of small and mid-sized forest properties because of their limited ability to coordinate their activities with other owners within the landscape, or to significantly maintain and/or improve landscape-scale vegetative patterns.</i></p>	C	<p><b>Over the breadth of Indicators that elaborate this Criterion, the audit team concludes that the LFSU operations can be considered to be in adequate conformance.</b></p>
<p><b>C6.3.a. Forest regeneration and succession</b></p>	C	
<p>6.3.a.1. Forest owners or managers use the following information to make management decisions regarding regeneration: landscape patterns (e.g., successional processes, land use/land cover, non-forest uses, habitat types); ecological characteristics of adjacent forested stands (e.g., age, productivity, health); species' requirements; and frequency, distribution, and intensity of natural disturbances.</p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reforestation takes into account landscape patterns such as fire return interval, condition of neighboring stands, desired future conditions, etc.</li> </ul>
<p>6.3.a.2. Forest owners or managers maintain or restore portions of the forest to the range and distribution of age classes of trees that would result from natural processes inherent to the site.</p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FS uses desired future conditions and HRV concept to drive management planning</li> <li>• A fundamental goal of management within the Unit is</li> </ul>

		to return stands to older conditions. However, this goal is far from being met.
6.3.a.3. Silvicultural practices generate stand conditions (species composition, physical structures, habitat types, and ecological processes) that are similar to those produced by disturbance regimes typical for the site	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Much of the eastside pine system is characterized by the low and moderate intensity fire regimes. Accordingly, harvests focus on mimicking these regimes through thinnings</li> <li>• Due to decades of fires exclusion and fuels build up, stand conditions are outside of the historic natural range of variation.</li> <li>• Current silvicultural practices conform with the FSC standard, but prior economic rotation based management would not have been in conformance</li> </ul>
<b>C6.3.b. Genetic, species, and ecosystem diversity</b>	C	
6.3.b.1. The forest owner or manager selects trees for harvest, retention, and planting in a manner that maintains or enhances the productive capacity, genetic diversity and quality, and species diversity of the residual stand.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tree selection maintains genetic diversity as the most vigorous healthy trees are left on site</li> <li>• FS works to eliminate offsite species, such as fir on pine sites</li> </ul>
6.3.b.2. Native seeds of known provenance are used for artificial regeneration.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seed zones are used in propagating planting stock</li> <li>• FS often uses seed from their own seed plantations</li> <li>• Native grass seed is used on re-vegetation projects</li> </ul>
6.3.b.3. Habitat components necessary to support native species are protected, maintained, and/or enhanced within the harvest unit and across the FMU ( <i>see also 6.3.e.1</i> ).  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ vertical and horizontal structural complexity</li> <li>▪ understory species diversity</li> <li>▪ food sources</li> <li>▪ nesting, denning, hibernating, and roosting structures</li> <li>▪ habitats and refugia for sedentary species and those with special habitat requirements</li> </ul>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Selection silviculture is highly conducive to maintaining habitat components for native species</li> <li>• Individual habitat elements are identified and retained (e.g. nesting and roosting trees)</li> </ul>
6.3.b.4. At the FMU level, a comprehensive range of native species, habitats, stand types, age and size classes (including large and old trees), and physical structures is maintained over time.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wide diversity of native species and habitats are maintained on the forest. The FS manages only for native species, and maintains diversity in stand types, age, and size classes.</li> </ul>
<b>C6.3.c. Natural cycles that affect the productivity of the forest ecosystem</b>	C	
6.3.c.1. If a decline in soil fertility or forest health is observed, forest owners or managers determine the source of the decline through tests and investigation. If soil degradation is found to be the source of the decline, forest owners or managers modify soil-management techniques.  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Primary management objectives shift from commercial production to restoration.</li> <li>▪ Site preparation is minimized.</li> <li>▪ The lightest practical equipment with the lowest ground pressure is used.</li> <li>▪ Whole-tree harvesting is discontinued, and tops are left in the forest.</li> <li>▪ Longer rotations and a diversity of species are used</li> </ul>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impressive and rigorous program of sampling for soil compaction. Levels of compaction are quite low on the forest.</li> <li>• Low pressure harvesting equipment is used</li> <li>• Soils are basically grassland soils with a high nutrient content.</li> <li>• Fremont-Winema has a soil scientist on staff</li> <li>• All management activities on the Unit are now oriented towards restoration</li> <li>• Stand replacing wildfires are mostly allowed to recover naturally</li> </ul>

<p><i>in lieu of artificial fertilization.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Natural, early successional processes are allowed or encouraged.</i></li> </ul>		
<p>6.3.c.2. Forest managers identify and apply site-specific fuels management practices, based on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) natural fire regimes,</li> <li>(2) risk of wildfire,</li> <li>(3) potential economic losses, and</li> <li>(4) public safety.</li> </ol>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is an active fuel management program involving both the fire and silvicultural staffs</li> <li>• FS has created a community fire management plan</li> <li>• Fuel treatments often aimed at Wildland Urban Interface</li> <li>• Risk of fire in mixed conifer stands may be underappreciated</li> <li>• It is unlikely that the FS can treat all the necessary stands, so the plan is to triage forests to treat areas around high fuel and bug kill areas</li> </ul>
<p>6.3.c.3. Post-harvest management activities maintain soil fertility, structures, and functions.</p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Slash is randomly distributed across the harvest area.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Burning is used where it is appropriate to the natural disturbance regime.</i></li> </ul>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whole tree logging is utilized as a one time deal for practical fuel treatment issues, FS soil scientists have not observed any decrease in soil fertility due to this harvesting method because of the rich soils on the Unit.</li> <li>• Stands are regularly under-burned after thinning in order to reduce fuel load</li> </ul>
<p>6.3.c.4. Prescriptions for salvage harvests balance ecological and economic considerations.</p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Coarse woody debris is maintained.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Den trees and snags are maintained.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Natural, background levels of 'pest' populations are allowed exist before measures to control such populations are implemented.</i></li> </ul>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The balance is clearly more towards ecological considerations rather than value recovery in salvage harvesting</li> <li>• 75-80% of fire areas are not salvaged</li> <li>• Large amounts of large/coarse woody debris and snags are left, undisturbed, during salvage operations</li> </ul>
<p><b>C6.3.d. Old-growth stands and forests</b></p> <p><b>Note: Failure to meet the provisions of Criterion 6.3.d. will be considered a major failure (fatal flaw).</b></p>		
<p><i>This section uses the following definitions:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Type 1 stands are those stands of at least 20 contiguous acres that have never been logged and that display late successional/old-growth characteristics. Stands that have never been logged, but which are smaller than 20 acres, are assessed for their ecological significance, and may also be classified as Type 1 stands. Areas containing a low density of existing roads may still be considered Type 1 stands, provided the roads have not caused significant, negative ecological impacts.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Type 2 stands are old unlogged stands smaller than 20 acres that are not classified as Type 1, and other stands of at least 3 contiguous acres that have been logged, but which retain significant late-successional/old-growth structure and functions.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Type 3 stands are those that have residual old-growth trees and/or other late-successional/old-growth characteristics, but do not meet the definition of a Type 2 stand.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Applicability note: When forest management activities (including timber harvest) create and maintain conditions that emulate Type 2 or 3 stands, the management system that created those conditions may be used to maintain them. Such areas may be considered as representative samples for the purposes of meeting criterion 6.4.</i></p>		
<p>6.3.d.1. Non-tribal Type 1 stands are not harvested. Timber harvests may be certifiable on Type 1 American Indian lands, in recognition of their sovereignty and unique ownership. Requirements for certification of tribal operations that include harvest in Type 1 stands are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Type 1 forests comprise a significant portion of the tribal ownership</li> </ul>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most inventoried old-growth is classified as separate management areas</li> <li>• The FS intends someday to log in old-growth management areas because many are in the regular timber management zone. Such harvesting will be selective, will meet Eastside screens, will be intended to enhance old-growth/late successional attributes and,</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A history of forest stewardship by the tribe exists</li> <li>▪ High Conservation Value Forest attributes are maintained</li> <li>▪ Old-growth structures are maintained in the managed stand</li> <li>▪ Conservation zones representative of Type 1 stands have been established</li> <li>▪ Landscape level considerations have been addressed</li> <li>▪ Rare species (<i>see Glossary</i>) are protected</li> </ul>		<p>as such, should not result in conversion from Type II to Type III</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No such logging has occurred in the last 15 years, at least</li> <li>• Harvests would be aimed at thinning from below and reducing fire hazards in old-growth ponderosa pine</li> <li>• Some old-growth areas in higher mixed conifer forests may be considered for entry</li> <li>• There is likely to be no logging in these areas before the plan is revised (next 10 years), so old-growth management will be addressed in the new plan</li> <li>• The FS is currently in compliance with this indicator. However, by the nature of harvesting within old-growth, there is a potential for a major non-conformance if Type I stands are entered or if there is conversion of Type II and/or III stands</li> </ul>
<p>6.3.d.2. Management activities adjacent to Type 1 stands are conducted to minimize abrupt forest/opening edge effects and other negative impacts on the ecological integrity of these areas.</p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Management activities are modified near old-growth stands to avoid off-site impacts</li> <li>• There are possible effects of grazing near old-growth stands (such as serving as weed vectors), but current practices are well managed</li> </ul>
<p>6.3.d.3. Timber harvests in Type 2 and Type 3 stands maintain late-successional/old-growth structures, functions, and components, including individual trees that function as refugia. There is no net decline in the area or the old-growth characteristics of Type 2 or Type 3 stands due to forest management, with the exception of Type 3 stands that are elevated to Type 2 stands.</p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Method of harvesting is designed to improve old-growth characteristics and move type III into type II, over time</li> <li>• Concern exists that a lack of sufficient active management leads to a risk of disease, moisture level, and fire due to overstocking in old-growth stands</li> <li>• Treatments are done well, but are still far below the amount of harvesting needed to maintain forest health because of existing stocking conditions and changes to the fire regime</li> </ul>
<p>6.3.d.4. Where Type 1, 2, and 3 stands are under-represented in the landscape, a portion of the forest is managed to create late-successional/old-growth characteristics.</p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Management activities are aimed at enhancing old-growth attributes</li> </ul>
<p><b>6.3.e. Retention</b>  <i>Applicability note: Several types of retention are required by this standard with respect to green trees, snags, and woody debris. The amounts of each of the following types of retention and/or set-asides are not necessarily cumulative.</i>  <i>Retention and set-aside provisions include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>habitats of sensitive, threatened, and endangered species (criterion 6.2)</i></li> <li>▪ <i>old-growth and late successional trees (6.3.d)</i></li> <li>▪ <i>post-harvest, within-stand tree retention (6.3.e.5)</i></li> <li>▪ <i>green trees around snags (6.3.e.2)</i></li> <li>▪ <i>native hardwoods (6.3.e.3)</i></li> <li>▪ <i>representative stand types (criterion 6.4)</i></li> <li>▪ <i>riparian management zones (criterion 6.5)</i></li> <li>▪ <i>late-seral management areas (10.5.a)</i></li> </ul>	C	
<p>6.3.e.1. Forest owners and managers retain (or, if absent, recruit) legacy trees, old and large trees, snags and woody debris to sustain populations of native plants, fungi, and animals, both within the harvest unit and across the FMU.</p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No trees over 21” are harvested; large old trees are protected</li> <li>• There is an opportunity for additional analysis on how to protect old-growth trees when they are less than 21”, (e.g., more important to focus on old-growth</li> </ul>

<p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Old trees with irreplaceable characteristics are retained.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>In some dry regions, retaining approximately 10 tons of debris per acre may be sufficient. In wetter regions, retaining 20 tons of debris per acre may be sufficient.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Debris is well distributed spatially and by size and decay class, with a goal of at least 4 large pieces (approximately 20" diameter X 15' length) per acre.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Three to 10 snags per acre (averaged over 10 acres) are maintained or recruited.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Snags are well represented by size, species, and decay class.</i></li> </ul>		<p>characteristics like deeply furrowed bark, witches broom, etc. rather than focusing exclusively on size)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Using size as a proxy for age, may be harvesting some older, slow-growing trees that are less than 21”</li> </ul>
<p>6.3.e.2. Where necessary to protect against wind throw and to maintain microclimate, green trees and other vegetation are retained around snags, down woody debris, and other retention components.</p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FS ensures extensive retention of green trees and snags; no even-aged management occurs on the Unit</li> </ul>
<p>6.3.e.3. Native hardwoods and understory vegetation are retained as needed to maintain and/or restore the natural mix of species and forest structure.</p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FS has projects to enhance aspen stands in riparian areas</li> <li>• Ceanothus and other shrubs are being maintained in the understory, to an excessive level in the view of many</li> </ul>
<p>6.3.e.4. Live trees and native understory vegetation are retained within the harvest unit in proportions and configurations that are consistent with the characteristic natural disturbance regime in each community type (<i>see Glossary</i>), unless retention at a lower level is necessary for purposes of restoration.</p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Silvicultural strategy of thinning from below, as mandated by the Eastside Screens, results in abundant green-tree retention in harvested areas</li> </ul>
<p>6.3.e.5. Within harvest openings larger than 6 acres, 10-30% of pre-harvest basal area is retained. The levels of green-tree retention depend on such factors as: opening size, legacy trees, adjacent riparian zones, slope stability, upslope management, presence of critical refugia, and extent and intensity of harvesting across the FMU. Retention is distributed as clumps and dispersed individuals, appropriate to site conditions. Retained trees comprise a diversity of species and size classes, which includes large and old trees.</p>	NA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not applicable, no harvest openings larger than 6 acres</li> </ul>
<p><b>6.3.f. Even-aged silvicultural systems</b></p>	NA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not applicable. No even-aged timber management on the LFSU</li> </ul>
<p>6.3.f.1. Even-aged silviculture (<i>see Glossary</i>) may be employed where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) native species require openings for regeneration or vigorous young-stand development, or</li> <li>2) it restores the native species composition, or</li> <li>3) it is needed to restore structural diversity in a landscape lacking openings, while maintaining connectivity of older, intact forests.</li> </ol>	NA	
<p>6.3.f.2. When trees are planted, the plantings maintain or enhance the composition and/or diversity of the forest ecosystem.</p>	NA	
<p>6.3.f.3. If regeneration harvest ages do not approach culmination of mean annual increment (CMAI, <i>see Glossary</i>), retention approaches the upper end of the range required in</p>	NA	

6.3.e.5.		
6.3.f.4. Regeneration harvest blocks in even-aged stands average 40 acres or less. No individual block is larger than 60 acres ( <i>see 6.3.e.4. and 6.3.e.5. for provisions of within-stand retention in openings larger than 6 acres</i> ).	NA	
6.3.f.5. Regeneration in previously harvested areas reaches a mean height of at least seven feet or achieves canopy closure ( <i>see Glossary</i> ) before adjacent areas are regeneration harvested.	NA	
<p><b>C6.4. 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.</b></p> <p><i>Applicability Note: When forest management activities (including timber harvest) create and maintain conditions that emulate an intact, mature forest or other successional phases that may be under-represented in the landscape, the management system that created those conditions may be used to maintain them, and the area may be considered as a representative sample for the purposes of meeting this criterion.</i></p> <p><i>Ecologically viable representative samples are designated to serve one or more of three purposes: (1) to establish and/or maintain an ecological reference condition, (2) to create or maintain a representative system of protected areas (i.e., includes samples of all successional phases, forest types, and plant communities (see Glossary and Appendix D), and/or (3) to protect a feature that is sensitive, rare, or unique in the landscape. Areas serving the purposes of (1) and (2) may move across the landscape as under-represented conditions change, or may be fixed in area and manipulated to maintain the desired conditions. Areas serving the purposes of (3) are fixed in location.</i></p> <p><i>Forests of all sizes may be conducive to protection of fixed features, such as rock outcrops and bogs. Medium-sized and large forests may be more conducive than small forests to the maintenance of successional phases and disturbance patterns.</i></p> <p><i>While public lands (see Glossary) are expected to bear primary responsibility for protecting representative samples of existing ecosystems, FSC certification of private lands (especially those with large contiguous areas of forest) can contribute to such protection.</i></p> <p><i>In some cases, the forest owner or manager may designate set-asides by formal means (conservation easements or purchase of conservation areas) on lands other than the certified FMU. Any off-FMU designation will be made to better implement or meet regional, state, and landscape level forest ecosystem and wildlife habitat restoration needs, plans, and objectives.</i></p>	C	<p><b>Over the breadth of Indicators that elaborate this Criterion, the audit team concludes that the LFSU operations can be considered to be in adequate conformance.</b></p>
6.4.a. Forest owners or managers assess the adequacy of representation of their forest types in protected areas across the landscape. This assessment entails collaboration with state natural heritage programs; public agencies; regional,	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National system of Research Natural Areas (RNA's) is intended to conserve areas of notable resource attributes; areas are identified at the level of the FS</li> </ul>

<p>landscape, and watershed planning efforts; universities; and/or local conservationists. It may also include gap analysis.</p>		<p>regional office</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grid of old-growth areas is identified regionally, and additional old-growth areas were set aside at the forest level</li> <li>• Intact native shrub-steppe ecosystems are globally and regionally rare, thus the Unit may not have adequate representation of shrub-steppe habitat in the RNA system.</li> <li>• There is marginal conformance to this Indicator. An assessment has not occurred at the forest/unit level, but has occurred nationally and regionally.</li> <li>• There is an opportunity for improvement here during the next round of forest planning</li> </ul>
<p>6.4.b. Where existing protected areas within the landscape are not of a size and configuration to serve one or more of the three purposes described in the applicability note above, forest owners or managers, whose properties are conducive to the establishment of such areas, designate ecologically viable areas that serve these purposes. The size and arrangement of on-site and off-site representative sample areas are documented.</p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See above, may need to fill gap of shrub-steppe habitat</li> </ul>
<p>6.4.c. The size and extent of representative samples on public lands being considered for certification is determined through a science-based (e.g., gap analysis, regional reserve design principals and methodologies), transparent planning process that is accessible and responsive to the public.</p> <p><b>Note: Failure to meet the provisions of 6.4.c. or 6.4.d. is a major failure (fatal flaw) for mid- and large-sized public forests.</b></p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RNA was a science based process, one of the 430 areas across the country is located within the Unit</li> <li>• Grid system for old-growth was publicized and included as part of a public process</li> <li>• Eastside Screen committee did a detailed gap analysis</li> <li>• Wildlife habitat connectivity is considered in design of Eastside screen old-growth management areas</li> </ul>
<p>6.4.d. Managers of large, conterminous public forests (<i>see Glossary</i>) establish and maintain representative protected areas sufficient in size to maintain species dependent on interior core habitats.</p> <p><b>Note: Failure to meet the provisions of 6.4.c. or 6.4.d. is a major failure (fatal flaw) for mid- and large-sized public forests.</b></p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are only a few species in need of interior core habitats (e.g., marten); there are more species associated with the older forest matrix</li> <li>• Various categories of land use allocations fulfill representative area needs, such as Research Natural Area's, 2200 acres protected habitat along Auger Creek, Gearhart Mountain wilderness area (partially within the Unit)</li> </ul>
<p><b>C6.5. 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.</b> <i>Applicability note: Soil cover and fertility are maintained in a condition that is sufficient to: (1) minimize soil erosion, (2) protect soil microbial communities, (3) protect inherent site productivity, (4) protect surface water quality, and (5) protect the natural processes in aquifers. The type and extent of canopy cover and groundcover required to accomplish the above is dependent on the following: slope; stability of the soil; potential for soil compaction; and characteristics of the climate, such as the intensity and frequency of precipitation.</i></p>	C	<p><b>Over the breadth of Indicators that elaborate this Criterion, the audit team concludes that the LFSU operations can be considered to be in adequate conformance. However, indicator-level non-conformances were observed regarding the forest transportation system, and a Minor CAR was stipulated.</b></p>
<p><b><u>Logging and Site Preparation</u></b></p> <p>6.5.a. Logging operations and the use of roads and skid trails</p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Soil hydrologists and geologists are on staff to provide necessary expertise</li> <li>• Soil moisture limits are used to restrict harvesting, and minimize soil impacts</li> </ul>

