



NSF International Strategic Registrations, Ltd.

August 7, 2006

Karen Shimamoto, Forest Supervisor
1301 South G Street
Lakeview, OR 97630
(541)947-2151

Re: SFI Assessment Report for the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

Dear Ms. Ishimamoto:

NSF-ISR has completed the field phase of the certification pilot study of Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit's SFI program. As you know, a team of foresters and biologists visited the unit Tuesday June 6 through Friday June 9, 2006. The team assessed conformance of the unit against both FSC and SFI requirements for forest certification. I report now on the SFI portion of the Pilot Joint SFIS Certification Audit / FSC Assessment.

Our audit team found that the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit meets most of the 2005-2009 Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard® (SFI) requirements, but still has several gaps in its program relative to the standard. We also found many requirements that the unit clearly exceeds, and several areas where the team identified opportunities for improvement. The detailed findings are presented in the attached draft report.

Because the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit has not formally applied for "SFI Program Participant" status most of the gaps or non-conformances involve SFI-specific items. These can not be resolved without a formal commitment to the SFI standard. Two gaps involved forest management practices beyond SFI-oriented approaches, one relating to forest health and the other relating to road maintenance best-management practices.

The detailed findings can be viewed in the "Audit Matrix" starting on page 62 (requirements and category of finding) and on page 75 (description of evidence and rationale for finding). In this table the term gap should be considered to be equivalent to a finding of non-conformance in an official certification audit.

If this were a formal certification NSF would have issued Corrective Action Requests (CARs) and your team would have been granted time to determine the causes of the "gaps" and devise plans to address them. However our proposal for this pilot project specified that we would not issue formal CARs.

Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

This report has changed slightly following peer review and with the incorporation of input from your staff. The most significant change with the consistent use of the term “Gap” to replace “Non-conformance” as was outlined in the project proposal. The use of this term will further emphasize that this was a study or evaluation of certification and not a formal, official certification review.

As we are considerably ahead of schedule I stand ready to make any other minor edits you or your staff might suggest. Otherwise we can consider this to be the final version of the report.

It has been a great pleasure to work with you and with your fine staff on this innovative project.

Sincerely yours,



Mike Ferrucci, Lead Auditor
SFI Program Manager, NSF-ISR
26 Commerce Drive, North Branford, CT 06471
Office and Mobile: 203-887-9248 mferrucci@iforest.com

cc: Petie Davis, NSF-ISR Audit Program Manager

Enclosure: SFIS Certification Pilot Audit Report

CERTIFICATION PILOT AUDIT REPORT
SUSTAINABLE FORESTRY INITIATIVE® STANDARD



Lakeview Sustained Yield Unit
of the
Freemont-Winema National Forest
FRS: 8Y581

Audit Dates: July 6-9, 2006
Report Date: August 7, 2006

NSF International Strategic Registrations, Ltd.

789 North Dixboro Road

Ann Arbor, MI 48105

888-NSF-9000

www.nsf-isr.org

Project Background

The SFI assessment of the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit of the Fremont-Winema National Forest was conducted as part of a pilot test of forest certification being conducted by the USDA Forest Service and the Pinchot Institute. The goal of the study is to *“explore what could be learned from testing third party auditing to both SFI and FSC standards and help the agency determine what policy and management changes might be needed if the Forest Service elects to pursue third party certification to externally developed standards of its national forests and grasslands.”*¹

Actual certification of national forests is not part of the project, and is not an expected outcome. Current Forest Service policy is to not seek certification for Forest Service lands. Since 2000 the Forest Service has been interested in exploring the value of independent, third party environmental audits. Subsequently, the use of EMS approaches became an official policy of the Forest Service, and an environmental management system is now required as part of the new planning rule².

The 2005-2009 Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard® is one of two certification standards being tested in the project. The Forest Stewardship Council Pacific Regional Standard is the other. For both standards the assessment is being conducted using regular methods, replicating an actual assessment as closely as possible. This document reports on the findings of the SFI portion of the project.