<p>occur only when soil compaction, erosion, and sediment transport do not result in degradation of water quality, site productivity, or habitats.</p> <p><i>For example, soils are either dry enough or frozen enough to minimize disturbance and compaction.</i></p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Designated skid trails are the norm throughout the Unit</li> <li>• Unstable areas are seeded to control erosion</li> <li>• Harvest operations occur with minimum soil impacts, e.g., rutting is minimized, water bars are systematically installed, etc.</li> <li>• When possible, frozen ground logging is used to prevent compaction.</li> </ul>
<p>6.5.b. Logging damage to regeneration and residual trees is minimized during harvest operations.</p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very little tree damage was observed throughout treated stands</li> <li>• FS ensures right to charge damage penalties, by including stipulation in contracts.</li> </ul>
<p>6.5.c. Areas in which the risk of landslides is extreme (considering factors, such as slope, soil, and concavity), are neither logged nor roaded.</p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deferred road maintenance may have contributed to a large slide in the North Warner Mountains, which was identified by the auditors.</li> <li>• Soil erosion and landslide analyses are conducted as part of the watershed analyses</li> <li>• No new roads are presently planned for the Unit</li> </ul>
<p>6.5.d. On sites with a high risk of landslides, the forest owner or manager assures that such risks will not be exacerbated by management operations, especially where landslide “runout” may affect water bodies.</p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The watershed analyses being completed across the Unit include a landslide risk analysis</li> </ul>
<p>6.5.e. In order to minimize soil disturbance, silvicultural techniques and logging equipment are selected in accordance with slope and the hazard rating for soil erosion.</p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>On slopes greater than 30 percent, ground-based yarding is used only when it is possible to do so without exacerbating soil erosion.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>On slopes greater than 50%, cable or helicopter yarding is used if it is technically feasible and will not result in adverse environmental effects due to the management operations.</i></li> </ul>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FS has a policy that on a greater than 35% slope, logging methods will switch from ground based to cable based</li> <li>• In addition to cable logging, helicopter logging is used on steep slopes</li> </ul>
<p>6.5.f. Plans for site preparation either minimize impacts to forest resources or specify the following mitigations:</p> <p>(1) 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.</p> <p>(2) Scarification of soils is limited to the minimum necessary to achieve successful regeneration of desired species.</p> <p>(3) Topsoil is minimally disturbed.</p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scarification of soils is not used as a site prep method</li> <li>• FS under-burns to remove slash after harvesting</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Transportation System (including permanent and temporary haul roads, skid trails, and landings)</u></b></p> <p>6.5.g. The transportation system is pre-planned, designed, located, constructed, maintained, and/or reconstructed to minimize the extent and impact of the system and its potential cumulative adverse effects:</p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>As a part of watershed assessments on public lands, habitats for salmonids and other threatened and endangered aquatic species are identified. If shown to be necessary, road density is reduced in such</i></li> </ul>	N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No new roads planned for the Unit. Roads are being decommissioned, and thus the overall trend is a gradual reduction in total road miles</li> <li>• There appears to be inadequate funding to maintain road systems</li> <li>• Annual road budget is \$900,000, backlogged maintenance is in \$10’s of millions</li> <li>• There are hundreds of road guideline violations across the landscape</li> <li>• There are currently 12,000 miles of road on the Fremont-Winema, which is out of proportion to projected amount of harvest activity that will take place</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>habitats and/or mitigated within the watershed.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Roads, landings, and skid trails are minimized.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Displacement of soil, sedimentation of streams, and impacts to water quality are minimized.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Patches of habitat and migration corridors are conserved.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Roads constructed across slopes in excess of 60 percent are full bench cuts or with minimal side-cast.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Roads are built on flat areas or stable slopes.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>The integrity of riparian zones and buffers surrounding other valuable ecological elements are conserved (e.g., wetlands, habitat for sensitive species, and interior old-growth forest).</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Permanent roads have structures to control soil erosion year-round and are managed under a winter maintenance plan.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Cooperative transportation planning with agencies, such as watershed councils, is used to minimize negative cumulative environmental impacts across the landscape.</i></li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• on the forest</li> <li>• FS is soon to finish a forest road analysis that will identify which roads are necessary and which can be eliminated</li> <li>• Overall, the audit team concludes that the current state of road system management constitutes a non-conformance with this Indicator; as such, CAR 2006.8 is stipulated.</li> </ul>
<p>6.5.h. Landings are designed and constructed to minimize soil erosion.</p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Landings are located on ecologically suitable sites.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Landings are limited to the smallest practical safe area.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Landings are sloped to divert runoff to non-erosive areas.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Landings are seeded and mulched or covered with slash after use.</i></li> </ul>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The log landings that the audit team examined were constructed to minimize erosion</li> <li>• The team observed no evidence of excessively large landings</li> </ul>
<p>6.5.i. Access to temporary and permanent roads is controlled to minimize impacts to soil and biota while simultaneously allowing legitimate access as addressed by Principles 3 &amp; 4 and identified in the management plan.</p> <p><i>For example: Roads without a weather resistant surface (e.g., soil, or native-surfaced roads) are used only during periods of weather when conditions are favorable to minimize road damage, surface erosion, and sediment transport.</i></p> <p>Access is restricted to roads that are not immediately needed for purposes of management.</p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Control of road use is adequate considering the level of use</li> <li>• Many roads have restricted seasonal usage</li> <li>• There are instances of road closures being violated by users</li> </ul>
<p>6.5.j. Failed drainage structures or other areas of active erosion caused by roads and skid trails are identified, and measures are taken to correct the drainage and erosion problems.</p>	N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of funding has led to road drainage issues as there is inadequate maintenance of drainage structures</li> <li>• CAR 2006.8 has been issued in response to this non-conformance</li> </ul>
<p>6.5.k. Access is restricted and erosion is controlled on infrequently used roads.</p>	N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Road access is not controlled on infrequently used roads</li> <li>• Roads are open to public access regardless of the frequency of their use. If a road is not closed for safety issues, then it is open to all users.</li> <li>• CAR 2006.8 has been issued in response to this non-conformance</li> </ul>
<p>6.5.l. Unnecessary roads are permanently decommissioned or</p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A forest road analysis will determine which roads are</li> </ul>

<p>put to bed.</p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Bridges and culverts are removed; water bars are installed.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Slopes are re-contoured and/or re-vegetated.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Ecologically functional drainage patterns are established.</i></li> </ul>		<p>unnecessary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is an active program to decommission roads</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Stream and Water Quality Protection</u></b></p>		
<p><i>Applicability Note: The following water quality requirements of this standard are superceded when and where state or federal laws, regulations, or other contractual requirements are more stringent. This section uses the following definitions:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Category A stream: A stream that supports or can support populations of native fish and/or provides a domestic water supply.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Category B stream: Perennial streams that do not support native fish and are not used as a domestic water supply.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Category C stream: An intermittent stream that never the less has sufficient water to host populations of non-fish aquatic species</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Category D stream: A stream that flows only after rainstorms or melting snow and does not support populations of aquatic species</i></li> </ul>		
<p>6.5.m. Streams, vernal pools, lakes, wetlands, seeps, springs, and associated riparian areas are managed to maintain and/or restore hydrologic processes, water quality, and habitat characteristics (<i>see NMFS (1996)</i>); state water quality standards; <i>Karr (1981)</i>), which may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ the capacity for water to infiltrate the soil</li> <li>▪ habitat for riparian species</li> <li>▪ moderating water temperature</li> <li>▪ controlling sedimentation</li> <li>▪ clean gravel for spawning</li> <li>▪ physical structures to protect the integrity of the stream channel,</li> <li>▪ including pools used by anadromous fish</li> </ul>	<p>C</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aquatic habitat of all types is clearly managed to maintain hydrologic processes</li> </ul>
<p>6.5.n. Forest owners or managers retain and recruit sufficient large, green trees; snags; understory vegetation; down logs; and other woody debris in riparian zones to provide shade, erosion control, and in-channel structures.</p>	<p>C</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stream management is designed for restoration and elimination of fish passage impediments</li> <li>• Streamside pine removal projects (to favor native riparian hardwoods) may be overly aggressive and could reduce the recruitment of large woody debris.</li> </ul>
<p>6.5.o. For Category A streams, and for lakes and wetlands larger than one acre, an inner buffer zone is maintained. The inner buffer is at least 50 feet wide (slope distance) from the active high water mark (on both sides) of the stream channel and increases depending on forest type, slope stability, steepness, and terrain. Management activities in the inner buffer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ maintains or restore the native vegetation</li> <li>▪ are limited to single-tree selection silviculture</li> <li>▪ retain and allows for recruitment of large live and dead trees for shade and stream structure</li> <li>▪ retain canopy cover and shading sufficient to moderate fluctuations in water temperature, to provide habitat for the full complement of aquatic and terrestrial species native to the site, and maintain or restore riparian functions</li> <li>▪ exclude use of heavy equipment, except to cross streams at designated places, or where the use of such equipment is the lowest impact alternative</li> <li>▪ avoid disturbance of mineral soil; where disturbance is unavoidable, mulch and seed are applied before the rainy</li> </ul>	<p>C</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 300' buffers are maintained as required by the Inland Native Fish Strategy</li> <li>• The buffers are essentially no management zones; FS can only do management designed around improving riparian and stream habitat</li> </ul>

<p>season</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ avoid the spread of pathogens and noxious weeds</li> <li>▪ avoid road construction and reconstruction</li> </ul>		
<p>6.5.p. For Category A streams, and for lakes and wetlands larger than one acre, an outer buffer zone is maintained. This buffer extends from the outer edge of the inner buffer zone to a distance of at least 150 feet from the edge of the active high water mark (slope distance, on both sides) of the stream channel. In this outer buffer, harvest occurs only where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ single-tree or group selection silviculture is used</li> <li>▪ post harvest canopy cover maintains shading sufficient to moderate fluctuations in water temperature, provide habitat for the full compliment of aquatic and terrestrial species native to the site, and maintain or restore riparian functions</li> <li>▪ new road construction is avoided and reconstruction enhances riparian functions and reduces sedimentation</li> <li>▪ disturbance of mineral soil is avoided; where disturbance is unavoidable, mulch and seed are applied before the rainy season</li> </ul>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FS watercourse buffer policies clearly meet the requirements of this Indicator; see above</li> </ul>
<p>6.5.q. For Category B streams, a 25-foot (slope distance) inner buffer is created and managed according to provisions for inner buffers for Category A. A 75-foot (slope distance) outer buffer (for a total buffer of 100 feet) is created and managed according to provisions for outer buffer for Category A (<i>see 6.5.n</i>).</p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least 150' buffers on Category B streams; same protection measures as above</li> </ul>
<p>6.5.r. For Category C streams, and for lakes and wetlands smaller than one acre, a buffer zone 75 feet wide (on both sides of the stream) is established that constrains management activities to those that are allowed in outer buffer zones of Category A streams.</p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met by compliance with Inland Native Fish Stragegy, see above</li> </ul>
<p>6.5.s. For Category D streams, management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ maintains root strength and stream bank and channel stability</li> <li>▪ recruits coarse wood to the stream system</li> <li>▪ minimizes management-related sediment transport to the stream system</li> </ul>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met by compliance with Inland Native Fish Stragegy, see above</li> </ul>
<p>6.5.t. Grazing by domestic animals is controlled to protect the species composition and viability of the riparian vegetation and the banks of the stream channel from erosion.</p> <p><i>For example, the numbers of livestock, as well as the seasonality and duration of grazing, are controlled to protect the aquatic-riparian habitat, with special emphasis afforded sensitive aquatic and riparian species.</i></p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grazing is actively managed to protect stream zones, and riparian areas are being ameliorated</li> </ul>
<p>6.5.u. Stream crossings are located and constructed to minimize fragmentation of aquatic habitat (<i>see Glossary</i>), maintain water quality, and either to accommodate a 100-year peak flood event or to limit the consequences of an unavoidable failure. Road crossings, dams, and other human-made structures that impede fish passage are removed or modified to enable passage, taking legal or environmental constraints into account.</p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Crossings of riparian management zones are minimized.</li> </ul>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New roadway drainage structures are sized to accommodate up to 100-year flood events</li> <li>• Currently there are over 400 inventoried fish passage impediments. This number was arrived at through engineer inventories. Typically, biologist inventories identify fewer impediments because they can more accurately identify what constitutes a true impediment.</li> <li>• It is going to take 30 years to replace all identified fish barriers, but through appropriate prioritizing of the backlog, the FS will address 2/3 of the habitat with removal of 1/3 of the passage impediments over the</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Stream crossings are installed at an angle that causes the least ecological disturbance to the waterway.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Culverts allow free passage of aquatic organisms.</i></li> </ul>		next 10 years
<p><b>C6.6. Management systems shall promote the development and adoption of environmentally friendly non-chemical methods of pest management and strive to avoid the use of chemical pesticides. World Health Organization Type 1A and 1B and chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides; pesticides that are persistent, toxic or whose derivatives remain biologically active and accumulate in the food chain beyond their intended use; as well as any pesticides banned by international agreement, shall be prohibited. If chemicals are used, proper equipment and training shall be provided to minimize health and environmental risks.</b></p>	C	<p><b>Over the breadth of Indicators that elaborate this Criterion, the audit team concludes that the LFSU operations can be considered to be in adequate conformance.</b></p>
<p>6.6.a. Forest owners and managers demonstrate compliance with FSC Policy paper: “Chemical Pesticides in Certified Forests, Interpretation of the FSC Principles and Criteria, July 2002” and comply with prohibitions and/or restrictions on World Health Organization Type 1A and 1B and chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides; pesticides that are persistent, toxic or whose derivatives remain biologically active and accumulate in the food chain beyond their intended use; as well as any pesticides banned by international agreement.</p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use is restricted to 4 chemicals region wide: glyphosate, piclorin, dicamba,</li> <li>• Imazypr may be used in the region, but is not being used in the Unit</li> </ul>
<p>6.6.b. Forest owners or managers employ silvicultural systems, integrated pest management, and strategies for controlling pests and/or unwanted vegetation that result in the least adverse environmental impact, with the goal of reducing or eliminating chemical use. Chemical pesticides, fungicides, and herbicides are used only when and where research or empirical experience has demonstrated that less environmentally hazardous, non-chemical pest/disease management practices are ineffective.</p> <p><i>For example, components of silvicultural systems, integrated pest management, and strategies for controlling vegetation may include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>creation and maintenance of habitat that discourages pest outbreaks</i></li> <li>▪ <i>creation and maintenance of habitat that encourages natural predators</i></li> <li>▪ <i>evaluation of pest populations and establishment of action thresholds</i></li> <li>▪ <i>diversification of species composition (see Glossary) and structure</i></li> <li>▪ <i>use of mechanical methods</i></li> <li>▪ <i>use of prescribed fire</i></li> </ul>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chemicals are only used for invasive species control, never for silvicultural objectives such as site preparation.</li> <li>• All chemical use is governed by an EIS</li> </ul>
<p>6.6.c. When and where chemicals are applied, the most environmentally safe and efficacious chemicals are used. Chemicals are narrowly targeted, and minimize affects on non-target species.</p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All chemicals used on the Unit are considered the most environmentally safe chemical to effectively accomplish the objective. Chemicals are narrowly targeted and carefully applied, e.g., there are no aerial applications.</li> </ul>
<p>6.6.d. Chemicals are used only when and where they pose no threat to supplies of domestic water, aquatic habitats, or habitats of Rare species.</p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are set backs from watercourses during pesticide application</li> <li>• Danger to rare species is reviewed as part of application planning</li> </ul>

6.6.e. When chemicals are used, the effects and impacts 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.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A database is maintained of where all invasive plants are located and treated (spray sites) allowing monitoring of the success/failure of control operations</li> <li>• By observing effectiveness, more parsimonious use of pesticides is becoming common</li> </ul>
6.6.f. Forest owners or managers develop written strategies for control of pests as a component of the management plan (criterion 7.1), which comply with official FSC policy.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pesticide application is always documented</li> <li>• FS is currently operating under a spraying EA. They're required to track how much pesticide is used as part of a forest wide management strategy</li> </ul>
6.6.g When chemicals are used, a written prescription is prepared that fully describes the risks and benefits of their use and the precautions that workers will employ.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prescriptions are prepared prior to spraying activities that describe the safety protocols to be followed by applicators</li> <li>• Risk and benefits of pesticide use are laid out in NEPA documents, including the programmatic Regional Noxious Weed EIS.</li> </ul>
<b>C6.7. 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.</b>	C	<b>Over the breadth of Indicators that elaborate this Criterion, the audit team concludes that the LFSU operations can be considered to be in adequate conformance.</b>
<p>6.7.a Forest Owners and managers prevent the unintended release of chemicals, petroleum products, containers and nonorganic wastes, and minimize health and environmental risks due to their disposal.</p> <p><i>For example forest owners and managers minimize health and environmental risks by:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Immediately containing spills of hazardous material, as required by applicable regulations, and then engaging qualified personnel to perform the appropriate removal and remediation.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Routinely checking equipment for leaking fluids. Broken and/or leaking equipment and parts are repaired or removed from the forest; discarded parts are taken to a designated disposal facility.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Parked equipment outside of riparian management zones and away from vernal pools and supplies of ground water to prevent toxic fluids from leaking into them</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Disposing of contaminated water and containers in a location and manner that is environmentally sound.</i></li> </ul>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A spill control plan, written by a registered hydrologist, is required if contractors bring more than 1320 gallons of fuel on a site.</li> <li>• When spills occur, operators are required to remove affected soil and dispose of it properly.</li> </ul>
6.7.b. In the event of a spill of hazardous material, forest owners or managers immediately contain the material, report the spill as required by applicable regulations, and engage qualified personnel to perform the appropriate removal and remediation.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contracts require that spills be reported and that contaminated material is removed.</li> </ul>
6.7.c. Equipment is routinely checked for leaking fluids. Broken and/or leaking equipment and parts are repaired or removed from the forest; discarded parts are taken to a designated disposal facility.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mechanical operations are reviewed at multiple points throughout the process, most frequently by the Contracting Officer</li> <li>• FS can require removal of equipment if it is found to be leaking.</li> </ul>
6.7.d. Equipment is parked outside of riparian management zones and away from vernal pools and supplies of ground water to prevent toxic fluids from leaking into them.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contracts require that equipment be parked outside of meadows and riparian areas. Equipment is never allowed out of the operational unit.</li> </ul>
6.7.e. If washing chemical containers is necessary, the	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Washing of equipment usually takes place off site</li> </ul>

contaminated water and containers are disposed of in a location and manner that is environmentally sound.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If equipment washing and cleaning is done on site, specified washing sites are identified and procedures for the recovery and disposal of contaminated water are approved prior to operations beginning.</li> </ul>
<p><b>C6.8. Use of biological control agents shall be documented, minimized, monitored, and strictly controlled in accordance with national laws and internationally accepted scientific protocols. Use of genetically modified organisms shall be prohibited.</b></p> <p><i>Applicability Note: Genetically improved organisms (e.g., Mendelian crossed) are not considered to be genetically modified organisms, and may be used. (See FSC policy on genetically modified organisms at <a href="http://www.fsc.org/en/whats_new/documents/Docs_cent/2">http://www.fsc.org/en/whats_new/documents/Docs_cent/2</a>. The prohibition of genetically modified organisms applies to all organisms including trees.</i></p>	C	<p><b>Over the breadth of Indicators that elaborate this Criterion, the audit team concludes that the LFSU operations can be considered to be in adequate conformance.</b></p>
6.8.a. Exotic (i.e., non-indigenous), non-invasive predators or biological control agents are used only as part of a pest management strategy for the control of exotic species of plants, pathogens ( <i>see Glossary</i> ), insects, or other animals when other pest control methods are ineffective, or can reasonably be expected to be proven ineffective. Such use is contingent on peer-reviewed scientific evidence that the agents in question are noninvasive and are safe for indigenous species.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No GMO species are used in the Unit or the Fremont-Winema</li> <li>• Bio control methods are used infrequently, and thoroughly tested before implementation to ensure they are target specific.</li> </ul>
<p><b>C6.9. The use of exotic species shall be carefully controlled and actively monitored to avoid adverse ecological impacts.</b></p>	C	<p><b>Over the breadth of Indicators that elaborate this Criterion, the audit team concludes that the LFSU operations can be considered to be in adequate conformance.</b></p>
6.9.a. The use of exotic plant species ( <i>see Glossary</i> ) is contingent on peer-reviewed scientific evidence that any species in question is non-invasive and does not diminish biodiversity. If non-invasive exotic plant species are used, their provenance and the location of their use are documented, and their ecological effects are actively monitored.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No exotic tree species are planted</li> <li>• Native grasses or sterile annual grasses are used as erosion control</li> </ul>
6.9.b. Forest owners or managers develop and implement control measures for invasive exotic plants.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is an active and well funded invasive plant control program; FS is currently working on site specific plans for weed control and identifying sites in need of treatment</li> <li>• All equipment is required to be cleaned before entering the forest, reducing the risk of spreading invasives</li> <li>• Botanists review gravel pit permits for invasive plants prior to their issuance</li> <li>• Horse recreational users required to use wheat free hay</li> <li>• Surveys are conducted for presence of weeds as part of every Environmental Assessment</li> </ul>
<p><b>6.10. Forest conversion to plantations or non-forest land uses shall not occur, except in circumstances where conversion:</b></p> <p>a) Entails a very limited portion of the forest management unit; and</p> <p>b) Does not occur on High Conservation Value Forest areas; and</p>	C	<p><b>The audit team found solid conformance with this Criterion.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no conversion of forests to plantations or non-forest use</li> <li>• Observation: lands designated for disposal have not been screened for HC VF, but the FSC assures the</li> </ul>

<p><b>c) Will enable clear, substantial, additional, secure, long-term conservation benefits across the forest management unit.</b></p> <p><i>Note: The Working Group considers this criterion sufficiently explicit and measurable. Indicators are not required.</i></p>		<p>auditors that they would be screened prior to disposal or trade</p>
<p><b>P7 A management plan -- appropriate to the scale and intensity of the operations -- shall be written, implemented, and kept up to date. The long-term objectives of management, and the means of achieving them, shall be clearly stated.</b></p>		
<p><b>7.1. The management plan and supporting documents shall provide:</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p><i>Applicability Note: The management plan may consist of a variety of documents not necessarily unified into a single planning document but which, nevertheless, represents an integrated strategy for managing the forest.</i></p>		<p><b>Over the breadth of Indicators that elaborate this Criterion, the audit team concludes that the LFSU operations can be considered to be in adequate conformance. One Indicator level non-conformance was observed, and a Minor CAR was issued in response.</b></p> <p>The audit team notes and expresses concern over the fact that a management plan specific to the Lakeview Unit itself has not been developed. The current situation reflects the fact that the Unit is managed as an integrated piece with the rest of the Fremont-Winema National Forest. But if certification is sought only for the Unit, exclusive of the remaining portions of Fremont-Winema, there would be a distinction that suggests the need for at least a plan supplement that is specific to the Unit. The Long-Range Strategy for the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit prepared by the Lakeview Stewardship Group provides some guidance for management in the Unit, but does not function in the same way as an official forest management plan would.</p>
<p><b>7.1.a. Management objectives</b></p>		
<p>7.1.a.1. A written management plan is prepared that:  (1) includes the landowner's vision (ecological, silvicultural, social, and economic), desired future conditions, potential future outcomes, goals, and objectives, as well as short-term and long-term actions and  (2) incorporates strategies for the maintenance, enhancement, and/or restoration of forest resource. The actions and objectives are specific, achievable, measurable, and adaptive. (The elements of a comprehensive forest management plan are found in Appendix H.)</p>	<p>C</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear goals and objectives stated in the forest plan</li> <li>• Watershed analysis map forestwide goals and objectives onto site-specific, prioritized, recommended treatment areas</li> </ul>
<p><b>7.1.b. Description of forest resources to be managed, environmental limitations, land use and ownership status, socioeconomic conditions, and profile of adjacent lands</b></p>		
<p>7.1.b.1. Using data collected proportionally to the scale and intensity of management, the forest owner or manager describes the following resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ timber</li> <li>▪ fish and wildlife</li> <li>▪ harvested non-timber forest products (e.g., botanical and mycological)</li> </ul>	<p>N</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 2 in Plan, summary of analysis of management conditions</li> <li>• Social and economic resources are described as well as supply and demand for each of the resources</li> <li>• Socio-Economic description of the region in the EIS (Chapter 5 appendix B)</li> <li>• Minor non-conformance: Description of harvested non-</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ non-economic natural resources</li> </ul>		<p>timber forest products not mentioned/addressed in the Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CAR 2006.5 was issued in response to this non-conformance</li> </ul>
7.1.b.2. Descriptions of special management areas, Rare species and their habitats, Rareplant communities, and other ecologically sensitive features in the forest are included in the management plan.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All management areas are clearly delineated and described in the plan</li> </ul>
7.1.b.3. A description of past land uses is included in the management plan and incorporated into the goals and objectives.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Past land use practices are described in the forest plan and the watershed assessments</li> </ul>
7.1.b.4. The legal status of the forest and its resources is identified in the management plan (e.g., ownership, usufruct rights, treaty rights, easements, deed restrictions, and leasing arrangements).	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plan identifies the land base as National Forest land wholly owned and managed by the federal government</li> </ul>
7.1.b.5. Relevant cultural and socioeconomic issues (e.g., traditional and customary rights of use, access issues, recreational uses, and issues of employment), conditions (e.g., composition of the workforce, stability of employment, and changes in forest ownership and tenure), and areas of special significance (e.g., ceremonial and archeological sites) are identified in the management plan.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Socioeconomic conditions are identified in planning documents</li> <li>• Sites of special significance are clearly laid out in EA's and other planning documents</li> </ul>
7.1.b.6. Landscape-level considerations within the ownership and among adjacent and nearby lands, including major bodies of water, critical habitats, and riparian corridors shared with adjacent ownerships, are incorporated in the management plan.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Watershed assessments include landscape level considerations and cumulative effects analyses.</li> </ul>
<b>7.1.c. Description of silvicultural and/or other management system</b>		
7.1.c.1. The choice of silvicultural system(s) and prescriptions are based on the integration of ecological and economic characteristics (e.g., successional processes, soil characteristics, existing species composition and physical structures, desired future conditions, and market conditions) ( <i>see also 6.3.a</i> ).	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The silvicultural system is defined in EA's prior to harvesting, and is based on rehabilitating the ecological vitality of the forest</li> </ul>
7.1.c.2. Prescriptions are prepared prior to harvesting, site preparation, pest control, burning, and planting and are made available to people who carry out the prescriptions.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All management planning documents are prepared well in advance of commencement of any ground activity and are well distributed to necessary personnel</li> </ul>
<b>7.1.d. Rationale for the rate of annual harvest and species selection</b>		
7.1.d.1. The management plan is based on the best available data on growth, yield, stocking, and regeneration. ( <i>see also 5.6.b</i> ).	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Growth and yield data is available for use from forest inventories, but the low thin silvicultural treatment favored on the unit rarely requires precise stand level data</li> </ul>
7.1.d.2. Species selection meets the economic goals and objectives of the forest owner or manager, while maintaining or improving the ecological composition, structures, and functions of the forest.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Species are selected based on natural conditions for the site</li> </ul>
<b>7.1.e. Provisions for monitoring forest growth and dynamics (see also Principle 8)</b> <i>Note: The Working Group considers this criterion sufficiently explicit and measurable. Indicators are not required.</i>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Forest growth is monitored based on the National Forest wide FIA system</li> </ul>
<b>7.1.f. Environmental safeguards based on environmental assessments (see also Criterion 6.1.)</b> <i>Note: The Working Group considers this criterion sufficiently</i>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental Assessments occur prior to the commencement of any activity. If there is a finding of significant impact, an Environmental Impact Statement</li> </ul>

<i>explicit and measurable. Indicators are not required.</i>		is prepared to mitigate such impacts
<b>7.1.g. Plans for the identification and protection of rare, threatened, and endangered species. (see also Criterion 6.3.)</b> <i>Note: The Working Group considers this criterion sufficiently explicit and measurable. Indicators are not required.</i>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plans exist at multiple scales for the protection of rare species, see Criterion 6.2</li> <li>Surveys of rare species done as part of environmental assessments prior to projects beginning</li> </ul>
<b>7.1.h. Maps describing the forest resource base including protected areas, planned management activities, and land ownership.</b>		
7.1.h.1. Appropriate to the scale and intensity of the operation, and to the relevance of the management of the FMU, the following maps are included in the management plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>property boundaries</li> <li>roads</li> <li>areas of timber production</li> <li>forest types by age class</li> <li>topography</li> <li>soils</li> <li>riparian zones</li> <li>streams, springs, and wetlands</li> <li>archaeological sites</li> <li>areas of cultural and customary use</li> <li>locations of and habitats for rare species</li> <li>designated High Conservation Value Forests</li> </ul> <p>Maps of some features may be kept confidential to protect their integrity.</p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is extensive mapping of the forest, including all measures required by the indicator (except designated HCVF areas)</li> <li>Maps of archeological sites and other sites of cultural interest to tribes in the region are kept confidential.</li> </ul>
<b>7.1.i. Description and justification of harvesting techniques and equipment to be used. (see also Criterion 6.5)</b> <i>Note: The Working Group considers this criterion sufficiently explicit and measurable. Indicators are not required.</i>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Guidelines exist for acceptable harvesting techniques and equipment, considering such factors as slope, soil condition, and desired condition of future stand</li> </ul>
<b>C7.2. 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.</b>	C	<b>The audit team concludes that the LFSU operations can be considered to be in adequate conformance with this Criterion. The only applicable Indicator was found to be in non-conformance because the management plan revision is overdue, and a Minor CAR was issued. However, the team determined that this non-conformance did not rise to the level of a Criterion level non-conformance, since the FS has taken substantial and affirmative steps throughout the years to update their suite of management planning documents, somewhat mitigating their tardiness on a major plan revision.</b>
7.2.a. Relevant provisions of the management plan are modified: (1) every 10 years or in accordance with the frequency of harvest for the stand or forest, whichever is longer; (2) in response to effects from illegal and/or unauthorized activities (e.g., damage to roads, depletion of timber and non-timber resources), (3) in response to changes caused by natural disturbances.	N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plan revision is well past original intent; will be more than 10 years overdue by the time it is completed</li> <li>On the positive side, there have been 26 amendments to the forest plan since approved in 1989</li> <li>There are ongoing efforts to maintain currency of the plan, field staff still uses plan</li> <li>Watershed analyses cover 75% of unit, these analyses have been completed more recently than the forest plan and have materially contributed to maintaining the currency of the body of planning documents that guides management on the Unit</li> <li>CAR 2006.10 was issued in response to this non-</li> </ul>

		conformance
<p><b>C7.3. Forest workers shall receive adequate training and supervision to ensure proper implementation of the management plans.</b>  <i>Note: The Working Group considers this criterion sufficiently explicit and measurable. Indicators are not required.</i></p>	C	<p><b>In the judgment of the audit team, the FS is in solid conformance with this Criterion.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1900-1 Forest Plan Implementation, week long training course for new hires</li> <li>• ART, Appeal Review Teams</li> <li>• There is an opportunity to improve contractor training</li> </ul>
<p><b>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.</b>  <i>Applicability Note: Forest owners or managers of private forests may withhold proprietary information (e.g., timber volumes by size and age class, marketing strategies, and other financial information). (see also Criterion 8.5)</i>   <i>Note: The Working Group considers this criterion sufficiently explicit and measurable. Indicators are not required.</i></p>	C	<p>In that all planning documents are available to the public, including but not limited to the LRMP, there is full conformance with this Criterion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public availability of plan information is well in excess of FSC certification requirements</li> <li>• Management planning documents all readily available online</li> <li>• FOIA process ensures that any plan not already public can be sought</li> </ul>
<p><b>P8 Monitoring shall be conducted -- appropriate to the scale and intensity of forest management -- to assess the condition of the forest, yields of forest products, chain of custody, management activities and their social and environmental impacts.</b>  <i>Applicability Note: On small and medium-sized forests, an informal, qualitative assessment may be appropriate. On large and/or intensively managed forests, formal, quantitative monitoring is probably required.</i></p>		
<p><b>C8.1. The frequency and intensity of monitoring should be determined by the scale and intensity of forest management operations, as well as, the relative complexity and fragility of the affected environment. Monitoring procedures should be consistent and replicable over time to allow comparison of results and assessment of change.</b></p>	C	<p><b>Over the breadth of Indicators that elaborate this Criterion, the audit team concludes that the LFSU operations can be considered to be in adequate conformance.</b></p>
<p>8.1.a. Implementation of the management plan is periodically monitored to assess:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ the degree to which management vision, goals, and objectives have been achieved</li> <li>▪ deviations from the management plan</li> <li>▪ unexpected effects of management activities</li> <li>▪ social and environmental effects of management activities</li> </ul>	C	<p>An annual report is issued on implementation of monitoring;</p>
<p>8.1.b. Inventories noted under section 8.2 below, are updated over periods not to exceed ten years, or the harvest frequency on the ownership, whichever is longer. Relevant ecological indicators (e.g., the status of and capacity for regeneration, habitat qualities of rare species, impacts to the quality of soil and water) are monitored before and after field management activities take place. Detailed monitoring is implemented at sites of special ecological significance (<i>see Appendix G</i>).</p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a CFI system updated every 10 years, all plots were re-measured during 2002-2005 as part of shift to new inventory system.</li> <li>• The managers have essentially abandoned stand level volume recon because its not required by their management strategies</li> <li>• Frequent opportunities to learn from informal monitoring is often lost due to institutional memory loss</li> <li>• FIA grid on 5k meters, operating on 4 times the intensity of a normal FIA in this region.</li> </ul>
<p><b>8.2. Forest management should include the research and data collection needed to monitor, at a minimum, the following indicators:</b>  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</p>	C	<p><b>Over the breadth of Indicators that elaborate this Criterion, the audit team concludes that the LFSU operations can be considered to be in adequate conformance. One Indicator level non-conformance was observed, and a Minor CAR was issued in response.</b></p>

<b>other operations</b>		
<b>e) Cost, productivity, and efficiency of forest management</b>		
<b>8.2.a. Yield of all forest products harvested</b>		
8.2.a.1. The forest owner or manager maintains records of timber-harvest volumes.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Records are maintained of all timber sales, including harvest volumes</li> </ul>
8.2.a.2. The forest owner or manager maintains records of the yield of harvested non-timber forest products.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Collection of NTFP's are monitored</li> </ul>
8.2.a.3. Significant, unanticipated removal (e.g., theft and poaching) of forest products is monitored, and recorded, and appropriate action is taken.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Poaching is not a significant problem, but the FS does monitor for it</li> </ul>
<b>8.2.b. Growth rates, regeneration, and condition of the forest</b>	C	
8.2.b.1. An inventory system is maintained to monitor: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>growth, mortality, stocking, and regeneration of the timber</li> <li>stand composition and structure</li> <li>effects of disturbances to the resources (e.g., disease, wind, fire, damage by insects and/or mammals)</li> <li>abundance, regeneration, and habitat conditions of non-timber forest products</li> <li>characteristics of water quality, such as temperature, sedimentation, and chemical loads (<i>see Appendix G; Karr 1981</i>)</li> <li>characteristics of terrestrial and aquatic habitats</li> <li>Soil characteristics</li> </ul>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monitoring 10% of inventory plots per year since 2001 using FIA protocols</li> <li>During 2001-2005 monitored 25% of plots per year as part of a transition to a new monitoring strategy</li> <li>Sales of NTFP are monitored, but not actual harvesting</li> <li>Water temperature and aquatic habitat are monitored (Stream surveys, macroinvertebrate studies)</li> <li>Soil compaction is heavily monitored</li> </ul>
<b>8.2.c. Composition and observed changes in the flora and fauna</b>		
8.2.c.1. Forest owners or managers periodically monitor and assess (1) their contribution toward recovery goals for threatened and endangered species in relation to changes in major habitats and populations, (2) changes in major habitat elements, and (3) presence and/or absence of and changes in the occurrence of Rare species.	N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some surveys not being followed up on, and institutional knowledge is being lost</li> <li>CFI system monitoring covers detection of habitat change</li> <li>Endangered fish population monitored; FS manages habitat, not species</li> <li>Bald eagle monitoring occurs</li> <li>FS could be focusing its monitoring on a much wider variety of species of concerns</li> <li>Need to be monitoring species populations, not just habitat changes</li> <li>New forest plan will include analysis of species populations</li> <li>CAR 2006.11 was issued in response to this non-conformance</li> </ul>
<b>8.2.d. Environmental and social impacts of harvesting and other operations</b>	C	
8.2.d.1. The environmental impacts of site-disturbing activities (e.g., road construction and repair, harvesting, and site preparation) are monitored after completion.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Soil impacts are monitored</li> <li>Post implementation monitoring of site-disturbing activities</li> </ul>
8.2.d.2. A monitoring program is in place to assess the condition and environmental impacts of the forest-road system.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monitoring on road system condition, every time a new area is entered road maintenance is identified</li> <li>It is unclear how frequently monitoring of road conditions occurs on areas not being considered for active projects, see Criterion 6.5</li> </ul>
8.2.d.3. Generation or maintenance of local jobs and public responses to management activities are monitored.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual monitoring report looks at jobs at local level</li> <li>Responses to public opinion is monitored</li> </ul>
8.2.d.4. The influence of forest management on the viability of	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The effects of forest management on local economy is</li> </ul>

<p>forest-based livelihoods is monitored, especially in the case of large forest holdings.</p> <p><i>For example, the destination of forest resources is documented.</i></p>		<p>annually monitored</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stewardship group provides an early sounding board for community concerns about management</li> </ul>
<p>8.2.d.5. The opportunity to jointly monitor sites of special significance (<i>see also criteria 3.2 and 3.3</i>) is offered to tribal representatives in order to determine adequacy of the management prescriptions.</p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offer is made to tribes to jointly monitor special sites, although offerings could be made more explicit</li> </ul>
<p><b>8.2.e. Cost, productivity, and efficiency of forest management</b></p>	C	
<p>8.2.e.1. Forest owners and managers monitor cash flows, costs, revenues, profit margins, and other financial indicators, to assure long-term financial viability.</p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All cash flows are monitored</li> </ul>
<p>8.2.e.2. Forest owners and managers take into account the economic benefits of all forest goods and services, including water quality, fish and wildlife, aesthetics, recreational uses, and carbon sequestration, and identify ways in which they might generate income.</p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Economic benefits of a full range of forest services are considered in management planning</li> </ul>
<p><b>C8.3. 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."</b></p> <p><i>Note: The Working Group considers this criterion sufficiently explicit and measurable. Indicators are not required.</i></p>	N	<p><b>The audit team concludes that the LFSU operations are not in conformance with this Criterion.</b></p> <p>The Lakeview Unit was not evaluated for chain of custody certification due to the nature of the pilot test.</p>
<p><b>C8.4. The results of monitoring shall be incorporated into the implementation and revision of the management plan.</b></p>	C	<p>The Forest Management Operation is in full conformance with this criterion.</p>
<p>8.4.a. Discrepancies between outcomes (i.e., yields, growth, ecological changes) and desired future conditions (i.e., plans, projections, anticipated impacts) are appraised. Management plans and actions are revised to better achieve the desired future conditions.</p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Management plan has had 26 amendments</li> <li>• Adaptive management is mentioned frequently throughout planning documents, actions are adjusted based on prior activities</li> <li>• FIA database may not be fully utilized by the staff, not able to access info at the district level, may be more knowledgeable at the forest level</li> <li>• Stewardship group form of monitoring is not as thorough as traditional monitoring</li> </ul>
<p><b>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.</b></p> <p><i>Applicability Note: Forest owners or managers of private forests may withhold proprietary information (e.g., timber volumes and age classes, marketing strategies, and other financial information).</i></p>	C	<p><b>Over the breadth of Indicators that elaborate this Criterion, the audit team concludes that the LFSU operations can be considered to be in adequate conformance.</b></p>
<p>8.5.a. A summary of monitoring results is maintained up-to-date and is made available to the public on request, either at no cost or at a nominal price.</p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An annual summary of monitoring results is produced and made public (for Fremont-Winema);</li> <li>• Comment: it would preferable if a summary was produced for the Unit as distinct from the Fremont-Winema.</li> </ul>
<p><b>P9 Management activities in high conservation value forests shall maintain or enhance the attributes which define such forests. Decisions regarding high conservation value forests shall always be considered in the context of a precautionary approach.</b></p> <p><b>High Conservation Value Forests are those that possess one or more of the following attributes:</b></p>		