Lakeview Sustained Yield Unit

Considerable information regarding the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit is available on various web sites, including the following:
<http://www.fs.fed.us/r6/frewin/projects/> focus on particular projects

FOREST CERTIFICATION: Background on the National Forest Certification Case Studies

(source: Pinchot Institute web site 11.05.05, http://www.pinchot.org/certification/national_forest.htm#what)

The National Forest Certification Case Studies will compare current land and resource management activities on national forests with the requirements of the two major forest certification programs now operating in the U.S. While the overall effort will be coordinated by the Pinchot Institute, the comparison will involve independent auditing firms. These firms will be contracted to carry out actual certification assessments, emulating a process that would be used for landowners actually seeking certification.

Seven case study areas in the National Forest System have been chosen. In total, the seven case study areas include portions of ten national forests: the entirety of five forests, three forests managed under one plan as the Florida National Forests, and a special unit that includes portions of the Winema and Fremont National Forests. The case study areas are the:

- [Allegheny National Forest](#) (PA)
- [Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest](#) (WI)
- [Medicine Bow National Forest](#) (WY)
- [Mt. Hood National Forest](#) (OR)
- [Siuslaw National Forest](#) (OR)
- National Forests in Florida (FL)
- [Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit on the Fremont-Winema National Forest](#) (OR)

The Forest Service selected these study areas based on several criteria, including stakeholder inquiries about certification and the readiness and interest of forest management staff. Also, it is important that the study areas represent diverse geographical, socio-political, economic and ecological settings.

¹ Forest Certification Fact Sheets, USDA Forest Service Forest Certification Test Project, <http://www.fs.fed.us/news/2005/releases/08/factsheets.pdf> 11.05.05

² “Forest Service ISO ... will require independent third party certification to standards developed through the forest planning process with public involvement. The key difference is the source of the standards.”

<http://www.fs.fed.us/r6/frewin/index.shtml> Fremont-Winema National Forests home page

<http://www.fs.fed.us/r6/frewin/projects/cert/> Certification Project Web Site

The latter of these sites contains information describing the Lakeview Unit and was used throughout the project to provide evidence of conformance in a format easily accessible to the audit team and available to any interested party. One section of the web site provides a good description of the unit as provided below.

“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 ...”

(source: US Forest Service Certification Project Web Site

<http://www.fs.fed.us/r6/frewin/projects/cert/>)

SFI Standard

The 2005-2009 Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard®³ consists of a tiered array of Principles, Objectives, Performance Measures, and Indicators that collectively comprise an approach to forestry that is sustainable. Organizations or individuals that manage forestland or procure wood for use in the manufacture of forest products can subscribe to this voluntary standard in order to demonstrate a commitment to forestry programs that are economically viable, environmentally appropriate, and socially acceptable. Program Participants must follow these standards, and can choose to undergo a third-party certification against the standards to further demonstrate their commitment to following good practices.

The SFI Principles (listed on the following page) describe the overall approach to sustainable forestry that is embedded in all SFI requirements. Certification audits focus on the applicable Objectives, Performance Measures, and Indicators. Objectives are the broad categories of issues considered in SFI certification. In cases such as the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit where only land management is involved (the privately-owned sawmill was not included in the scope of the project) Objectives 1-7 and 8 -13 apply. The actual metrics are found in the indicators. For

³ For a complete copy of the SFI Standard go to <http://www.aboutsfb.org/sfiprogram.cfm> and download the PDF document at <http://www.aboutsfb.org/generalPDFs/SFBStandard2005-2009.pdf> .

this project 79 SFI Indicators organized under 26 SFI Performance Measures were deemed relevant.

SFI Principles

1. Sustainable Forestry

To practice sustainable forestry to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs by practicing a land stewardship ethic that integrates reforestation and the managing, growing, nurturing, and harvesting of trees for useful products with the conservation of soil, air and water quality, biological diversity, wildlife and aquatic habitat, recreation, and aesthetics.

2. Responsible Practices

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

3. Reforestation and Productive Capacity

To provide for regeneration after harvest and maintain the productive capacity of the forestland base.

4. Forest Health and Productivity

To protect forests from uncharacteristic and economically or environmentally undesirable wildfire, pests, diseases, and other damaging agents and thus maintain and improve long-term forest health and productivity.

5. Long-Term Forest and Soil Productivity

To protect and maintain long-term forest and soil productivity.

6. Protection of Water Resources

To protect water bodies and riparian zones.

7. Protection of Special Sites and Biological Diversity

To manage forests and lands of special significance (biologically, geologically, historically or culturally important) in a manner that takes into account their unique qualities and to promote a diversity of wildlife habitats, forest types, & ecological or natural community types.

8. Legal Compliance

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

9. Continual Improvement

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

Source: Sustainable Forestry Initiative® (SFI) Standard, 2005–2009 Edition

Methods Used for Pilot Study

The goal of the pilot study, to “*explore what could be learned from testing third party auditing to both SFI and FSC standards and help the agency determine what policy and management changes might be needed if the Forest Service elects to pursue third party certification to externally developed standards of its national forests and grasslands.*”⁴, was best achieved by conducting the study as similarly as possible as an official SFI certification. Thus NSF employed its SFI Standard Operating Procedures and utilized an approved lead auditor and audit team members who meet the SFI requirements. Brief bios for the audit team members are found in the audit plan, which is Attachment 2 of this report.

Throughout the project all certification activities were conducted as closely as possible to an actual certification project. However, some normal SFI certification processes could not be followed. Because the Forest Service has not made a decision to become SFI certified and has not become an SFI Program Participant there are some requirements that could not be met, including responding to annual surveys from the Sustainable Forestry Board on forestry practices. Further, the Forest Service has not become involved with the Oregon SFI Implementation Committee, which is associated with several SFI requirements. Thus there were numerous SFI requirements that could not have been met by the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit by for structural reasons.

Perhaps most significantly, the Corrective Action Request process was not utilized completely. Formal SFI certification includes an iterative series of visits by auditors to determine conformance with all of the requirements. The first visit is called a “readiness review” and the next visit is the certification audit. If certification is granted then follow-up visits called surveillance audits would occur, normally at least annually. Significant gaps discovered during the readiness review would normally be addressed before the certification audit was conducted. In this pilot study the SFI gaps found in the readiness phase were not addressed. The certification audit phase was conducted despite this, in accordance with the pilot study methodology.

As part of a standard SFI audit when gaps (termed non-conformances in an official audit) are found the Lead Auditor issues a Corrective Action Request describing the gap and providing a template for response. The response from the Program Participant would then include an explanation of the reason for the non-conformance, a plan to correct it, and a plan to prevent it from reoccurring. This three-part response is termed a “Corrective Action Plan”. For the pilot study there was no expectation that non-conformances discovered during the readiness review or during the certification audit would be addressed by the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit. Thus there were no formal corrective action plans developed or reviewed.

SFI Certification is awarded after all Major Non-conformances are corrected (plans are implemented) and approved by the Lead Auditor, and after plans for all Minor Non-conformances are approved by the Lead Auditor. As noted above, during this pilot study non-conformances were identified by the audit team but no effort was made by the Forest Service to remedy the gaps. Thus even if certification was sought (it was not) it could not be awarded.

⁴ Forest Certification Fact Sheets, USDA Forest Service Forest Certification Test Project, <http://www.fs.fed.us/news/2005/releases/08/factsheets.pdf> 11.05.05

Assessment Process, Itinerary, and Participants

The project began with a Readiness Review conducted within the unit on November 8-10, 2005. Readiness Review findings are generally focused on the adequacy of documentation and existence of programs for each relevant Performance Measure. The goal of an SFI readiness review is to ensure that the organization seeking certification understands the standard and has adequate program substance to justify the cost and expense of a full SFI Certification Audit. The review process is designed to identify gaps in programs or documentation rather than determining actual conformance with the requirements. The results of this initial phase were provided in a report to the Forest Service which is provided as Attachment 1.

In conjunction with the readiness review phase a formal Certification Audit Plan was developed to guide the implementation of the June 6-9, 2006 pilot certification audit. This plan was modified during the audit to respond to opportunities and identified needs, as is typical of all audits. The actual audit activities are summarized in a description of the itinerary which follows below⁵. The participating personnel are listed following the description of each day's activities.

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, 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

⁵ This itinerary section was prepared by Brendan Grady of Scientific Certification Services, which support on this and other audit tasks was greatly appreciated. The same information is provided in the FSC report.

 Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

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

Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

	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 ridge top, 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

 Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

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: 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 under burned
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 under burning 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 under burned. Discussed burning procedures, current fuel loads, and target fuel loads after burning.
3	Wildhorse Allotment – Viewed a stream which had banks shaved and exclosure 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

- Final discussions and review of outstanding issues
- Audit team deliberations
- Exit briefing

Findings of Certification Report

The 2005-2009 Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard® incorporates three tiers of requirements, which are listed in the audit matrix in the appendix. The top tier consists of 13 objectives comprising the fundamental goals of sustainable forest management. Certification is assessed against the middle and lower tier requirements, termed Performance Measures and Indicators. Performance Measure are designed to be means of judging whether the Objectives are fulfilled, and Indicators are specific metrics providing information about an organization's forestry and environmental performance.

The Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard was written to apply to all types of forestry organizations throughout the United States and Canada. As such, not all of the provisions of the standard would be expected to apply to all organizations. Some of the requirements were found to not apply and are so indicated in the audit results matrix found at Attachment 3.

Each applicable SFI requirement was assessed by the audit team, with one or more of the following potential findings:

- Exceeds the Requirements: The requirement is clearly exceeded.
- Full Conformance: The requirement is met.
- Opportunity for Improvement: Although the requirement is met, there are opportunities to improve in this area
- Minor Non-Conformance: An isolated lapse in SFIS program implementation which does not indicate a systematic failure to consistently meet an SFI objective, performance measure or indicator.
- Major Non-Conformance: One or more of the SFIS performance measures or indicators has not been addressed or has not been implemented to the extent that a systematic failure of a Program Participant's SFI system to meet an SFI objective, performance measure or indicator occurs.

The audit matrix provides a description of evidence reviewed and findings for all applicable requirements. The Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit was judged by the audit team to be in full conformance with the majority of applicable requirements. Further, the unit was exceeds the standard in the following areas:

- Indicator 2.2.1 - Minimized chemical use required to achieve management objectives: The Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit makes little use of chemicals, and only for control of invasive exotic species.
- Indicator 4.1.3 - Plans to locate and protect known sites associated with viable occurrences of critically imperiled and imperiled species and communities: The Forest Service goes well beyond protection of know sites to devote considerable resources to expanding information about rare, threatened, and vulnerable species and communities with local or regional importance.
- Objective 6 - Management of lands that are ecologically, geologically, historically, or culturally important in a manner that recognizes their special qualities:

Efforts to manage and protect special sites and lands are exemplary.

- Performance Measure 12.1 - Support of efforts by other landowner organizations or programs to apply principles of sustainable forest management:
The USDA Forest Service, through its State and Private Forestry Program is a leader in these efforts, and Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit personnel contribute to these efforts on the unit and within their communities.
- Indicator 12.2.3 - Recreation opportunities for the public, where consistent with forest management objectives:
Recreation has a high emphasis on the Fremont-Winema National Forests and within the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit, beyond requirements to merely allow recreation if it doesn't interfere with forest management objectives.
- Performance Measure 12.3 - Participation in the development of public land planning and management processes:
The Fremont-Winema National Forests have strong outreach efforts for all land management decisions, including long-term collaboration with the informal Lakeview Stewardship Group, which is an outstanding model for successful public involvement.
- Performance Measure 12.4 - Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall confer with affected indigenous peoples:
Tribal consultation on the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit and beyond is well-practiced and comprehensive.

Several Opportunities for Improvement were noted:

- Indicator 1.1.4: There is an opportunity to improve in the implementation of planned harvest levels.
- Indicator 7.1.1: There is an opportunity for improvement in small log utilization within the unit.
- Indicator 10.1.3: There is an opportunity to improve the awareness of and ability to utilize FIA data on the forest that is collected by and managed by regional Forest Service staff for large-scale planning and analysis.
- Indicator 12.1.2: There is an opportunity to improve in the area of landowner assistance documents for use in SFI information packets.

A Minor Gap was identified regarding the planning documentation required under Indicator 1.1.1. This requirement is generally met, but most documents pertain to either the Fremont National Forest or the Fremont-Winema National Forests rather than to the Lakeview Unit specifically. Clearly connecting the goals and objectives of the Fremont Plan to the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit would be required to maintain certification.

A Minor Gap was identified involving Indicator 3.1.1: A seasonal stream intersection on a passenger-vehicle road (038) does not have a culvert crossing the road at right angles, as per Forest Service road design and maintenance standards. Instead the stream flows in the uphill road ditch to a culvert. This culvert outflows into a drainage that runs into the upper side of a recent major debris slide. It is possible that the stream water contributed to the slide.