<p><b>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></p> <p><b>b) forest areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems</b></p> <p><b>c) forest areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g. watershed protection, erosion control)</b></p> <p><b>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).</b></p> <p><i>Applicability note: Classification of a forest as a "high conservation value forest" (HCVF) does not automatically preclude active management. In addition to the forest types listed in sections (a) through (d) of the HCVF definition, HCVFs in the Pacific Coast region include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• forest types listed in Appendix D (i.e., rare communities in the region), unless further refined by consultations with heritage programs, local native plant societies, local experts, and NGOs</li> <li>• primary, late-successional, or old-growth forests (<i>see also criterion 6.3.</i>)</li> <li>• roadless areas (areas that have never had logging roads, skid trails, etc.) larger than 500 acres or that have unique attributes</li> <li>• habitats for rare species, and may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ water catchments that provide water supplies to municipalities</li> <li>▪ buffers and corridors within landscape-level plans that are critical to the maintenance of processes and functions of high conservation value areas (see also criteria 6.3 - 6.5); and</li> <li>▪ native grasslands, wetlands, and other ecologically important non-forested sites within the forest.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><i>Note: The status of HCVFs on American Indian lands requires special consultation between certifying teams and the affected tribe or nation.</i></p>		
<p><b>C9.1. Assessment to determine the presence of the attributes consistent with High Conservation Value Forests will be completed, appropriate to scale and intensity of forest management.</b></p>	N	<p><b>The audit team concludes that the LFSU operations are not in conformance with this Criterion. Major CAR 2006.3 has been issued in response to this non-conformance.</b></p>
<p>9.1.a. Attributes and locations of High Conservation Value Forests are determined by the identification of globally, nationally, regionally, and locally unique HCV attributes (<i>see Appendix D</i>) that may be present in or adjacent to the forest, and their delineation by habitat descriptions and maps.</p>	N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An assessment of how the management of the Unit addresses the FSC concept of High Conservation Value Forests has not been completed using established HCVF procedures (such as the FSC HCVF Tool Kit).</li> <li>• Areas that would likely qualify as HCVF have not been officially designated as such (e.g. wilderness areas, old-growth stands, municipal water supplies, roadless areas larger than 500 acres)</li> <li>• Because such an assessment has not taken place, the audit team cannot confirm that all high conservation values on the forest are being adequately protected.</li> </ul>
<p><b>C9.2. The consultative portion of the certification process must place emphasis on the identified conservation attributes, and options for the maintenance thereof.</b></p>	N	<p><b>The audit team concludes that the LFSU operations are not in conformance with this Criterion. Major CAR 2006.3 has been issued in response to this non-conformance.</b></p>
<p>9.2.a. Consultations are held with stakeholders and scientists to confirm that proposed HCV locations and attributes have been accurately identified. On public forests, a transparent and accessible public review of proposed HCV attributes and areas is carried out. Information from stakeholder consultations and other public review is integrated into HCVF descriptions and</p>	N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No HCVF process has taken place, see 9.1</li> </ul>

delineations.		
<b>C9.3. 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.</b>	N	<b>The audit team concludes that the LFSU operations are not in conformance with this Criterion. Major CAR 2006.3 has been issued in response to this non-conformance.</b>
9.3.a. Where the identification of HCVF attributes and areas is incomplete at the time of certification, forest owners or managers identify HCVF attributes and areas, develop a plan to maintain and/or enhance them, and begin implementation of the plan within one year of certification.	N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No HCVF process has taken place, see 9.1</li> </ul>
9.3.b. Stands and forests designated as HCVFs, which have been entered for timber harvest, are managed over the long term to assure that both the quality of their HCVF attributes and their area are maintained.	N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No HCVF process has taken place, see 9.1</li> </ul>
9.3.c. Forest owners and managers of HCVFs (forests and/or stands) coordinate conservation efforts with owners and managers of other HCVFs within their landscape.	N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No HCVF process has taken place, see 9.1</li> </ul>
<b>C9.4. Annual monitoring shall be conducted to assess the effectiveness of the measures employed to maintain or enhance the applicable conservation attributes.</b>  <i>Applicability note: Except where HCV attributes change rapidly or demonstrate ecological instability, annual monitoring may be informal and may be combined with other field activities. Attributes and locations that are highly vulnerable (e.g., small and/or unstable populations) and those that are intensively managed are monitored formally on an annual basis.</i>	N	<b>The audit team concludes that the LFSU operations are not in conformance with this Criterion. Major CAR 2006.3 has been issued in response to this non-conformance.</b>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No HCVF process has taken place, see 9.1</li> </ul>

## 1.1 Evaluation of Conformance with the “Additional Considerations” for National Forest Management

The Lakeview FSU was also evaluated against the National Forest Additional Considerations (see Section A, 2.0 for more details). The role of these Additional Considerations (“AC’s”) was to simulate the type of supplemental indicators that may be developed under the direction of FSC-US for use in National Forests if certification of federal lands were ever to become a real possibility. Since these AC’s were not part of the duly approved standard, the Forest Service’s conformance to them was not considered when determining the overall conformance to the Standard. Similarly, CAR’s were not developed for AC’s for which the audit team reached a finding of non-conformance.

Note: “C” = conformance

“N” = non-conformance

AC 1.1.1. By policy and action, managers of National Forests demonstrate compliance with applicable federal laws and administrative requirements (e.g. NEPA, ESA, Clean Water Act, NFMA, MUSYA, The Wilderness Act, Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, Organic Act, CFR, Title 7, applicable sections of the US Code, the Forest Service Manual, and Forest Service Handbooks).	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Management in the Lakeview Unit is in compliance with applicable laws and requirements, as evidence by their success in the appeals process and in court</li> <li>• See 1.1.a</li> </ul>
AC 1.5.1. National Forest managers assure that motorized recreational access opportunities and use patterns do not	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunities for recreation are provided</li> <li>• The auditors saw no evidence of significant adverse impacts</li> </ul>

<p>significant adverse environmental impacts. A variety of approaches are used to manage and limit both authorized and unauthorized OHV activity and related damage. (Note: Examples of such approaches include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deploying law enforcement resources at a scale that is commensurate with the scale and intensity of motorized recreation use activity occurring on the Forest;</li> <li>• Establishing penalties for unauthorized use sufficient to act as effective deterrents;</li> <li>• Ensuring that users are clear about closures through improved signage and other information sharing means;</li> <li>• Engaging in active and focused outreach/communications with user groups;</li> <li>• Fostering collaborative efforts with OHV clubs that promote ecologically and socially responsible use of OHVs.)</li> </ul>		<p>from OHV use</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FS is actively engaging in user group collaboration (motorized and non-motorized)</li> <li>• One stakeholder expressed concern about how the posted open policy will be enforced</li> <li>• Currently, there is a very low level of OHV use. However, problems with ATV's could occur in the near future because there is 10-15% growth in demand each year. Fremont-Winema will need to stay on top of the issue Recommendation 2006.1,</li> </ul>
<p>AC 3.3.1. Solicitation of Tribal collaboration is designed around culturally sensitive approaches that honor nation-to-nation relationships.</p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FS appropriately recognizes sovereignty of tribes, and deals with them on nation to nation standing</li> <li>• Tribal members on staff with FS help achieve good working relationships with tribes</li> <li>• There are examples of historical insensitivities, but no recent problems.</li> </ul>
<p>AC 3.3.2. If written requests for Tribal participation fail to generate substantive responses, increasingly affirmative methods (e.g., in-person meetings) are attempted in order to secure Tribal input.</p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tribal input is readily and frequently given</li> <li>• FS holds quarterly meetings with tribes</li> </ul>
<p>AC 4.1.1. Migrant worker conditions (including transit to and from work sites) are actively monitored by both contractors and Forest Service personnel.</p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is improved monitoring of this due to bad press nationally</li> <li>• Long commute times for some migrant workers was cited as a stakeholder concern</li> <li>• Contractors confirm that policy of frequent inspections are taking place to ensure migrant worker laws are being followed</li> </ul>
<p>AC 4.5.1. Managers of National Forests establish a policy and mechanism for informally resolving disputes and make it readily available to the general public.</p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appeals reform act provides for multiple level of formal and informal dispute resolution</li> <li>• FS is required to contact appellant prior to lawsuits being filed in order to try and resolve issues outside of courts</li> <li>• There is an open door policy at Ranger stations and supervisors office</li> <li>• There are multiple advisory committees</li> <li>• There is a link on every webpage that if you have any concerns or comments, here's how to contact</li> </ul>
<p>AC 6.1.1. Managers of National Forests use the best available science and information to prepare, at the scale of watersheds or larger, a written description of the historic range of variability of forest conditions and disturbance regimes, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of the intensity, distribution, frequency, size, resulting landscape patterns, and residual stand structures of the major disturbance regimes.</li> </ul>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Written description of historic range of variability (HRV) included in watershed analysis; usually composed from accumulated professional knowledge and outside research (GTR's from Fish and Wildlife); legacy information is available</li> <li>• There is an opportunity to improve the level of familiarity that field staff have with HRV of the forest.</li> <li>• Unarguably, the region is well beyond the historical range</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of the historic range of variability of estimated composition of forest cover types, typical age class distribution, and estimated stand structures;</li> <li>• Estimates of average fire return intervals for low, medium, and high (stand replacing) intensity fires.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• of stocking levels due to fire exclusion</li> <li>• Reconstruction/estimation of the HRV can be time consumptive which becomes a significant issue due to staffing/resource limitations on the Unit. While it would be of interest to know something about HRV at the scale of individual watersheds or districts, limited resources would be better spent adapting regionally-derived, large scale characterizations of HRV</li> <li>• HRV is discussed in EA's and watershed analyses, though without specificity</li> <li>• Lakeview is basically using as a frame of reference the HRV for the Columbia River Basin</li> </ul>
<p>AC 6.1.2. Forest managers invite external expert review of the description of the historic range of variability of forest conditions; the description is also made available for public review.</p>	N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft Watershed Analyses are only reviewed internally, they have not been submitted for external expert review</li> <li>• We are uncertain as to whether or not documents that present the agency's analyses of HRV are made available for public comment and review.</li> </ul>
<p>AC 6.1.3. Current forest conditions are compared, at appropriate scales, with the historic range of variability of forest conditions. Measures of current forest condition include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area, composition (e.g., species and age class distribution), patch size and spatial representation of ecological types including old-growth and late seral forests;</li> <li>• Composition and distribution of snags, den trees, mast trees, coarse woody debris and other habitat-related structural elements.</li> </ul>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current forest conditions are compared to HRV in the watershed assessments</li> </ul>
<p>AC 6.1.4. National Forest managers consider the effects of management activities on neighboring lands are included in the scope of environmental impact assessments.</p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Landscape level analysis in original plan is not complete, but will be part of the next NEPA analysis</li> <li>• FS is required to look at effects of cumulative impacts of operations on neighboring lands; FS has, in places, stopped harvesting when neighbors have overharvested</li> <li>• Watershed analyses are carried out on a multi-ownership scale</li> <li>• The EIS always includes a cumulative effects analysis</li> <li>• Effects of private and other landowners on FS land is taken into consideration</li> </ul>
<p>AC 6.2.1. A comprehensive list of the species of interest and species of concern (e.g., species with notable conservation need) is maintained for each National Forest. Managers demonstrate through policies and actions that said species are duly considered in the course of forest management.</p>	N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• List of species of interest is not complete; Lists for fish and plant species are in good shape, however wildlife lists are lacking. Accordingly, the audit team concludes that there is not adequate conformance to this Additional Consideration.</li> <li>• Candidate FWS species are not being considered; Additionally, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife sensitive species are not considered.</li> <li>• If another agency has determined a species to be a candidate species, then the FS should take notice, but it has not done so in all cases. Examples include Flamulated Owls, White-headed Woodpecker, Oregon spotted frog, yellow billed cuckoo, Lewis's woodpecker,</li> </ul>
<p>AC 6.3.1. On National Forests, a desired future condition is defined and measurable targets are established for restoring forest composition and structure that are under-represented</p>	N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desired future conditions are defined</li> <li>• Prescriptions are far too limited to achieve a landscape wide result, 72% of the forest is overstocked</li> </ul>

relative to the historic range of variability (as per analysis from AC 6.1.1-6.1.3). Targets are established with consideration of existing social, environmental and economic factors; management policies and actions demonstrate progress in achieving these targets and do retard the natural rate of recovery of ecosystems.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Progress towards achieving targets is proceeding too slowly</li> <li>• Projects are not based on defined timelines, rather FS is just treating areas when funding is available</li> <li>• There is widespread concern that overstocking is a threat to major goals of the forest, including protection of old-growth</li> </ul>
AC 6.3.2. Connectivity between important wildlife habitats and key landscape features (such as HCVFs) is retained while implementing even-aged timber management on National Forests.	NA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No even-aged management occurs on the unit</li> </ul>
AC 6.3.3 In the absence of overriding ecological considerations, even-aged rotations (for planned “green sales”) on National Forests are at least as long as the culmination of mean annual increment, measured in board feet at the stand level.	NA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No even-aged management occurs on the unit</li> </ul>
AC 6.5.1. Forest management practices, such as management of cattle grazing, maintain or restore aquatic ecosystems and habitat features, wetlands, and forested riparian areas (including springs, seeps, fens, and vernal pools).	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FS actively manages grazing through cattle reduction, controlling frequency of return intervals, rotation, and browse monitoring, etc.</li> <li>• There is an annual monitoring system for riparian vegetation</li> <li>• Riparian vegetation is clearly being restored by grazing management, question is how fast</li> <li>• FS employs qualified grazing staff</li> <li>• Audit team found no direct evidence of grazing negatively affecting upland forest areas</li> </ul>
AC 6.9.1. Managers of National Forests identify high risk activities by which invasive exotic plants become established. Control mechanisms are implemented for high risk activities associated with Forest Service management responsibilities.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is active and well funded invasive plant control; currently working on site specific plans for weed control and identifying sites in need of treatment</li> <li>• All equipment is required to be cleaned before entering the forest to reduce the risk of spreading invasives</li> <li>• Botanists review gravel pit permits for invasive plants prior to their issuance</li> <li>• Horse recreational users are required to use wheat free hay</li> <li>• Survey for presence of weeds as part of every Environmental Assessment</li> </ul>
AC 9.1.1. National Forest managers use either the FSC HCVF Tool Kit, Canadian National Framework for HCVF, or develop their own comparable approach for identifying HCVF. The adapted mechanism/methodological approach is made available for external expert review and broad stakeholder comment.	N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The forest managers have not conducted an HCVF assessment process on the forest; as such, the audit team concludes that there is inadequate conformance to this AC</li> </ul>
AC 9.1.2. By policy and action, managers of National Forests demonstrate compliance with Section 2(c) of the Wilderness Act and the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act in the course of identifying and designating HCVF.	N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The forest managers have not conducted an HCVF assessment process on the forest</li> </ul>

## **1.2 Controversial Issues**

Based upon the audit team’s work on the Lakeview FSU and our stakeholder interactions, we consider the following topics to merit consideration as “controversial issues:”

- Commercial timber harvest levels
- Grazing policies, particularly impacts on riparian and aquatic resources
- FSC certification of National Forests
- Methods of addressing overstocked stands

## **2.0 TRACKING, TRACING AND IDENTIFICATION OF FOREST PRODUCTS**

This section of the report addresses the procedures employed by the forest managers to track the flow of wood products from the point of harvest through to the point where custody is assumed by another entity (i.e., the wood products purchaser). The fundamental requirement that must be demonstrated by the forest management operation is that product from the certified forest area not be mixed with product from non-certified sources. This requirement is attained by compliance with the FSC Criteria for chain of custody. It is against these Criteria that SCS evaluates applicant forest managers for potential award of chain of custody certification.

Given the nature of this pilot test, the chain-of-custody of certified material was not evaluated. Currently certification of National Forests is prohibited by FSC policy, so evaluating the Unit on their use of the FSC logo would be highly premature. If, hypothetically, the Unit ever were to become certified, a documented control system would be needed in order to ensure that uncertified wood products are not sold as certified. The partial estate nature of such a certification (i.e., the Unit being a subset of the Fremont-Winema National Forest) could be a potential stumbling block in creating such a system.

## Appendix 1 Forest Service Statues

The following is a complete list of the federal statues governing Forest Service Management:

- 05-10-1872: U.S. Mining Laws
- 08-01-1888: Right of Eminent Domain
- 06-06-1897: Organic Administration Act
- 02-28-1899: Mineral Springs Leasing
- 03-03-1899: Public Land Surveys
- 02-01-1905: Transfer Act
- 06-08-1906: Preservation of American Antiquities
- 03-04-1907: Disposition of Receipts from National Forest Revenues
- 05-23-1908: Twenty-Five Percent Fund
- 06-25-1910: Indian Allotments
- 03-01-1911: Weeks Law
- 03-04-1913: Expenditures from Receipts
- 06-30-1914: Cooperative Funds
- 03-04-1915: Occupancy Permits
- 08-11-1916: Deposits from Brush Disposal
- 08-11-1916: Wildlife Game Refuges
- 03-04-1917: Mineral Resources on Weeks Law Lands
- 07-03-1918: Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918
- 02-25-1920: Mineral Leasing Act
- 06-05-1920: Federal Power Act
- 03-20-1922: General Exchange Act
- 06-07-1924: Clarke-McNary Act
- 01-31-1925: Affidavits, Affirmations and Oaths
- 03-03-1925: Facilitate and Simplify Work of Forest Service and to Promote Reforestation
- 04-12-1926: Timber Exportation
- 05-15-1926: Limitation of National Forest Designation
- 12-22-1928: Color of Title
- 02-18-1929: Migratory Bird Conservation Act
- 04-28-1930: Title Adjustment
- 05-27-1930: Damage to Private Property (Search and Rescue)
- 06-09-1930: Knutson-Vandenberg Act
- 02-26-1930: Land Acquisition - Declaration of Taking
- 03-03-1931: Davis-Bacon Act
- 06-30-1932: Contracts Prior to Appropriations
- 03-03-1933: Buy American Act
- 03-10-1934: Fish and Wildlife Coordination act
- 06-04-1936: Funding Employment and Equipment
- 06-30-1936: Walsh-Healey Act
- 07-22-1937: Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act
- 02-26-1938: Sale of Photographic Reproductions and Maps

- 02-16-1938: Federal Crop Insurance - Title V
- 05-28-1940: Domestic Water Supply
- 06-08-1940: Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act
- 06-15-1940: Deposit of Sale Instruments in Treasury
- 07-08-1943: Land Acquisition - Title Adjustment
- 03-29-1944: Sustained Yield Forest Management
- 09-21-1944: Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944
  - Title II - Authorizing Rewards
  - Title VII - Uses of Appropriated Funds
- 12-22-1944: Federal-State Cooperation for Soil Conservation
- 06-25-1947: Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act
- 07-31-1947: Minerals Act of 1947
- 08-07-1947: Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands
- 06-25-1948: U.S. Criminal Code ("Title 18, U.S.C. Chapter 91-Public Lands")
- 06-25-1948: Tort Claims Procedure ("Title 28, U.S.C.")
- 06-30-1948: Clean Water Act (Federal Water Pollution Control Act)
  - Title I - Research and Related Programs
- 06-21-1949: Mining Assessment Work
- 06-30-1949: Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949
  - Title VIII - Urban Land Utilization
  - Title IX - Selection of Architects and Engineers
- 10-11-1949: Anderson-Mansfield Reforestation and Revegetation Joint Resolution
- 04-24-1950: Granger-Thye Act
- 09-06-1950: General Appropriation Act, 1951
  - Chapter XII - General Provisions (Expenditure Limitations)
- 05-23-1952: Smokey Bear Act
- 07-30-1953: Small Business Act
- 08-04-1954: Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act
- 09-03-1954: Permits for Public Buildings and Other Public Works
- 07-14-1955: Clean Air Act
- 07-23-1955: Multiple Use Mining Act of 1955
- 08-11-1955: Mining Claims Rights Restoration Act of 1955
- 07-26-1956: Interchange with Department of Defense
- 08-03-1956: Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1956
- 08-08-1956: Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956
- 06-20-1958: Forest Service Omnibus Act of 1958
- 07-31-1958: Townsite Act
- 08-27-1958: Forest Highways
- 09-02-1958: Weeks Act Status for Certain Lands
- 09-08-1959: Wild Horse Protection
- 06-11-1960: Functions Transfer (Interior to Agriculture)
- 06-12-1960: Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act 1960
- 09-15-1960: Sikes Act (Fish and Wildlife Conservation)
- 03-03-1962: Leases Around Reservoirs
- 08-13-1962: Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act
- 09-05-1962: Joint Surveys of Watershed Areas