Twelve SFI requirements were judged to be not addressed or implemented at the level of a Major Gap. These Major Gaps fell into six broad categories:

1. Forest health
2. Oregon SFI Implementation Committee
3. SFI-specific roles and responsibilities and commitment
4. Contractor qualifications requirements
5. SFI-specific reporting – Performance Measure
6. Management system and management review

Forest health – Performance Measure 2.4, Indicator 2.4.2

72% of the stands in the unit are overstocked, leading to high risk of uncharacteristically severe, stand-replacing wildfire or insect infestation. The audit team was not provided convincing evidence of a plan (including a timeline and resources needed) to address this overstocking and restore forest health. The “National Fire Plan” (see <http://www.fireplan.gov/>) is partially responsive, as is the “Fremont-Winema National Forests Five Year Action Plan for Acceleration of Vegetative Treatments to Improve Condition Class, May 19, 2004”. These plans are not specific to the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit.

Oregon SFI Implementation Committee – Indicators 10.2.1, 12.1.1, 12.2.1, 12.5.1

These indicators involve SFI-specific activities that would be expected to occur in concert with the SFI Implementation Committee. The Lakeview Unit and the Fremont-Winema National Forests have not committed to the SFI Program and their staff are not involved in supporting the efforts of the Oregon SIC at this time.

SFI Commitment and SFI-specific Roles and Responsibilities – Indicators 10.1.1 & 10.1.2

There has been no commitment to the SFI Standard. Other than the forest planner, foresters and specialists have not received specific assignments for implementation of SFI requirements.

Contractor Qualifications – Indicator 10.1.4

There is no skill, training, or experience requirement for timber harvesters.

SFI-specific Reporting – Performance Measure 12.6, 12.6.1

Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit (or the Fremont-Winema National Forests or Forest Service) are not currently SFI Program Participants and thus do not participate in the SFI survey nor report annual to the SFI Program on compliance with the standard.

Management System and Management Review – Performance Measure 13.1

Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit and the Fremont-Winema National Forests are not currently SFI Program Participants, and thus have not developed a system for reviewing SFI-specific requirements, reporting information to management regarding progress in achieving SFI Standard objectives and performance measures, or to assess changes and improvements necessary to continually improve their SFI Program.

Additional details are provided in the audit matrix.

Implications

The majority of the significant gaps (Major Gaps) in conformance with the 2005-2009 Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard® relate to “SFI-specific” requirements. These include, for example, not having a statement of commitment to the SFIS, not having assigned SFI roles and responsibilities, not supporting the efforts of the SFI Implementation Committees, not filling out the SFI Annual Progress Report, and not conducting an annual management review of the effectiveness of the SFI Program. Interested parties within and outside of the Forest Service believe that these gaps could be easily addressed should the Forest Service decide to seek SFI certification, and the Lead Auditor concurs.

The management system requirements (Performance Measure 13.1, all three indicators) focus on SFI-specific aspects of management review. These requirements have a strong relationship to the environmental management systems being developed for all Forest Service units in coordination with all new management plans.

The most significant finding is the Major Gap relating to forest health. The Lead Auditor considered a wide range of evidence and consulted various stakeholders in reaching this conclusion. Two reasons were paramount in classifying this finding. First, the array of documents provided did not include a plan with priorities, timelines, and budgets for addressing overstocking. Second, those documents that address the overstocking and forest health issue were not specific to the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit, but instead covered larger areas, being either forest-wide or relating to all western forests managed by the Forest Service.

The Contractor qualifications requirements (see Indicator 10.1.4) are not met with existing bid specifications. In other public lands certification projects the logging and forestry community was generally quite supportive of skills-training requirements for logging contractors.

The road maintenance Minor Gap is likely to be easily remedied with respect to the isolated road segment identified in the finding. Without the development of a corrective action plan with a determination by the Forest Service of whether this is an isolated or systematic problem the audit team determined that it was isolated rather than systematic. Interviews and a review of budget levels suggest that follow-up annual surveillance audits would likely find additional issues with road-related BMPs.

Attachment 1

READINESS REVIEW REPORT
SUSTAINABLE FORESTRY INITIATIVE® STANDARD



Lakeview Sustained Yield Unit
of the
Freemont-Winema National Forest
FRS: 8Y581

Audit Dates: November 8 – 10, 2005

NSF International Strategic Registrations, Ltd.