- 09-28-1962: Petrified Wood (Exclusion from Deposits)
- 10-10-1962: McIntire-Stennis Act
- 10-23-1962: Mining Claim Occupancy Act
- 10-23-1962: Forest Service Omnibus Act of 1962
- 09-03-1964: Wilderness Act
- 09-03-1964: Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965
- 10-13-1964: National Forest Roads and Trails Act
- 07-09-1965: Federal Water Project Recreation Act
- 07-22-1965: Water Resources Planning Act
  - Title I - Water Resources Council
  - Title II - River Basin Commission
- 10-20-1965: Solid Waste Disposal Act
- 10-22-1965: Service Contract Act of 1965
- 06-24-1966: Public Lands, Grants to States
- 07-18-1966: Statutes of Limitations for Certain Actions Brought by the Government
- 09-06-1966: Government Organization and Employees
  - Chapter 5 - Subchapter H, Administrative Procedures
  - Chapter 57 - Subchapter I, Travel and Subsistence Expenses; Mileage Allowances
- 09-09-1966: Highway Safety Act
- 10-15-1966: National Historic Preservation Act
- 12-04-1967: Sisk Act (Land Exchanges with Local Governments)
- 08-12-1968: Architectural Barriers Act of 1968
- 10-02-1968: Wild and Scenic Rivers Act
- 10-02-1968: National Trails System Act
- 10-16-1968: Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968
- 10-17-1968: Carlson-Foley Act (Control of Noxious Plants)
- 01-01-1970: National Environmental Policy Act
- 04-03-1970: Environmental Quality Act of 1970
- 08-13-1970: Youth Conservation Corps
- 12-24-1970: Geothermal Steam Act of 1970
- 12-29-1970: Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970
- 12-31-1970: Mining and Minerals Policy Act of 1970
- 01-02-1971: Uniform Relocation Assistance and Land Acquisitions Policies Act of 1970
- 01-05-1971: Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970
- 08-10-1971: Cooperative Law Enforcement (Authority for)
- 12-15-1971: Wild Horses and Burros Protection Act
- 05-18-1972: Volunteers in the National Forests Act of 1972
- 08-30-1972: Rural Development Act of 1972
- 09-18-1972: Supplemental National Forest Reforestation Fund
- 10-06-1972: Federal Advisory Committee Act of 1972
- 10-25-1972: Real Property Quiet Title Actions
- 08-10-1973: Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973
- 09-26-1973: Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Title V)
- 12-28-1973: Endangered Species Act of 1973
- 05-22-1974: Disaster Relief Act of 1974
- 05-24-1974: Preservation of Historical and Archeological Data

- 06-22-1974: Woodsy Owl-Smokey Bear Act
- 08-17-1974: Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974
- 08-30-1974: Federal Procurement Policy Act
- 11-21-1974: Freedom of Information Act
- 12-31-1974: Privacy Act of 1974
- 01-03-1975: Eastern Wilderness Act
- 01-03-1975: Federal Noxious Weed Act of 1974
- 12-12-1975: Cooperative Funds and Deposits
- 12-22-1975: Energy Policy & Conservation Act
- 09-13-1976: Government in the Sunshine Act
- 10-11-1976: Toxic Substances Control Act
- 10-20-1976: Payments in Lieu of Taxes Act
- 10-21-1976: Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976
- 10-22-1976 National Forest Management Act of 1976
- 08-03-1977: Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977
- 09-29-1977: Food and Agriculture Act of 1977
  - Title XIV - National Agricultural Research, Extension and Teaching Policy Act of 1977
  - Title XVIII - Department of Agriculture Advisory Committees
- 11-16-1977: Safe Drinking Water Amendments of 1977
- 11-18-1977: Soil and Water Resources Conservation Act of 1977
- 06-30-1978: Renewable Resources Extension Act of 1978
- 06-30-1978: Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Research Act of 1978
- 07-01-1978: Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978
- 08-04-1978: Emergency Flood Prevention (Agricultural Credit Act of 1978)
- 08-11-1978: American Indian Religious Freedom
- 10-10-1978: Secretary of Agriculture-Jurisdiction of Lands
- 10-10-1978: Acceptance of Gifts
- 10-25-1978: Public Rangelands Improvement Act of 1978
- 11-01-1978: Contract Disputes Act of 1978
- 11-09-1978: Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978
- 10-31-1979: Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979
- 06-30-1980: Energy Security Act
- 09-26-1980: National Aquaculture Act of 1980
- 09-29-1980: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act of 1980
- 10-14-1980: Recreational Boating Safety and Facilities Improvement Act of 1980
  - Title III - Reforestation Tax Incentives and Trust Fund
- 10-14-1980: Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals Reorganization Act of 1980
- 10-21-1980: Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980
- 12-02-1980: Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act
- 12-11-1980: Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act of 1980
- 12-12-1980: RPA Statement of Policy of 1980 (Interior Department and Related Agencies, Appropriations for FY 1981)
- 12-17-1980: Donation of Real Property to U.S.
- 12-19-1980: Wood Residue Utilization Act of 1980
- 12-22-1980: Salmon and Steelhead Conservation and Enhancement Act
- 11-16-1981: Lacey Act Amendments of 1981

- 12-22-1981: Agriculture and Food Act of 1981
  - Title XV - Resource Conservation
- 09-13-1982: Money and Finance
  - Chapter 13 - Subchapter III, Limitations, Exceptions, and Penalties
  - Chapter 15 - Subchapter II,
  - Chapter 37 - Subchapter II, Claims of the United States Government
  - Chapter 63 - Using Procurement Contracts and Grants and Cooperative Agreements
  - Chapter 65 - Intergovernmental Cooperation
  - Chapter 69 - Payment for Entitlement Land
- 06-12-1983: Prompt Payment Act
- 01-12-1983: Small Tracts Act
- 10-16-1984: Federal Timber Contract Payment Modification Act
- 12-23-1985: 1985 Farm Bill
  - Title XII - Conservation Reserve Program
- 10-22-1986: National Forest Ski Area Permit Act of 1986
- 10-27-1986: National Forest System Drug Control Act of 1986
- 08-20-1988: Federal Land Exchange Facilitation Act of 1988
- 09-09-1988: Temporary Emergency Wildfire Suppression Act
- 10-04-1988: Rails to Trail
- 10-24-1988: Forest Ecosystems and Atmospheric Pollution Research Act of 1988
- 10-24-1988: Firefighter Pay Cap
- 11-05-1988: Federal Energy Management Improvement Act of 1988
- 11-18-1988: Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988
- 11-18-1988: Federal Cave Resources Protection Act of 1988
- 11-18-1988: Federal Employees Liability Reform and Tort Compensation Act of 1988
- 12-13-1989: North American Wetlands Conservation Act
- 07-26-1990: Americans with Disabilities Act
- 08-20-1990: Customs and Trade Act of 1990
  - Title IV - Forest Resource Conservation and Shortage Relief Act of 1990 (Log Export Restrictions)
- 11-05-1990: Foreign Operations Appropriations Act
  - Title VI - International Forestry Cooperation Act of 1990
  - 11-16-1990: National Forest Foundation Act (Title IV)
- 11-16-1990: Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation
- 11-16-1990: National Environmental Education Act
- 11-28-1990: National 1990 Farm Bill
  - Title XII - Forest Stewardship Act of 1990
    - Subtitle A - Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act
    - Subtitle B - Research and Education
    - Subtitle C - America The Beautiful
    - Subtitle D - Miscellaneous Provisions
  - Title XV - Agricultural Development and Trade Act of 1990 (Rural Communities Revitalization)
  - Title XXIV - Global Climate Change Prevention Act of 1990
- 11-28-1990: Take Pride in America Program (Title XI)
- 11-28-1990: National Indian Forest Resources Management Act (Title III)
- 11-29-1990: Federal Debt Collection Procedures Act

- 12-18-1991: ISTEA (Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991)
  - Title I - Part A - Scenic Byways Program
  - Title I - Part B - Symms National Recreational
- 01-03-1992: Pacific Yew Act
- 09-30-1992: Tourism Policy and Export Promotion Act of 1992

10-05-1992: Appeals Reform act - Sec 322 Forest Service Decision making And Appeals Reform

**A Pilot Test Preliminary Assessment of the Management of the:**

**Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit**

**As managed by the**

**USDA Forest Service**

**Fremont-Winema National Forest**

**Relative to the Standards of Third-Party Certification under the  
Forest Stewardship Council**

**Date of Field Audit: November 8-10 2005**

**Date of Report: December 30, 2005**

**By:**

**SCIENTIFIC CERTIFICATION SYSTEMS**

**2200 Powell St. Suite Number 725**

**Emeryville, CA 94608, USA**

**SCS Contact: Dr. Robert J. Hrubes**

## INTRODUCTION

The Pinchot Institute for Conservation (PIC), acting in collaboration with the USDA Forest Service (FS) retained Scientific Certification Systems to provide detailed information about the feasibility and costs of achieving third-party certification of the management of the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit, located in Lake County, Oregon. Certification of forest management programs by independent, third parties has become increasingly common world-wide for a variety of reasons. Of note, numerous state forestry agencies have sought independent, third-party certification of state forestlands under their management over the past several years. Certification provides assurance to customers, managers, landowners, and the general public that objective standards are being met in the management of forests. Certification also helps land managers understand how their programs and practices compare with other organizations and helps these managers improve their forestry and conservation practices.

To further its understanding of certification, PIC/FS issued a request for proposals for the execution of dual feasibility studies (also referred to as scoping assessments or preliminary evaluations) of the Lakeview Stewardship Unit relative to the Principles & Criteria of the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) and the Sustainable Forestry Initiative® (SFI) certification programs.

Scientific Certification Systems (SCS) of Emeryville, California and NSF International Strategic Registrations (NSF) of Ann Arbor, Michigan joined to prepare and submit a joint proposal in response to the Pinchot Institute's request for proposals. PIC awarded a contract, and the two firms began work in September, 2005. This report summarizes the findings of the FSC portion of this joint FSC – SFI Gap Analysis and Readiness Review, otherwise known as a Preliminary Evaluation or Scoping Visit.

### **The Forest Service Pilot Test Program**

The assessment and results presented in this report are part of a broader certification pilot project being undertaken by the USDA Forest Service. Depending upon funding availability, up to 7 National Forest units will undergo a simulated dual (FSC/SFI) certification evaluation process (scoping visits followed by full evaluations) for the purpose of generating experiential information with which the Forest Service can determine if it wishes to, in fact, seek third-party certification for some or all of the National Forest units it manages. In order to provide the greatest amount of directly relevant strategic information from these pilot tests, they are structured so as to be “full simulations” of the full protocols of both the FSC and SFI programs. As such, the pilot test for the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit includes the following steps:

- Selection of and signing a contract with an entity(ies) duly accredited to conduct audits against the FSC and SFI standards
- Scoping Visit
  - Pre-field document collation and review
  - Public notice and solicitation of comment (FSC, only)
  - On site visit including field reconnaissance and staff interviews
  - Stakeholder consultation (FSC, only)
  - Report preparation (separate for FSC and SFI)
- Development of special considerations/supplemental indicators through a transparent and participative process (FSC, only)
- Public notice and solicitation of comment, connected to the full evaluation (FSC, only)

- Full field evaluation, including stakeholder consultation
- Rendering of a certification decision on the basis of information gathered (simulated)
- Preparation of reports (separate for FSC and SFI)

For more information on the pilot test case studies, go to: [http://www.pinchot.org/certification/national\\_forest.htm](http://www.pinchot.org/certification/national_forest.htm).

To be clear, award of certification is not a possible outcome of these pilot projects.

## **FORMAT USED TO ADDRESS ASSESSMENT ISSUES**

PIC/FS requested a joint FSC – SFI preliminary evaluation and selected the SCS/NSF-ISR team, which proposed to employ a single two-person audit team. The audit was conducted by:

- FSC Lead Auditor, Dr. Robert Hrubes, SCS
- SFI Lead Auditor, Mike Ferrucci, NSF-ISR

Resumes of the audit team members can be found in Appendix 1.

### **The preliminary evaluation/gap analysis consisted of the following phases:**

Phase I - Scheduling, Document Request and Planning

Phase II - Office Review and Field Assessment

Phase III - Report Preparation and Revisions

The purpose of a scoping visit/preliminary evaluation is to provide a forestland owner or manager with early and strategic insight as to their preparedness to achieve FSC or SFI endorsed certification, were a full evaluation to be carried out. As such, a preliminary evaluation constitutes a “gap analysis” with which forestland owners and managers are better able to identify aspects of their management program that may be deficient relative to the certification standard and, thus, could serve as obstacles to achieving certification, were a full evaluation to be undertaken.

## SCS BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Scientific Certification Systems (SCS) is an FSC-accredited auditing and certification company that has certified forest operations world wide, totaling over 14 million acres. In the U.S., SCS has worked with state forestry agencies in the following states:

- Wisconsin
- Michigan
- Washington
- Maine
- Pennsylvania
- Maryland

SCS has issued over 600 chain-of-custody certificates, also under the aegis of the FSC. These certificates are associated with over 35 countries, around the world. SCS has been a FSC-accredited certification body since 1995.

Preliminary evaluations are a standard first step in the FSC-endorsed certification process and are designed to afford insight to a forest management entity as to general areas of strength and weakness relative to the standards of certification. The results of a preliminary evaluation will enable forest managers and decision-makers to make more informed decisions as to the merits and potential costs or implications of seeking FSC-endorsed certification.

It is important for all interested parties to understand that a preliminary evaluation does not provide any guarantees as to the outcome of a full certification evaluation. Because of its preliminary and limited nature, this first step in the certification process is properly framed as an indication and expert judgement as to the likely outcome of a full evaluation, were one to be conducted. But both false positive and false negative preliminary judgements could arise during a preliminary evaluation, though SCS employs only its senior staff and experienced outside consultants to conduct preliminary evaluations so as to enhance the robustness of the process.

### Summary of Events

The field component of the scoping visit was conducted from November 8 through November 10, 2005 and included the following activities:

#### Monday, November 7:

Hrubes (FSC lead auditor) and Ferrucci (SFI lead auditor) fly into Klamath Falls; final audit preparations that evening

#### Tuesday, November 8

Travel from Klamath Falls to Lakeview with Jerry Haugen (Forest Service certification coordinator for this project)

9 AM: group discussion with Forest Supervisor and selected SO staff

--introductions

--overview of the pilot tests, FSC and SFI certification programs

--general overview of LFSU and Fremont-Winema National Forest

1 PM: group discussion in Paisley Ranger District office

- regional/local economic trends
- road management
- timber salvage operations
- fuels management
- recreation activities
- range management
- forest monitoring
- appeals and stakeholder interactions
- tribal issues
- old-growth
- stream restoration

2:30 PM: field trip up the Chewaucan River to inspect aquatic habitat restoration projects

- Slide Integrated Fuels/Vegetation Mgt. Planning Area

7 PM: Public stakeholder meeting

- held at the SO and attended by 10 individuals<sup>6</sup>, all residents of Lake County

#### Wednesday, November 9

8 AM: opening meeting at Lakeview Ranger District office with the District Ranger and selected staff

- timber harvesting; East Side screens, silviculture, harvest levels
- watershed analyses and funding role of Resource Advisory Committee
- Public Law 106-393; Title II/III funded projects
- management planning/updates
- effects of funding reductions
- stream habitat typing/survey work
- staff training
- chemical use
- re-engineering initiatives
- contracting practices and policies/stewardship contracts
- non-timber product utilization/activities
- Lake County biomass power initiative
- recent fire history

12 PM: field trip to Upper Thomas Creek drainage

- watercourse restoration/road crossing upgrade
- timber management
- fuels/fire management
- old-growth

#### Thursday, November 10

9 AM: more group discussions at the SO

- archeological and cultural resource management
- road management/removal of fish impediments
- litigation and appeals
- ORV management and policies

---

<sup>6</sup> Some of the attendees were F.S. employees.

- endangered species management
- hydrological analyses/staff reductions
- BMP monitoring/soil compaction monitoring/rangeland monitoring
- weed/exotics management
- riparian management and policies (e.g., INFISH)
- recreation program
- tribal coordination/collaboration
- land management planning (LRMP)/status of plan revision initiative
- public involvement in plan revision
- implications of the new planning regulations
- implications of funding shortfalls
- interagency coordination such as with ODEQ re water quality
- inventory work/GIS data collection/mapping/database mgt.
- worker health and safety

2:00 PM: closing meeting

- presentation of preliminary observations/impressions
- review of the remaining stages of the pilot project

3:00 PM: road tour of southwestern portion of the Unit (vicinity of Dog Lake), guided by Terry Sodorff and accompanied by Jerry Hagen

- travel to Klamath Falls

Friday, November 11

Both lead auditors fly out of Klamath Falls, returning home.

### **Individuals Interviewed**

During the course of the office meetings and field inspections, the lead auditors had the opportunity to meet and talk with an extensive number of Forest Service employees attached to the Fremont-Winema National Forest, from Forest Supervisor Karen Shimamoto down to field technicians. Interviews took place in both individual and group settings, both in offices and in the field. Additionally, the auditors held an open invitation public meeting on the evening of Day 1, held at the Supervisor's Office in Lakeview.

Forest Service Personnel Interviewed:

Karen Shimamoto, Forest Supervisor  
 Jerry Haugen, Forest Environmental Coordinator  
 Ric Rine, Deputy Forest Supervisor  
 Karen Zamudio, Forest Ecologist  
 Dave Hogan, Fish Biologist/Program Manager  
 Dave Paweleck, Forest Hydrologist  
 Norm Michaels, Forest Silviculturist  
 Rick Elston, Silver Lake Ranger District Environmental Coordinator  
 Martina Keil, North Zone Range Management Specialist  
 Mike Neville

Terry Sodorff, Lakeview District Ranger  
Brian Watts  
Jim Leal  
Jody Perozzi  
James Price  
Desi Zamudio, Forest Soil Scientist  
John Kaiser, Forest Archeologist  
Jerry Panter, Project Engineer  
Rick Kehr, Engineering/Recreation Staff Specialist  
Jack Shehan, Ecosystem Management Staff Officer  
Catherine Callaghan

#### Stakeholders Interviewed<sup>7</sup>:

Paul Harlan, Collins Companies, Fremont Sawmill/Lakeview Stewardship Group  
Jim Walls, Lake County Resource Initiative  
Deanna Johnston, Lakeview Stewardship Group  
Bill Duke, Lake County Resource Initiative  
Melvin Dick, Lake County Commissioner  
Ryan Benham, Reporter, Lake County Examiner  
Kerry Hart, Collins Companies, Fremont Sawmill

## FORMAT OF FINDINGS

Under the umbrella of the FSC, forest management operations are evaluated against a set of standards known as the *FSC Principles and Criteria of Forest Stewardship*, which in this case are further elaborated by a duly endorsed regional standard, the *FSC Pacific Coast Regional Standard*. Like all National and Regional Standards, the FSC Pacific Coast Regional Standard provides regionally-specific elaborations and interpretations of the P&C, in the form of regional *Indicators* associated with each of the Criterion.

To follow are the SCS lead auditor's findings, presented in two formats:

A general overview of strengths and gaps relative to each of the FSC Principles of Forest Stewardship.

A summary of possible gaps/deficiencies relative to the regional indicators that elaborate upon the FSC Principles and Criteria.

The reader is reminded that preliminary evaluations (scoping visits), by their very nature, are not definitive determinations of the degree of conformance to the certification standard. Only a full certification evaluation, conducted under the auspices of the FSC and according to FSC protocols, will generate definitive determinations of conformance. In contrast, preliminary evaluations provide the audit team's professional judgments as to possible non-conformances, based upon limited exposure to the forest management operations.

---

<sup>7</sup> On November 18, 2005, after the field component of the scoping visit, the SCS auditors conducted a 90 minute tele-conference with members of the Lakeview Stewardship Group, a citizens committee that was instrumental in the 2001 re-authorization of the Unit and that is developing their own vision and plan for the future management of the Unit.

That is, the results of preliminary evaluations constitute findings as to the likelihood that the candidate forest management operation would be found in conformance to the standard, were a full evaluation to be conducted.

In instances where possible non-conformances or “gaps” are identified and discussed in this report, we recommend that the Lakeview Unit managers pursue a combination of the following responses, between now and the time of the full evaluation, scheduled for early June, 2006:

- In the event that Lakeview Unit managers believes that an identified gap, in fact, does not exist despite the preliminary findings of the lead auditor, compile additional information and evidence to submit to the full evaluation team—on or before the conduct of the full evaluation--that better demonstrates how the Forest Service is conforming to the particular criterion or indicator
- Formulate, and implement as far as possible, corrective actions aimed at closing the identified gaps.

### **Development of Special Considerations**

Per the terms of the Request for Proposal jointly issued by The Pinchot Institute for Conservation and the USDA Forest Service, this pilot test exercise is to include an additional procedural step—the identification and development, through a consultative process, of any “special considerations” that, due to the unique nature of national forest management, ought to be brought to bear in the assessment of, in this case, the Lakeview Unit. Given this charge, SCS has developed a multi-staged procedure for developing these special considerations that, at the time of the full evaluation in June 2006, will be formatted as “supplemental indicators:”

- Use the scoping visit as a source of information about possible special considerations
- On the basis of the scoping visit, and bringing to bear our years of experience in certification and national forest management issues, internally develop a first draft list of special considerations/supplemental indicators
- Conduct an iteration of expert review and revisions to the list of special considerations
- Conduct an iteration of open public/stakeholder review and revision to the list of special consideration
- Finalize the supplemental indicators, for use in the June 2006 (simulated) full certification evaluation.

Due to this extra procedural stage of the overall process, the findings of the scoping visit are additionally provisional (i.e., subject to subsequent revision) due to the fact that these special considerations/supplemental indicators due not yet exist as, as such, have not yet been brought to bear in assessing the management of the Unit.

## **FINDINGS**

### **General Overview**

Based upon the information gathered and preliminary judgments formed from document reviews, personal interviews and field inspections, it is the SCS audit team’s general sense that the Forest Service’s management of the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit is, overall, quite compatible with the general thrust and requirements of FSC certification, as detailed in the FSC Pacific Coast Regional Standard. Of significant note in this regard:

- The unit exists for the purpose of supporting/enhancing the regional economic health of Lake County, Oregon, which is highly compatible with FSC Principles 4 and 5
- The basic thrust of management activities is to restore the ecological health of the Unit; timber management is conducted within this clear context
- Management is highly transparent and, even in the context of the new national forest planning regulations, incorporates a substantial amount of stakeholder consultation and input as well as mechanisms for dispute resolution
- The general tenor of relations between the Forest Service and the citizens of Lake County, Oregon, are notably positive as compared to many other units within the National Forest System
- There are established mechanisms for regularly interacting with the neighboring Native American tribe, the Klamath Tribe

But, given the breadth and detail of requirements found within the FSC certification standards, it is essentially impossible for any forest management unit to not be deficient relative to some components of, in this case, the FSC Pacific Coast Regional Standard. At this point in time, and on the basis of the information gathered during the scoping visit, the prospects for a positive outcome during the upcoming (simulated) full certification evaluation will be enhanced if the Lakeview Unit managers make a commitment to address the following areas that presently constitute potential gaps of a more substantive nature:

- Documenting/justifying the reason behind the partial estate engagement in the FSC process
- Developing and employing mechanisms for assuring more affirmative collaboration with neighboring tribes
- Designing strategies for more treating, at a larger scale, overstocked stands within the Unit
- Developing a management plan (even if just an umbrella document) that is specific to the Unit
- Developing a mechanism for producing periodic summaries of the results of monitoring activities on the Unit
- Articulating, in written form, policies and practices that assure conformance with the no entry/no net loss requirements for old-growth management found in the FSC standard
- Developing a crosswalk document that demonstrates how the Forest Service is meeting the HC VF analytical and management requirements contained in Principle 9
- Pursuing strategies for more active management of the road system
- Pursuing strategies for a more expeditious pace in eliminating fish passage impediments
- Compiling evidence that grazing on the Unit is controlled and monitored sufficient to avoid significant adverse ecological impacts.

Gaps notwithstanding, our overall assessment is that the Forest Service's management of the Lakeview Unit is a demonstrably competent mechanism for achieving the practice of responsible forest management on an environmentally and socially important public forest holding. The type of forest management being practiced by the Forest Service on this Unit, while at present perhaps not adequately covering every base required by the FSC, nonetheless has the potential to be a very "good fit" with FSC-endorsed certification.

#### Findings Relative to the FSC P&C/Pacific Coast Regional Standard

As mentioned previously in this report, award of FSC-endorsed certification does not require perfection or across-the-board exemplary performance; deficiencies are acceptable provided that:

the totality of the management program can be considered exemplary there is fundamental conformance with the breadth of each of the FSC *Criteria*<sup>8</sup> and any “fatal flaw” Indicators contained in the FSC Pacific Coast Regional Standard provisions, i.e., *Corrective Action Requests (CARs)*, are stipulated by the certifier and accepted by the certification applicant for addressing identified non-conformances relative to the applicable approved regional indicators, or interim indicators in regions without an approved regional standard.

In the context of the FSC P&C, this concept generally means that non-conformance at the Regional Indicator level is potentially certifiable<sup>9</sup> but non-conformance at the higher level of a Criterion is not certifiable. In light of this “decision rule,” a certifier’s accredited procedures must expressly ferret out criterion-level non-conformance that would preclude award of certification. In the SCS Forest Conservation Program protocols, this is accomplished through two mechanisms:

*Fatal flaw indicators/scoring guidelines* present in the relevant approved regional standard. The Pacific Coast Regional Standard identifies Indicators 6.3.d, 6.4.c, 6.4.d and 10.5.b to be “fatal flaw” indicators. Non-compliance with a fatal flaw indicator triggers the issuance of Major CARs/pre-conditions (i.e., certification cannot be awarded).

*Accredited evaluating protocols* that lead to findings of conformance at the criterion level by individually evaluating the separate sets of indicators associated with each criterion; this determination is done collectively by the full audit team, under the facilitation of the team leader employing group consensus methodologies.

## **FSC Principles & Criteria**

### **FSC Principle 1: Compliance with Laws and FSC Principles**

This FSC Principle is elaborated through a set of 6 Criteria that focus on issues such as conformance to all applicable national and local laws and regulations, payment of legally prescribed fees, taxes and royalties, protections against illegal harvesting and other unauthorized activities, and demonstrating a long-term commitment to adhere to the FSC Principles & Criteria.

#### **Comments and Observations:**

With regard to the 6 Criteria and 10 Regional Indicators that elaborate upon this Principle, it is our preliminary sense that management of the Lakeview Unit can demonstrate acceptable conformance with all but two Criteria. While there are parties, most commonly environmental NGOs, that appeal and occasionally litigate agency decisions, it is our sense that Unit managers endeavor to and succeed at respecting applicable federal laws and regulations. At the time of the full evaluation, Unit managers should be prepared to demonstrate that such appeals and litigation are not, in fact, prima facie evidence of non-compliance with legal requirements.

---

<sup>8</sup> As discussed later in this report, the audit team as concluded that FSC Principle 10 does not apply to the State Forest program and its possible certification under the FSC.

<sup>9</sup> There are some criteria or sub-criteria for which non-compliance would constitute an impediment to award of certification, regardless of offsetting strengths. Such “fatal flaw” issues include: use of GMO’s, use of prohibited chemicals, conversion of natural forest to plantations, lack of a written management plan.

Criterion 1.3 focuses on compliance with international agreements and conventions and it is our sense that Unit managers will need to undertake additional actions in order to demonstrate adequate conformance. As is commonly the case with U.S.-based forest managers, the Unit managers do not appear to have a solid and comprehensive awareness of which international agreements and conventions may be applicable and what the specific requirements may be. A common corrective action request that is specified with regard to this Criterion is for forest managers to develop a registry of applicable international agreements and conventions and to conduct a self assessment of the adequacy of compliance.

Criterion 1.6 addresses the somewhat vague issue of “commitment of the FSC Principles & Criteria.” Helpfully, the three regional indicators provide more focus and specificity, such as on “partial estate certification.” Clearly, the Forest Service’s present engagement in FSC certification falls under the rubric of partial estate certification and, as such, it will be necessary for the agency to provide a written justification for not submitting the entire national forest estate for certification review, at this point in time. This justification should include provisions that will be put in place, should the situation arise, to assure that the general public clearly understands which units have been certified and which have not.

On another and perhaps more immediately important spatial scale, the Forest Service will need to present a written rationale for why only the Lakeview Unit rather than the entire Fremont-Winema National Forest is the defined scope of this (simulated) certification evaluation. To the extent that the Unit is not, in fact, a logical management unit distinct from the full combined National Forest (and there is substantial evidence to support the argument that LFSU is not an operational management unit), the logic of seeking certification only for the Unit becomes strained. This issue arises elsewhere in the Pacific Coast Standard, as well, such as in Principle 7 where the absence of a forest management plan specific to the Unit raises issues of possible non-conformities.

Likewise, Unit managers will need to publicly post a written statement expressing a commitment to manage the Unit in accordance with the FSC P&C, as augmented by the Pacific Coast Regional Standard. Under the FSC’s guidelines for partial estate certification, the Forest Service will also need to help the certifiers confirm that there are not situations on other national forest units not undergoing the certification process that could constitute a major non-conformance with the applicable FSC regional standard. That is, FSC-accredited certification bodies, per FSC guidelines, cannot evaluate a partial estate “in a vacuum” where circumstances on the remainder of the estate are not considered at all.

Overall, and provided that prior to a full evaluation the Forest Service expressly addresses the likely gaps associated with Criteria 1.3 and 1.6, it is our sense that a full evaluation would confirm adequate conformance to this Principle and to the 6 Criteria contained therein such that any observed gaps would not constitute a barrier to award of certification.

## **FSC Principle 2: Tenure and Use Rights and Responsibilities**

This FSC Principle, detailed through 3 Criteria, focuses on the long-term tenure and use rights to the land that is undergoing certification evaluation. Forest managers seeking FSC-endorsed certification must establish clear and legal ownership or right to manage the defined forest area that is being evaluated. Customary use rights, if clearly demonstrated, must be appropriately honored.

Comments and Observations:

In the judgment of the SCS audit team, management of the Lakeview Unit appears to be well positioned relative this FSC Principle, as indicated by the following observations:

- The tenure status of the Unit, and the legal right of the Forest Service to act as manager, is clearly not in question
- There is a demonstrable and exemplary track record of allowing customary uses and activities on the Unit; the Forest Service has at least 5 citizen and tribal advisory committees to help assure that Unit management is compatible with community expectations
- It is widely recognized that the tenor of community relationships between the Forest Service and the people of Lake and Klamath Counties is quite positive, especially relative to other national forest units around the western U.S.

Overall, it is our clear sense that a full evaluation would confirm adequate conformance to this Principle such that any observed gaps would not constitute a barrier to award of certification.

### **FSC Principle 3: Indigenous Peoples' Rights**

This FSC Principle is concerned about the rights of indigenous peoples to own, use and manage their lands and territories. There are 4 Criteria that elaborate upon this principle. For most non-Indian owned lands in the U.S., the relevance of this Principle is pertinent with respect to protection of sites of special cultural or ecological importance and with respect to compensation for the application of traditional knowledge that can be attributable to defined indigenous peoples (note: we are not aware of any instance to date where this compensation obligation has been invoked; indeed, we find such a possibility to be highly unlikely in a socio-legal framework such as exists in the U.S.).

#### **Comments and Observations:**

In the judgment of the audit team, the applicable components Principle 3 in the context of the management of a national forest unit are limited to Criteria 3.2 and 3.3. But, we note that the Klamath Tribe is actively seeking to secure control of its former tribal lands, now the Winema component of the combined Fremont-Winema National Forest. However, it is our sense that this process is proceeding through legal channels in an appropriate manner and that, in the interim, the Forest Service is actively endeavoring to solicit and consider tribal perspectives in management decisions impacting the former tribal lands. In terms of the partial estate certification issues raised in Criterion 1.6, it is Criterion 3.1 that would rise up as the area with most significant question: Does the management of the Winema Unit by the Forest Service constitute a non-conformance with the expectation that indigenous people control forest management on their lands unless they delegate control with free and informed consent to other agencies? This question will need to be addressed during a full evaluation.

With respect to this narrowed scope (Criteria 3.2 and 3.3), it is the audit team's preliminary judgment that the Forest Service is operating in generally adequate conformance, though there are opportunities for improvement that might be identified in a full evaluation, either in the form of a recommendation or a corrective action request. These opportunities for enhanced conformance generally relate to pursuing more affirmative and innovative means of reaching out to and securing the active collaboration of neighboring tribes.

Overall, it is our sense that a full evaluation would likely confirm adequate conformance to applicable Criteria subsumed in this Principle such that any observed gaps would not constitute a barrier to award of certification. But this is a “close call” and it is possible, therefore, that a full evaluation would find a need to pursue more affirmative and culturally effective means of interacting with the Klamath Tribe and perhaps the Fort Bidwell Tribe and that this could be stipulated as a Major CAR. The FSC standard speaks to affirmative outreach using culturally sensitive methods that enhance the likelihood of active dialogue and collaboration.

#### FSC Principle 4: Community Relations and Worker’s Rights

This FSC Principle, elaborated through 5 Criteria, addresses the effects of forest management on the well being of forest workers and local communities. The Criteria focus on issues such as: preferences for local employment, compliance with employee health and safety regulations, rights of workers to organize, completion of social impact assessments, and employee grievance resolution mechanisms. In short, this Principle expresses the position that exemplary forest management must include a conscious sensitivity to the interests of the most directly impacted stakeholders: employees, contractors and local communities.

#### Comments and Observations:

With respect to the scope and thrust of this Principle, we note that the very purpose of the Lakeview Unit, since its establishment in the late 1940’s has been to assure enhanced benefits for the rural economy of Lake County, Oregon. Indeed, it would be difficult to identify another forest management operation—public or private—that could demonstrate a compatibility with P.4 more so than can the Lakeview Unit.

Criterion 4.1 addresses local opportunities for employment and other forest services. The Regional Indicators address issues such as overall quality of employment packages, preferences for local employment and processing, and contributions to public education. With respect to 6 of the 7 Regional Indicators that elaborate upon this Criterion, it is our sense that a full evaluation will reveal that the Lakeview Unit is in very solid conformance. But Indicator 4.1.b may be a concern; this Indicator requires that employment conditions for non-local forest workers are as good as for local workers. The question that will need to be vigorously investigated as part of the full evaluation is whether or not working conditions for migrant laborers employed, for instance, by planting and vegetation control contractors that operate on the Unit demonstrate conformance with this Indicator. We were simply unable to look into this matter during the scoping visit.

Criterion 4.2 requires conformance with all applicable laws and regulations with regard to human health and safety. Here, the team concludes that the demonstration of conformance is not as clear. While there are existing safety programs for Forest Service employees—and we observed first hand the seriousness by which safety is considered when a plane that had been chartered to take the auditors on an overflight was rejected for safety reasons—we did not have the opportunity to confirm whether or not the Forest Service requires safety programs for all contractors that operate within the Unit. This issue will need to be examined in the full evaluation and, if there is no such requirement for contractors, a corrective action request would likely be issued.

Criterion 4.3 deals with the right of employees and workers to organize and collectively bargain. We note that non-supervisory Forest Service employees on the Fremont-Winema are unionized, which provides unambiguous evidence of their right to organize and collectively bargain. As with the safety issue, we do not at present have evidence to confirm that the rights to organize and collectively bargain are extended to employees

of contractors that operate on the Unit. And more specific to the one Regional Indicator associated with this Criterion, we have not seen evidence confirming that the Forest Service requires its contractors to have effective dispute resolution mechanisms in place. To the extent that Forest Service contracts include standard provisions requiring contractors to comply with all applicable state and federal regulations, then conformance to this Criterion can likely be demonstrated for employees of contractors. If such provisions are not part of the standard contracts, a CAR asking for such an inclusion would be likely as part of a full certification evaluation.

Criterion 4.4 requires social impact evaluations as part of management planning and operations. It also requires stakeholder consultation. With respect to the first requirement, it is our sense that indeed Unit managers engage in periodic review of relevant socio-economic indicators. As such, it is not likely that a CAR would result from a full evaluation, but avoidance of a CAR would be enhanced if Unit managers provided the full audit team with a written summary of the means and methods by which they consider potential social impacts of their actions and policies. With respect to the second focus of this Criterion, stakeholder consultation, it is our clear sense that adequate conformance would be confirmed during a full evaluation. However, the new planning regulations are widely perceived by ENGOs as reducing their opportunities to provide meaningful input and we can anticipate this being an issue that arises during the audit team's stakeholder outreach as part of the full certification evaluation.

Criterion 4.5 focuses on dispute resolution mechanisms and, here, it is our preliminary judgment that the manner in which Unit managers seek to resolve conflicts informally and early are quite effective. Of particular note, the efforts of the Forest Supervisor to affirmatively reach out to potential appellants/litigants are clearly responsive to the thrust of this Criterion. We also note that the appeals process and, after that, the court system provides an avenue of dispute resolution that constitutes clear evidence of conformance to this Criterion.

Overall, it is our sense that a full evaluation would confirm very solid conformance to Criteria associated with this Principle such that any observed gaps would not constitute a barrier to award of certification.

### **FSC Principle 5: Benefits from the Forest**

This FSC Principle addresses several loosely related issues such as efficiency in the use of forest products, financial viability of the forest management operation, and diversity of environmental and social benefits from forest management. Principle 5 is elaborated through 6 Criteria. Of note, Criterion 5.6 requires that the rate of harvest not exceed levels that can be permanently sustained, perhaps one of the most focused and specific requirements found throughout the P&C. The other 5 criteria within this principle address matters such as balancing financial objectives with full cost accounting (including environmental costs), optimal use of harvested products and local processing, minimization of waste and residual stand damage, diversification of products from the forest, and protection of forest services such as watershed functions and fisheries values.

#### **Comments and Observations:**

Without question, the Lakeview Unit generates important benefits to the people of Lake County and south-central Oregon as well as people everywhere that perceive a stake in how our national forests are managed. Benefits associated with the Unit include:

Timber (sawlogs, pulp logs, biomass chips) harvested from the Unit and that is earmarked for processing by the lone remaining sawmill in the county  
Economic activity and employment associated with cattle grazing on the Unit and the support such grazing brings to the regional ranching economy  
Employment opportunities, both directly with the Forest Service and through contractors and lessees  
Public outdoor recreational opportunities and the associated boost to the rural economy of south-central Oregon, through employment and user expenditures; such recreational opportunities also enhance the quality of life of the residents of the region  
Bio-diversity and habitat benefits of maintaining healthier forests on properties under active management driven by stewardship rather than revenue maximization

This Principle also includes the issue of economic viability, more specifically the expectation that forest managers *strive toward* economic viability. While the long-term viability of the Forest Service’s management of the Lakeview Unit is incrementally and cumulatively threatened by ongoing and deepening budget reductions, it is nonetheless clear that Unit managers have been active and creative in seeking/striving to maintain viability in the face of these shortfalls. But there is a limit to how long the Forest Service can “make do with less” before the overall program functionality suffers to a much more significant extent than as thus far been the case.

With respect to optimal use and local processing (Criterion 5.2), the audit team concludes that the very purpose of the Lakeview Unit, as established through the initial enabling legislation and the recent reauthorization legislation, establishes a level of conformance with the thrust of this Criterion that may be without equal amongst public and private forest operations that have sought FSC certification, to date. With respect to minimization of waste and damage to residual trees (Criterion 5.3), the auditors were unable to make direct observations of active logging during the brief scoping visit, but the available evidence from viewing relatively recent harvest areas is that the Unit managers place a high priority on waste minimization and avoiding residual stand damage. During the full evaluation, scheduled for the early part of the 2006 field season, the auditors will be able to more effectively ascertain the level of conformance to this Criterion.

With respect to taking action to avoid dependence on a single forest product, we observe what we consider to be marginally adequate conformance. In large part due to the paucity of wood processing facilities in Lake County and the remoteness from other markets, there is little focus beyond management for the production of solid wood products (e.g., sawmilling). Of positive note, Unit managers such as the Lakeview District Ranger are actively working to bring a biomass energy facility into the County, recognizing that it will create a local market for wood chips from small diameter and low grade trees. While there is little else in the way of programmatic focus on non-timber forest products for diversifying the income stream, we do note the active range management/grazing allotment program, though such activities generally do not fall under the rubric of “non-timber forest products” as envisioned by the FSC. And of course, another important non-timber product associated with the Unit that has direct commercial value, at least to private concerns such as outfitters, guides, and event promoters associated with the growing activity of hang-gliding, is outdoor recreation.

With respect to Criterion 5.5, where it is stated that forest management should recognize, maintain and enhance the value of non-market forest services such as watersheds and fisheries, it is our strong sense that a full evaluation will lead to a finding a very solid conformance (notably, the Pacific Coast Regional Standard contains no regional indicators for this Criterion). When assessing the “big picture” of what management of the Unit is all about—as underscored by the reauthorization legislation and the name change to a “stewardship

unit”—we easily conclude that the agency’s management program is fundamentally oriented towards managing for these non-market forest services, most all of which are dependent upon healthy forest ecosystems.