789 North Dixboro Road

Ann Arbor, MI 48105

888-NSF-9000

www.nsf-isr.org

Certification Dual Assessment Case Study for the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

Project Background

The assessment of the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit on the Fremont-Winema National Forest was conducted as part of a pilot test of forest certification being conducted by the USDA Forest Service and the Pinchot Institute. The goal of the study is to *“explore what could be learned from testing third party auditing to both SFI and FSC standards and help the agency determine what policy and management changes might be needed if the Forest Service elects to pursue third party certification to externally developed standards of its national forests and grasslands.”*⁶

Actual certification of national forests is not part of the project, and is not an expected outcome. Current Forest Service policy is to not seek certification for Forest Service lands. The Forest Service, since 2000, has been interested in exploring the value of independent, third party environmental audits. Since then, the use of EMS approaches has become an official policy of the Forest Service, and are required as part of the new planning rule.⁷

The 2005-2009 Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard® is one of two certification standards being tested in the project. The Forest Stewardship Council Pacific Regional Standard is the other. For both standards the assessment is being conducted using regular methods, replicating an actual assessment as closely as possible. This document reports on the findings of the first phase of the SFI portion of the project, deemed an SFI Readiness Review.

Lakeview Sustained Yield Unit

Considerable information regarding the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit is available on various web sites, including the following:

FOREST CERTIFICATION: Background on the National Forest Certification Case Studies

(source: Pinchot Institute web site 11.05.05,
http://www.pinchot.org/certification/national_forest.htm#what)

The National Forest Certification Case Studies will compare current land and resource management activities on national forests with the requirements of the two major forest certification programs now operating in the U.S. While the overall effort will be coordinated by the Pinchot Institute, the comparison will involve independent auditing firms. These firms will be contracted to carry out actual certification assessments, emulating a process that would be used for landowners actually seeking certification.

Seven case study areas in the National Forest System have been chosen. In total, the seven case study areas include portions of ten national forests: the entirety of five forests, three forests managed under one plan as the Florida National Forests, and a special unit that includes portions of the Winema and Fremont National Forests. The case study areas are the:

- [Allegheny National Forest](#) (PA)
- [Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest](#) (WI)
- [Medicine Bow National Forest](#) (WY)
- [Mt. Hood National Forest](#) (OR)
- [Siuslaw National Forest](#) (OR)
- National Forests in Florida (FL)
- [Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit on the Fremont-Winema National Forest](#) (OR)

The Forest Service selected these study areas based on several criteria, including stakeholder inquiries about certification and the readiness and interest of forest management staff. Also, it is important that the study areas represent diverse geographical, socio-political, economic and ecological settings.

⁶ Forest Certification Fact Sheets, USDA Forest Service Forest Certification Test Project, <http://www.fs.fed.us/news/2005/releases/08/factsheets.pdf> 11.05.05

⁷ “Forest Service ISO ... will require independent third party certification to standards developed through the forest planning process with public involvement. The key difference is the source of the standards.”

<http://www.fs.fed.us/r6/frewin/projects/> focus on particular projects

<http://www.fs.fed.us/r6/frewin/index.shtml> Fremont-Winema National Forests home page

<http://www.fs.fed.us/r6/frewin/projects/cert/> Certification Project Web Site

The latter of these sites contains information describing the Lakeview Unit and will be used throughout the project to provide evidence of conformance in a format easily accessible to the audit team and available to any interested party. One section of the web site provides a good description of the unit as provided below.

“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 ...”

(source: US Forest Service Certification Project Web Site
<http://www.fs.fed.us/r6/frewin/projects/cert/>)

SFI Standard

The 2005-2009 Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard®⁸ consists of a tiered array of Principles, Objectives, Performance Measures, and Indicators that collectively comprise an approach to forestry that is sustainable. Organizations or individuals that manage forestland or procure wood for use in the manufacture of forest products can subscribe to this voluntary standard in order to demonstrate a commitment to forestry programs that are economically viable, environmentally appropriate, and socially acceptable. Program Participants must follow these standards, and can choose to undergo a third-party certification against the standards to further demonstrate their commitment to following good practices.