With respect to Criterion 5.6, we note that actual timber harvest levels are very substantially below maximum sustainable levels in the classic sense of that term as well as the allowable harvest levels generated through the LRMP process. In the context of FSC certification, conservative harvest levels such as has been the norm on the Unit is very much a positive situation as it no doubt is associated with a much wiser and environmentally and socially exemplary balancing of timber and non-timber considerations than is typically associated with regimes oriented towards realizing maximum sustainable harvest levels. That said, the drastically reduced harvest levels on the Unit over the past 10-15 years has a down side, both with respect to regional socio-economic issues (a focus of other Criteria) as well as with respect to conformance with Regional Indicator 5.6.c. This Indicator addresses the issue of well-stocked stands and the relationship to harvest levels and stand-level harvesting practices. With respect to stand-level harvesting practices, our preliminary sense is that Unit timber management prescriptions do indeed result in appropriate stocking levels. But the more significant issue, and one of potential non-conformance, is the problem of overstocked stands because of the much reduced harvesting program. The Forest Service (encouraged by the Lakeview Stewardship Group) is attempting to address this through non-commercial tools such as PCT and prescribed fire, but the stocking problem appears to be worsening over time. More aggressive strategies, including more commercial timber management, may in fact be needed to establish an adequate level of conformance to this Indicator.

Another issue that is likely to arise during a full evaluation is that there is not a separately calculated allowable harvest level (as academic as such an exercise may be in the current fedlands management climate) for the Unit, as distinct from the rest of the Fremont-Winema National Forest. This is another manifestation/complication of the partial estate certification issue, discussed above.

Overall, it is our sense that a full evaluation would confirm adequate conformance to Criteria comprising this Principle such that any observed gaps may result in the issuance of minor CARs but would not constitute a barrier to award of certification.

### **FSC Principle 6: Environmental Impact**

This FSC Principle is elaborated by a set of 10 Criteria that focus on issues such as impact assessments, protection of listed species, biodiversity, reserve areas, stream-side and wetlands buffers, erosion control, exotic species, chemical use, high conservation value forests, and forest conversions. Of all the FSC principles, this one is the most expansive in scope, with an associated high level of emphasis on data and information collection and analysis. Collectively, the thrust of this principle manifests a clear bias towards the maintenance and restoration of natural forest conditions.

#### **Comments and Observations:**

Over the breadth of this expansive Principle, it is the audit team’s preliminary judgment that the Forest Service’s management of the Lakeview Unit is in reasonable conformance with Principle 6. While it is likely that a full evaluation would reveal non-conformances with perhaps several of the 72 Regional Indicators that have been specified for this Principle, it is our sense on the basis of the scoping visit that the distribution of these non-conformances would be such that there would still be a finding of adequate conformance with each of the 10 Criteria. At the field level, the auditors did not observe systematic and significant patterns where

inappropriate levels of environmental impact are occurring as a result of forestry operations. Indeed, we consistently observed circumstances indicating that forestry operations (e.g., timber harvests) are being carried out in a manner that avoids adverse impacts such as soil loss, rutting and compaction, watercourse degradation, damage to residual stands and non-timber vegetation, as well as loss of aesthetic quality. Resource management operations in the Unit appear to be conducted with competent and substantive consideration of potential adverse environmental impacts. As well, the management approaches do not substantially rely upon chemicals, exotic species or conversion of forested areas to non-forest cover.

With respect to Criterion 6.1, which addresses environmental impact assessments and is elaborated with 5 Regional Indicators, it is our preliminary judgment that the management of the Lakeview Unit is in clear conformance. The Forest Service regulations place a very high priority on environmental analyses at multiple spatial and temporal scales. The basic theme of national forest management—now commonly referred to as ecosystem management—is to restore forest conditions to less altered states, closer to historic conditions. Analysis are carried out in advance of site-disturbing activities; all significant actions in the field result from a process of elaborating and selecting from a set of alternative courses of action, per NEPA requirements.

With regard to addressing threatened and endangered species issues (Criterion 6.2, augmented with 3 Regional Indicators), the auditors did not observe anything that would indicate a major gap. Indeed, it is our sense that management of all national forest units, not just the Lakeview Unit, has been marked for well over a decade by a major emphasis on maintaining/enhancing habitat conditions for federally listed species. Relative to the 3 Regional Indicators for this Criterion, it is our sense that a full evaluation would likely confirm a solid level of conformance.

FSC Criterion 6.3, focusing on the maintenance of ecological functions and values, is quite expansive in scope, as indicated by 6 sub-criteria that each have between 3 and 5 Regional Indicators. It is our preliminary judgment that a full evaluation of the agency's management of the Lakeview Unit will lead to a conclusion that the program not only maintains but enhances ecological functions such as forest regeneration and succession, biological diversity, and natural cycles. That is, the management regimes and policies on the Unit generally are leading to ecologically healthier forests, over time. But there is one subject of particularly notable significance that falls within the scope of this Criterion and that merits some comment: old-growth. Underscoring its significance, sub-criterion 6.3(d) of the Pacific Coast Regional Standard, which addresses old-growth, has been designated a "fatal flaw" requirement. This means that certification is precluded in the event of a finding of non-conformance with this sub-criterion (i.e., a Major CAR is required). Throughout the Pacific Coast region, and on federal lands in particular, the certification standards "place the bar high" with respect to requiring:

- No entry/harvest in Type 1 old-growth stands
- No net loss of acreage of Type 2 and Type 3 old-growth stands

Old-growth is a particularly significant issue on the Lakeview Unit (as with most western national forest units) due to the fact that most of the forested areas that have not been clearcut since the advent of intensive management starting in the 1970's qualify as one of the three types of old-growth. As such, the no entry/no net loss requirement is relevant in most all forest management operations taking place on the Unit.

Based upon the information gathered during the scoping visit, it is our sense that:

- Areas within the Unit meeting the definition of Type 1 old-growth are not being entered

- Harvesting prescriptions applied in Type 2 and 3 old-growth are conforming with the “no net loss” standard; that is, the harvesting is light selective cutting aimed at increasing average stem diameters and maintaining late successional attributes.

At bottom line, it is our preliminary judgment that management activities on the Lakeview Unit are in conformance with sub-criterion 6.d of the Pacific Coast Regional Standard. However, it is quite possible that a full certification evaluation would result in the specification of a corrective action request in which the Forest Service is asked to develop explicit written policy and guidelines assuring continued conformance with the operative old-growth requirements contained in the certification standard.

Another issue that falls within the scope of C6.3, perhaps somewhat less controversial but nonetheless a “hot button,” is salvage logging after wildfire. We note that several if not all of the salvage sales offered on the Unit over the past several years have been appealed by ENGOs. While the filing of an appeal is not prima facie evidence of impropriety, it does nonetheless raise questions about the adequacy with which the Forest Service is balancing ecological and economic considerations, as required by Regional Indicator 6.3.c.4. At the time of the full evaluation, Unit managers should expect that the audit team will investigate salvage timber sales in some detail and, as such, Unit managers should be prepared to demonstrate how ecological considerations are being appropriately factored into the decisions of where and how to salvage harvest.

Criterion 6.4 pertains to a representative system of reference areas. It is our sense that an appreciably portion of the Unit is assigned to “management areas” that function as reference areas. We are not as sure as to the representivity of the current array of such reference areas and the extent to which the establishment of such areas incorporates public input. At the time of the full evaluation, Unit managers should be prepared to present evidence with respect to both representivity and public involvement.

Criterion 6.5 requires written guidelines to avoid environmental impacts. Further, the Regional Indicators associated with this Criterion speak to field conditions that should be observable in response to adherence to these written guidelines. With respect to written guidelines, it is our clear sense that the Forest Service can easily demonstrate solid conformance, with its full array of standards and guidelines for all aspects of national forest management. But with respect to the components of this Criterion that focus on field conditions (which most of the Regional Indicators in fact focus on, despite the thrust of the Criterion, itself), we are not as sanguine. In particular, it is our sense that there may be gaps that are revealed in the full evaluation with respect to:

- Indicator 6.5.g: It is our preliminary sense that the Unit’s road system, and the planning that supports it, is rather ad hoc, especially relative to the strong emphasis on a well-planned/designed road network that is envisioned in this Indicator
- Indicator 6.5.i: This Indicator speaks to “controlling” and “restricting” access to road segments that “are not immediately needed for purposes of management.” While such an expectation should appropriately be balanced against public use considerations, we nonetheless have a preliminary sense that Unit managers could be more active and strategic in closing off non-critical road segments
- Indicator 6.5.l: This Indicator directs that unnecessary roads are permanently decommissioned or “put to bed.” While the Fremont-Winema does have a road decommissioning program that does involve roads within the Unit, budget reductions have substantially limited the level of activity.
- Indicator 6.5.t: This Indicator requires that cattle/sheep grazing is controlled in order to protect riparian vegetation and stream channel banks. Clearly, such efforts are a major management focus on the Unit

(and the rest of the Fremont-Winema), the existing lawsuit and the backlog in riparian survey work raises some questions as to the overall adequacy of the current level of management effort. This issue will no doubt be a significant area of focus during the full evaluation and Unit managers should be prepared to present evidence documenting conformance with this Indicator.

- Indicator 6.5.u: Here, the regional standard addresses stream crossings and elimination of impediments to fish passage. Like the grazing issue, Unit managers are clearly engaged in a program aimed at eliminating fish passage impediments, over time. The problem is the much protracted time frame for completing the task, due to budgetary constraints. At current funding levels, Unit managers estimate that it will take more than 30 years to eliminate the some 400 known impediments (only 10% have been eliminated, thus far). This pace is not likely to be found in adequate conformance with this Indicator and the specification of a CAR (focusing on securing more funding in order to accelerate the pace) is likely.

We consider the current level of conformance with the full scope of Criterion 6.5 to be marginal and the common underlying cause may be inadequate funding to carry out important field-level restoration and control activities; the potential gaps discussed above, should be considered of higher priority for additional effort by Unit managers prior to the full evaluation.

Criterion 6.6 focuses on chemical use. More accurately, it focuses on the expectation that forest managers employ every effort to avoid and/or minimize chemical use. Further, there are certain chemicals that simply cannot be used on certified forests (WHO Type 1A and 1B chemicals). Generally, we note that the Forest Service uses very little in the way of chemical herbicides on the Unit and elsewhere. As such, it is our sense that a full evaluation would confirm a solid conformance to the “avoid and minimize” aspect of this Criterion.

However, Criterion 6.6 also prohibits the use of a specific (and expanding) list of chemical substances. The Forest Service is possibly using a few chemicals that are prohibited from use on FSC certified forests and that will have to be ceased prior to award of certification. Of note, the list of prohibited chemicals on FSC-certified forests was substantially increased in November, 2005. If these chemicals are still in use at the time of the full evaluation, the audit team will be obligated to issue a Major CAR. Prior to a full evaluation, the appropriate personnel at the Fremont-Winema National Forest should secure the list of prohibited chemicals to compare with the list of chemicals used on the Unit. The list of chemicals used should also be conveyed to SCS prior to the full evaluation.

Criterion 6.7 deals with disposal of hazardous materials and, here, the audit team did not observe any significant nonconformance issues in the field. At the time of the full evaluation, Unit managers should be prepared to present to the audit team an overview of its chemical disposal and safety procedures, such as spill management/containment protocols and off-site disposal protocols. But, all in all, we consider it relatively likely that adequate conformance can be confirmed at the time of the full evaluation.

In that biological control agents and/or genetically modified organisms (GMOs) are not employed on the Lakeview Unit, Criterion 6.8 is largely non-relevant. Criterion 6.9 deals with the use of exotic species. It is our understanding that Forest Service on the Fremont-Winema National Forest does not employ exotic species, with the possible exception of grass mixes used to cover bare soil.

Finally, Criterion 6.10 deals with conversion of forests to non-forest uses. On the basis of the scoping visit, we consider this issue to be essentially irrelevant as no forest conversions to non-forest uses is taking place or is contemplated to take place on the Lakeview Unit.

Over the full scope of this lengthy and multi-subject Principle, it is our sense that a full evaluation would likely confirm adequate conformance to 9 of the 10 Criteria comprising this Principle such that any observed gaps would not constitute a barrier to award of certification. But we see the situation with respect to Criterion 6.5 as marginal, such that Unit managers should be prepared to “put their strongest case forward” as to how they believe they are in conformance. And if additional corrective actions were undertaken prior to the full evaluation, it would certainly be helpful in keeping any CARs graded as “minor” rather than “major.”

### FSC Principle 7: Management Plan

This Principle is elaborated through 4 Criteria, which collectively call for a very high level of commitment to management planning. A public summary of the management plan is required, as are regular updates to that public summary.

#### Comments and Observations:

In that there is no management plan that is specific to the Lakeview Unit and in that the Fremont and Winema Forest Plans are very much dated (though the two units were combined a few years ago, there is as yet still separate plans of record), we consider that this Principle is the weakest area of conformance at the present time, of the 9 applicable Principles. The lack of a Unit-specific management plan, perhaps more than any other consideration, raises questions as to the efficacy of pursuing certification for only the Unit as opposed to the entirety of the Fremont-Winema National Forest. If a full fledge certification initiative were to be pursued subsequent to the pilot test, and if the current scope, limited to just the Unit, is maintained, it will be necessary for the Forest Service to generate some sort of “management plan” that is specific to the Unit. In the absence of such a plan being developed prior to June 2006, the pilot test full evaluation will likely result in a (simulated) Major CAR being stipulated.

In short, conformance to both Criterion 7.1 (plan content) and 7.2 (periodic updates) requires on the part of the Forest Service an initiative to generate a plan specific to the Unit that addresses the plan content requirements of 7.1, even if this Unit-specific plan is largely a compilation or extraction from the larger Fremont-Winema Forest Plan(s). As well, a greater commitment to the timely completion of the major revision to the Forest Plan would be very helpful in demonstrating adequate conformance with Criterion 7.2.

Criterion 7.3 addresses training of workers and employees so that the plan can be adequately implemented. It is our preliminary judgment that the Forest Service places a strong emphasis on maintaining current skills of its salaried employees. However, we note that efforts to maintain up-to-date employee records of training received have not been maintained in recent years, thereby making it more difficult for the FS to demonstrate conformance. We are less certain as to the adequacy of the Forest Service’s commitment to assuring that employees of contractors operating on the Unit receive adequate training.

Criterion 7.4 requires that a public summary of the management plan be made publicly available. As a public agency, all plans generated by the Forest Service are, we assume, publicly available. The problem is not

one of availability but of currency and of specificity (to the Unit as distinct from the entire Fremont-Winema National Forest).

Overall, it is our sense that a full certification evaluation would not be able to confirm adequate conformance to this Principle without a commitment on the part of Lakeview Unit managers to develop a plan that is specific to the Unit, as distinct from the larger Fremont-Winema National Forests, as well as a ramped up time frame that would assure a speedier completion of the Forest Plan revision, than is currently likely to be the case.

### **FSC Principle 8: Monitoring and Assessment**

As a conceptual and thematic companion to Principle 7, this Principle (elaborated through 5 Criteria) requires certified operations to engage in an aggressive and formal program of periodic monitoring of the impacts of management operations, focusing upon both bio-physical and socio-economic impacts as well as the extent of plan compliance. Chain of custody is also addressed within this Principle (Criterion 8.3).

#### **Comments and Observations:**

Criterion 8.1 requires forest monitoring, particularly as tied to plan components, *scaled to the size and intensity of operations*. It is our preliminary sense that the level of monitoring of forest conditions on the Unit to be marginal and perhaps less than fully adequate, in large part due to the fact that Criterion 8.1 addresses a broad range of topics that the Forest Service may not be adequately covering. We note that Indicator 8.1.b. speaks to detailed monitoring of sites of special ecological significance; the scoping visit did not uncover evidence that this type of focused monitoring is occurring, at least to an adequate extent. As a companion to the situation with respect to Principle 7, it would be beneficial if Unit managers ramped up their systematic monitoring activities and better linked these monitoring activities with the plan revision process.

Criterion 8.2 addresses research and data collection; notably, the Criterion explicitly lists five different subject areas upon which research and data collection should be focused. Generally, it is our preliminary sense that an appreciable amount of research and data collection is taking place on the Unit. But we note that some basic types of inventory work, including timber resource inventory activities, are not longer being undertaken due to budgetary constraints.

Regional Indicator 8.2.d.5 represents a likely gap, though it would most likely be addressed through a Minor CAR rather than a Major CAR. It is our understanding that while there is active tribal interaction, there is not an express invitation to, for instance, the Klamath Tribe to engage in joint monitoring of special significance in order to more effectively assess the adequacy of the management prescriptions applied to those areas.

One subject listed in this Criterion that is commonly an issue (gap) for forest operations seeking certification is monitoring of social impacts. And while there could be more regular and systematic efforts at monitoring social impacts associated with Unit activities, it is our sense that Unit managers can point to more being done in this arena that most forest managers can.

Criterion 8.3 deals with chain-of-custody. Here, we note that the Forest Service sells standing trees and, as such, its CoC obligations are very limited. The main requirement is that the agency must keep accurate

records of all sales—volumes (estimates if that is all that is available), species, date of sale, name of purchaser. This information, as necessary, can play a key role in allowing FSC to reconcile the flow of certified material through the supply chain. Aside from this obligation, managers of FSC certified forests can do a great service to the regional forest products industry, and to the interests of the segment of the forest products industry that trades in certified product, by helping to educate the industry on its CoC obligations. Specifically, all purchasers of timber sales on the Unit will need to hold a CoC certificate or be expressly covered by another party's certificate *if the certified status of federal timber is to be maintained once the timber leaves the Unit*. Given that the only remaining sawmill in Lake County is already a holder of a FSC Chain of Custody certificate, the Lakeview Unit's managers educational tasks are quite limited and will largely pertain to outside buyers from northern California or other counties in Oregon. Award of certification requires that a "documented control system" be developed and submitted to SCS. This DCS would be, in this case, a relatively brief document in which the Forest Service's limited CoC obligations are described, including specification of individuals/staff positions responsible for key tasks.

Criterion 8.4 requires that the results of monitoring be incorporated into management planning. Given the state of the management planning process, as discussed above, it stands to reason that the manner by which monitoring results are incorporated into management planning is likewise in a present state of inadequate conformance to this Criterion. Hopefully, the Forest Plan revision process that will be ramping up in early 2006 will be able to better demonstrate that results and findings of monitoring undertaken on the Unit over the past number of years are being incorporated into/informing the new plan.

Criterion 8.5 requires a public summary of the results of monitoring activities. Here, we see a mixed current situation. The general level and breadth of monitoring appears to be pretty solid relative to the certification standard, but it is not apparent that Unit managers can point to a public document that would meet the requirement for a summary of monitoring results, particularly focusing on the Unit itself, and that this summary is periodically updated.

Overall, it is our sense that without additional prior work on the part of Unit managers a full evaluation may reveal inadequate conformance to one or more Criteria comprising this Principle such that any observed gaps could possibly constitute a barrier to award of certification

### **FSC Principle 9: Maintenance of High Conservation Value Forests**

This FSC Principle is elaborated upon through 4 Criteria that collectively focus on the identification and appropriate management of areas within the defined forest area(s) that possess notable attributes meriting conservation. Such attributes may be ecological or social, in nature. Areas of high conservation value are to be managed so that the defining attributes are maintained or enhanced; focused monitoring must be undertaken with respect to efficacy of HCVF management strategies.

#### **Comments and Observations:**

More so than perhaps any other Principle, P.9 requires the certified landowner to engage in some explicit analyses that are not commonly undertaken without a solid knowledge of and commitment to the P&C. That is, P9 requires actions that are unlikely to have been undertaken by an operation not already certified. The reason for this is that the entire concept of *high conservation value forests* is somewhat of an odd fit to North American forest managers, at least in the terms used by the FSC and in the manner in which there is a need to

engage in stakeholder consultation. Although we do not believe that Forest Service's management of the Lakeview Unit is resulting in the loss or degradation of areas meeting the FSC's definition of "high conservation value forests," the fact remains that P.9 places some affirmative procedural obligations on forest managers to expressly address, obligations that the Lakeview Unit managers cannot adequately demonstrate it is meeting at this point in time without some sort of summary document. To be found in adequate conformance to P9, Unit managers will need to demonstrate in some sort of summary cross-reference presentation that it collectively addresses, in a reasonable and functionally equivalent form, the following activities:

- defining those attributes that merit designation as high conservation value
- determining the presence of HCVPs on the Lakeview Unit, including some focused consultation with outside stakeholders,
- developing appropriate guidelines for the management of identified areas of HCVP
- developing monitoring protocols designed to assess the effectiveness of the HCVP management guidelines

It is our sense that the Forest Service is already covering these basis, but in a format and employing terms that do not provide for a concise and comprehensive verification that P.9 is being adequately addressed. But, when all is said and done, the Lakeview Unit managers must nevertheless provide a reasonable demonstration that they understand their obligations regarding Principle 9 and that they are taking appropriate actions to meet those obligations. This Principle is an area of deficiency for most FSC certified operations, at this point in time, and we do not expect that, at the time of award of certification, that a complete treatment of HCVP has been completed. But it will be necessary, for award of certification, that the Forest Service demonstrate that it understands the expectations, has initiated a strategy, and is committed to completing the tasks in a reasonable time frame.

But again, it is our sense that the Forest Service is already covering the necessary HCVP bases to a pretty decent extent but that it is just not covered under a single comprehensive process nor described in a single comprehensive document. To that extent, the agency's task is more one of compilation and exposition rather than additional substantive analytical work.

### **FSC Principle 10: Plantations**

This FSC principle, elaborated through 9 Criteria, provides additional certification requirements specific to those operations where the nature and intensity of management practices and regimes is such that most, if not all, of the characteristics of a natural forest are absent. That is, plantations under the FSC use of the term are defined by the totality of the management regime, not on the means of stand establishment (e.g., clearcut and plant). The 9 Criteria address issues such as: plantation management objectives, diversity in the composition of plantations, plantation design and layout, natural areas within the plantation operation, control of pests and pathogens, periodic monitoring and conversion of natural forest to plantations. In brief, areas supporting natural forest cannot be converted to plantations through the use of plantation forest management regimes.

### **Comments and Observations:**

At issue is whether or not the type of forest management practiced on the Lakeview Unit constitutes "natural forest management" or "plantation forest management." As the Forest Service has not practiced even-

aged management on any national forest units in Region 6 for over a decade, it is a simple matter to determine that the forest management being practiced on the Lakeview Unit unambiguously falls under the category of “natural forest management.” Accordingly, Principle 10 would not be applicable if a full evaluation were to be conducted.

**Summary Table of Potential Non-Conformances Relative to the Regional Indicators**

**Note: The following table identifies those FSC Criteria and Indicators for which, based upon the scoping visit, there is a higher likelihood that management of the Lakeview Unit is presently in non-conformance. Due to the nature of scoping visits (gap analyses), both false positive and false negative conclusions can arise; only a full certification evaluation can definitively ascertain conformance and non-conformance to the certification standard. Corrective actions undertaken by the Forest Service prior to a full certification evaluation (simulated) could eliminate numerous of the presently identified potential gaps.**

**Note, also, that while there are numerous potential non-conformances identified and briefly discussed below, it is our sense that, overall, the Lakeview Stewardship Unit is in a relative strong position to undergo a successful certification evaluation, where (simulated) award of certification with Minor Corrective Action Requests is a probable outcome.**

<b>C1.1 Forest management shall respect all national and local laws and administrative requirements.</b>	
1.1.a. The applicant’s forest management plans and operations in the region demonstrate compliance with federal, state, county, municipal, and tribal laws, as well as case law and regulations.	Pending and recently resolved lawsuits against the Forest Service in which the courts have sided with plaintiffs serve to detract from a demonstration of conformance with this indicator.
<b>C1.3. In signatory countries, the provisions of all binding international agreements such as CITES, ILO Conventions, ITTA, and Convention on Biological Diversity, shall be respected.</b>	
1.3.a. Forest owners or managers comply with treaties, including those with American Indian tribes, and other international agreements that have been signed by the President of the United States, ratified by the Senate and have entered into force. (Note: see Analysis of US Government Procedures for Abiding with Treaties, FSC-US, 3/10/03).	It is not apparent that there has been a comprehensive inventorying and assessment (by the Forest Service, either at the Unit level or at the national level) of compliance with applicable international agreements and conventions. A register of applicable international agreements and the obligations these agreements create for the management of the Lakeview Unit would provide clear demonstration of conformance with this Indicator
<b>C1.4. 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 by the involved or affected parties.</b>	
1.4.a. Any perceived, possible conflict between US law and FSC P&C shall be referred to FSC ABU.	Conformance would be clearly demonstrated if there was a written policy stating that the Unit managers will bring any such conflicts to the attention of the certification body.
<b>C1.6. Forest managers shall demonstrate a long-term commitment to adhere to the FSC Principles and Criteria.</b>	
1.6.a Forest owners or managers provide written statements of commitment to the FSC Principles and Criteria. The commitment is stated in the management plan [see 7.1], a document prepared for the certification process, or another official document.	Commitment to FSC P&C is the litmus test, not just a generic commitment to sustainable forest management. A written statement of commitment posted on the Unit’s web site would constitute an adequate demonstration of conformance.  Aside from a written commitment to the P&C, the FSC is now emphasizing the requirement that managers of FSC-certified

	forests must have a demonstrable working knowledge of the applicable certification standard, which in this case is the Pacific Coast Regional Standard. At this juncture, the level of working knowledge of the standard amongst the F.S. staff charged with managing the Unit is not adequate.
1.6.b Forest owners or managers document the reasons for seeking partial certification.	Were this a real certification project, the Forest Service would need to submit a written justification as to why only the Lakeview Unit and the Allegheny National Forest and not the rest of the national forest system is being put forward in the FSC certification process.
<b>C3.2. Forest management shall not threaten or diminish, either directly or indirectly, the resources or tenure rights of indigenous peoples.</b>	
3.2.b. Forest owners or managers invite the participation of tribal representatives in jointly planning forestry operations that affect tribal and other American Indian resources.	During the full certification evaluation, it will be helpful if evidence is provided as to <i>affirmative</i> efforts undertaken by F.S. personnel to invite active participation of tribal representatives in joint planning activities, where appropriate, within the Unit.
3.3.b. Forest owners or managers and tribal representatives jointly develop measures to protect or enhance areas of special significance.	Likewise for this Indicator, but with the focus on efforts to jointly develop protection measures, where appropriate, within the Unit.
<b>C4.1. The communities within, or adjacent to, the forest management area should be given opportunities for employment, training, and other services.</b>	
4.1.b. The conditions of employment are as good for non-local workers as they are for local workers doing the same job (e.g., remuneration, benefits, safety equipment, training, and workman’s compensation).	The recent investigative news stories published in the Sacramento Bee highlight an issue that perhaps is most publicized on the national forests but that applies throughout North America: are migrant workers doing forestry work such as vegetation management and planting being exploited? This question will need to be explored during a full evaluation.
<b>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 Labour Organization (ILO).</b>	
4.3.a. Forest owners or managers and their contractors develop effective mechanisms to resolve disputes between workers and management.	Does the F.S. mandate and monitor that contractors have “effective mechanisms to resolve disputes between workers and management?”
<b>C5.6. The rate of harvest of forest products shall not exceed levels that can be permanently sustained.</b>	
5.6.a. The level of sustainable harvest is based on clearly documented projections that use growth and regeneration data, site index models, and the classification of soils. The level of documentation is determined by the scale and intensity of the operation. ( <i>see also 7.1.d</i> )	Is the Lakeview Unit still a separate “sustained yield unit” with a separately calculated allowable harvest? If the scope of a certificate is to be limited to just the Unit, then conformance to this Indicator will need to be demonstrated at that spatial scale rather than at the scale of the entire Fremont-Winema National Forest.
5.6.c. The rate and methods of harvest lead to well-stocked stands across the forest management unit (FMU). Under-stocked and over-stocked stands are returned to fully stocked levels at the earliest practicable time.	The limited amount of timber harvesting on the Unit is contributing to a situation of generally overstocked stands, adversely impacting stand health and vigor.
<b>6.3. Ecological functions and values shall be maintained intact, enhanced, or restored, including:</b> a) Forest regeneration and succession. b) Genetic, species, and ecosystem diversity. c) Natural cycles that affect the productivity of the forest ecosystem. d) Old-growth stands and forests e) Retention f) Even-aged silvicultural systems	
6.3.c.4. Prescriptions for salvage harvests balance ecological and economic considerations.	The fact that salvage sales on the Unit have been appealed by ENGOs raises questions as to conformance with this Indicator;

	Unit managers should be prepared to provide evidence that ecological considerations are being appropriately addressed in the design and execution of fire salvage timber sales.
<b>C6.3.d. Old-growth stands and forests<sup>10</sup></b>	It is our understanding that essentially the entire forested portion of the Unit qualifies as at least Type 3 old-growth except for those areas that were clearcut and planted during the 1970's to 1990's.
<p><i>This section uses the following definitions:</i></p> <p><i>Type 1 stands are those stands of at least 20 contiguous acres that have never been logged and that display late successional/old-growth characteristics. Stands that have never been logged, but which are smaller than 20 acres, are assessed for their ecological significance, and may also be classified as Type 1 stands. Areas containing a low density of existing roads may still be considered Type 1 stands, provided the roads have not caused significant, negative ecological impacts.</i></p> <p><i>Type 2 stands are old unlogged stands smaller than 20 acres that are not classified as Type 1, and other stands of at least 3 contiguous acres that have been logged, but which retain significant late-successional/old-growth structure and functions.</i></p> <p><i>Type 3 stands are those that have residual old-growth trees and/or other late-successional/old-growth characteristics, but do not meet the definition of a Type 2 stand.</i></p>	
6.3.d.1. Non-tribal Type 1 stands are not harvested	Strict adherence to this requirement is crucial
6.3.d.2. Management activities adjacent to Type 1 stands are conducted to minimize abrupt forest/opening edge effects and other negative impacts on the ecological integrity of these areas.	Have buffers been established around all type I stands or are there other mechanisms in place for assuring that abrupt forest/opening edge effects are avoided?
6.3.d.3. Timber harvests in Type 2 and Type 3 stands maintain late-successional/old-growth structures, functions, and components, including individual trees that function as refugia. There is no net decline in the area or the old-growth characteristics of Type 2 or Type 3 stands due to forest management, with the exception of Type 3 stands that are elevated to Type 2 stands.	It is our sense, from the very limited field reconnaissance undertaken as part of the scoping visit, that harvesting prescriptions on the Unit are not resulting in "type conversion" from Type 2 to Type 3 old-growth or from Type 2/Type 3 to non-old-growth. However, a clear demonstration of conformance with this Indicator requires the establishment of written guidelines that assure "no net loss."
<b>C6.4. 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.</b>	
6.4.c. The size and extent of representative samples on public lands being considered for certification is determined through a science-based (e.g., gap analysis, regional reserve design principals and methodologies), transparent planning process that is accessible and responsive to the public.	At the time of or prior to the full certification evaluation, it would be helpful if a summary was prepared that describes the "science-based transparent planning process that is accessible and responsive to the public" that was used in support of the establishment of representative sample/natural areas on the Unit.
<b>C6.5. 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.</b>	
6.5.g. The transportation system is pre-planned, designed, located, constructed, maintained, and/or reconstructed to minimize the extent and impact of the system and its potential cumulative adverse effects.	Budgets and staff allocated to road system maintenance may not be at levels associated with exemplary performance relative to this Indicator
6.5.i. Access to temporary and permanent roads is controlled to minimize impacts to soil and biota while simultaneously allowing legitimate access as addressed by Principles 3 & 4 and identified in the management plan. Access is restricted to roads that are not immediately needed for purposes of management.	The limited field reconnaissance undertaken as part of the scoping visit did not generate an impression that the level of road access control (gates, berms, etc.) is fully consistent with this Indicator.
6.5.t. Grazing by domestic animals is controlled to protect the species composition and viability of the riparian vegetation and the banks of the stream channel from erosion.	The potential adverse environmental impacts of cattle grazing will be an issue that the full audit team will need to examine closely. Based upon brief interviews with pertinent F.S. staff and consideration of the active lawsuit, it is possible that a non-conformance finding could result from the full evaluation.

<sup>10</sup> Sub-criterion 6.3.d is designated as a "fatal flaw" requirement in the Pacific Coast Standard. As such, non-conformance with this sub-criterion precludes award of certification (i.e., a Major CAR must be specified in the event of a finding of non-conformance).

<p>6.5.u. Stream crossings are located and constructed to minimize fragmentation of aquatic habitat (<i>see Glossary</i>), maintain water quality, and either to accommodate a 100-year peak flood event or to limit the consequences of an unavoidable failure. Road crossings, dams, and other human-made structures that impede fish passage are removed or modified to enable passage, taking legal or environmental constraints into account.</p>	<p>There is an active program to eliminate fish impediments but, based upon interviews, 90% of approximately 400 culverts carrying fish-bearing waters are presently barriers to passage. The current estimate is that, at the current pace, it will take 30 years to eliminate these barriers. If correct, this would not constitute adequate conformance with this Indicator.</p>
<p><b>C6.6. Management systems shall promote the development and adoption of environmentally friendly non-chemical methods of pest management and strive to avoid the use of chemical pesticides. World Health Organization Type 1A and 1B and chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides; pesticides that are persistent, toxic or whose derivatives remain biologically active and accumulate in the food chain beyond their intended use; as well as any pesticides banned by international agreement, shall be prohibited. If chemicals are used, proper equipment and training shall be provided to minimize health and environmental risks.</b></p>	
<p>6.6.a. Forest owners and managers demonstrate compliance with FSC Policy paper: “Chemical Pesticides in Certified Forests, Interpretation of the FSC Principles and Criteria, July 2002” and comply with prohibitions and/or restrictions on World Health Organization Type 1A and 1B and chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides; pesticides that are persistent, toxic or whose derivatives remain biologically active and accumulate in the food chain beyond their intended use; as well as any pesticides banned by international agreement.</p>	<p>The F.S. will need to provide SCS with a comprehensive list, by trade name and constituent content, all chemical herbicides and pesticides used on the Unit.</p>
<p><b>C6.9. The use of exotic species shall be carefully controlled and actively monitored to avoid adverse ecological impacts.</b></p>	
<p>6.9.b. Forest owners or managers develop and implement control measures for invasive exotic plants.</p>	<p>At the time of the full certification evaluation, Unit managers should be prepared to demonstrate that there is, in fact, an active program in place for controlling the spread of exotics in the Unit.</p>
<p><b>7.1. The management plan and supporting documents shall provide:</b>  <b>a) Management objectives.</b>  <b>b) Description of the forest resources to be managed, environmental limitations, land use and ownership status, socio-economic conditions, and a profile of adjacent lands.</b>  <b>c) Description of silvicultural and/or other management system, based on the ecology of the forest in question and information gathered through resource inventories.</b>  <b>d) Rationale for rate of annual harvest and species selection.</b></p>	
<p>7.1.a.1. A written management plan is prepared that:  (1) includes the landowner's vision (ecological, silvicultural, social, and economic), desired future conditions, potential future outcomes, goals, and objectives, as well as short-term and long-term actions and  (2) incorporates strategies for the maintenance, enhancement, and/or restoration of forest resource. The actions and objectives are specific, achievable, measurable, and adaptive. (The elements of a comprehensive forest management plan are found in Appendix H.)</p>	<p>Of note, there is not a management plan that is specific to the Stewardship Unit, as a distinct unit with the Fremont/Winema National Forest. Some type of Unit-specific management plan, even if it relies heavily by reference on the Fremont-Winema forest plan, would likely be needed were the F.S. to seek certification just for the Stewardship Unit.</p>
<p><b>7.1.d. Rationale for the rate of annual harvest and species selection</b></p>	<p>See comment under 5.6.a.</p>

<p><b>C7.2. 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.</b></p>	
<p>7.2.a. Relevant provisions of the management plan modified: (1) every 10 years or in accordance with the frequency of harvest for the stand or forest, whichever is longer; (2) in response to effects from illegal and/or unauthorized activities (e.g., damage to roads, depletion of timber and non-timber resources); (3) in response to changes caused by natural disturbances.</p>	<p>On the positive side, the Forest Service has actively sought to develop plan updates and amendments in order to maintain the currency of guidance for field activities. On the negative side, the Forest Plan is presently several years past due for a major revision. The Fremont-Winema is in the early stages of completing this major plan revision, but budget limits as well as uncertainty surrounding the new planning regs raise questions as to how expeditiously this revision process will unfold</p>
<p><b>C7.3. Forest workers shall receive adequate training and supervision to ensure proper implementation of the management plans.</b></p>	<p>There appears to be a strong emphasis on workforce training but record keeping and consistent administration of the training activities is deficient.</p>
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>An up-to-date summary focusing on the Unit would be helpful, particularly in the absence of a management plan that is specific to the Unit.</p>
<p><b>C8.1. The frequency and intensity of monitoring should be determined by the scale and intensity of forest management operations, as well as, the relative complexity and fragility of the affected environment. Monitoring procedures should be consistent and replicable over time to allow comparison of results and assessment of change.</b></p>	
<p>8.1.a. Implementation of the management plan is periodically monitored to assess:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ the degree to which management vision, goals, and objectives have been achieved</li> <li>▪ deviations from the management plan</li> <li>▪ unexpected effects of management activities</li> <li>▪ social and environmental effects of management activities</li> </ul>	<p>While there are an array of activities that credibly fall under the rubric of “monitoring” on the Unit, a compilation or umbrella monitoring plan is presently lacking.</p>
<p><b>8.2. Forest management should include the research and data collection needed to monitor, at a minimum, the following indicators:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Yield of all forest products harvested.</li> <li>b) Growth rates, regeneration and condition of the forest.</li> <li>c) Composition and observed changes in the flora and fauna.</li> <li>d) Environmental and social impacts of harvesting and other operations</li> <li>e) Cost, productivity, and efficiency of forest management</li> </ol>	
<p>8.2.a.2. The forest owner or manager maintains records of the yield of harvested non-timber forest products.</p>	<p>While permits for the removal of non-timber forest products are required, yields may not be recorded.</p>
<p>8.2.d.3. Generation or maintenance of local jobs and public responses to management activities are monitored.</p>	<p>We are not aware of current activities that would demonstrate adequate conformance with this Indicator.</p>
<p>8.2.d.4. The influence of forest management on the viability of forest-based livelihoods is monitored, especially in the case of large forest holdings.</p>	<p>Likewise for this Indicator.</p>
<p>8.2.d.5. The opportunity to jointly monitor sites of special significance (see also criteria 3.2 and 3.3) is offered to tribal representatives in order to determine adequacy of the management prescriptions.</p>	<p>If such an offer to the Klamath and/or Fort Bidwell tribes to jointly monitor sites of tribal significance has been extended, evidence should be presented during the full evaluation.</p>
<p><b>C8.3. 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."</b></p>	<p>A chain-of-custody “documented control system” must be developed if on-product claims (e.g., sale of FSC certified logs or lumber) are desired to be made and if the timber harvested from the Unit is to enter the supply stream as FSC-certified material.</p>

<b>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.</b>	
8.5.a. A summary of monitoring results is maintained up-to-date and is made available to the public on request, either at no cost or at a nominal price.	Inadequate conformance to this requirement at present, with respect to preparing a periodic up-to-date summary and with respect to covering the full array of subjects listed in Criterion 8.2
<b>P9 Management activities in high conservation value forests shall maintain or enhance the attributes which define such forests. Decisions regarding high conservation value forests shall always be considered in the context of a precautionary approach.</b>	It is our sense that areas within the Unit meeting the FSC definition of “high conservation value forest areas” are, in fact, being adequately identified and appropriately managed, even though there has not been an explicit effort by F.S. personnel to manage in conformance with this Principle. To demonstrate adequate conformance, during a full evaluation, Unit managers should develop a written “cross walk” that demonstrates how the extant planning procedures and any other similar initiatives cover the HCVF analysis obligations contained in this Principle. Particular attention should be paid to the requirements for stakeholder consultation in the process of defining, identifying and developing prescriptions for the management of HCVF areas.

## FINAL COMMENTS

We would like to express our appreciation to the numerous Forest Service employees that interacted with the audit team over the 3+ day audit, but particularly to Jerry Haugen for his central role in planning for and helping to manage the audit process, as well as his work in designing and populating the web site that now contains a wealth of pertinent information about the Fremont-Winema National Forest and the Lakeview Unit. The auditors found the interactions with all staff to be highly professional and effective in acquiring a good understanding of the breadth and complexity of management programs and activities on the Lakeview Unit. We are very impressed with the positive attitudes and stewardship ethic displayed by all employees with whom we interacted. The “negative” comments contained in this report should by no means be construed as an indictment of the Forest Service’s management of the Lakeview Unit and the sometimes daunting job it is doing of managing a national forest unit that is subject to growing and oftentimes conflicting demands from the “public,” broadly defined. Our responsibility is to identify and discuss those aspects of a forest management operation that may not presently dove-tail well with requirements for certification under the Forest Stewardship Council. We believe that FSC-endorsed certification, were the Forest Service to pursue it on the Lakeview Unit and were the FSC to allow national forest units to engage in a bona fide certification project, is well within the realm of attainability. Of course, the simulated full evaluation, scheduled to take place in early June, 2006, will provide a much more definitive set of assessments as to just how well-positioned the Lakeview Unit is to achieve FSC certification. Given our experiences during this scoping visit, we look forward to the next stages of this pilot project.