The SFI Principles (listed on the following page) describe the overall approach to sustainable forestry that is embedded in all SFI requirements. Certification audits focus on the applicable Objectives, Performance Measures, and Indicators. Objectives are the broad categories of issues considered in SFI certification. In cases such as the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit where only land management is involved (the privately-owned sawmill was not included in the scope of

⁸ For a complete copy of the SFI Standard go to <http://www.aboutsfb.org/sfiprogram.cfm> and download the PDF document at <http://www.aboutsfb.org/generalPDFs/SFBStandard2005-2009.pdf>.

the project) Objective 1-7 and 8 -13 apply. The actual metrics are found in the indicators. For this project 81 SFI Indicators organized under 25 SFI Performance Measures were deemed relevant.

SFI Principles

1. Sustainable Forestry

To practice sustainable forestry to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs by practicing a land stewardship ethic that integrates reforestation and the managing, growing, nurturing, and harvesting of trees for useful products with the conservation of soil, air and water quality, biological diversity, wildlife and aquatic habitat, recreation, and aesthetics.

2. Responsible Practices

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

3. Reforestation and Productive Capacity

To provide for regeneration after harvest and maintain the productive capacity of the forestland base.

4. Forest Health and Productivity

To protect forests from uncharacteristic and economically or environmentally undesirable wildfire, pests, diseases, and other damaging agents and thus maintain and improve long-term forest health and productivity.

5. Long-Term Forest and Soil Productivity

To protect and maintain long-term forest and soil productivity.

6. Protection of Water Resources

To protect water bodies and riparian zones.

7. Protection of Special Sites and Biological Diversity

To manage forests and lands of special significance (biologically, geologically, historically or culturally important) in a manner that takes into account their unique qualities and to promote a diversity of wildlife habitats, forest types, & ecological or natural community types.

8. Legal Compliance

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

9. Continual Improvement

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

Source: Sustainable Forestry Initiative® (SFI) Standard, 2005–2009 Edition

Findings of Readiness Review

Readiness Review findings are generally focused on the adequacy of documentation and existence of programs for each relevant Performance Measure. They are designed to ensure that the organization seeking certification understands the standard and has adequate program substance to justify the cost and expense of a full SFI Certification Audit. They are designed to identify gaps in programs or documentation rather than determining actual conformance with the requirement. Therefore this report focuses on areas where the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit's programs and practices are not likely meeting the SFI requirements at this time.

The majority of the Gaps relate to SFI Program specific requirements. These include, for example, not having a statement of commitment to the SFIS, not having assigned SFI roles and responsibilities, not supporting the efforts of the SFI Implementation Committees, not filling out the SFI Annual Progress Report, and not conducting an annual management review of the effectiveness of the SFI Program. The complete list of gaps is found in Attachment 1, including a summary keyed to the standard and details for each gap.

The report sections which follow comprise the typical contents of an SFI Readiness Review and Audit Plan (text on this and previous pages was added to the typical NSF SFI Report Template to ensure that the following report would be understandable in the context of the pilot project). This explanatory text will be included in the final report as well.

 Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

A. Operation(s) within the scope of SFIS Certification Audit:

FRS #1 : 8Y581 Location: Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

B. NSF Audit Team:

Lead Auditor: Michael Ferrucci Auditor: Robert Hrubec

C. Corrective Action Requests (CARs) Issued During the RR:

MAJOR(S) : NA MINOR(S) : NA

The Program Participant is required to take appropriate corrective action prior to the SFI Certification Audit. Corrective Action Plans should be forwarded to the NSF Lead Auditor

Note: CARs were not issued – Gaps are identified, and will become CARs during Certification Audit unless measures are taken by the Forest Service to develop programs to fill these gaps.

D. Audit Team Recommendation: **Continue SFIS Certification Process.**

The SFIS Certification Audit has been tentatively scheduled for June 6 to 9, 2006.

 Program Participant has major non-conformances that are being addressed and will be resolved prior to the SFIS Certification Audit.

CAR Number(s) Requiring Proof of Corrective Action Implementation:

 Program Participant has major non-conformance(s) that will not be resolved prior to the SFI Certification Audit. Client is advised to correct the deficiencies and submit a Corrective Action Plan to the lead auditor for approval prior to initiation of the SFIS Certification Audit.**E. Scope of the SFIS Certification:**

The scope of the organization includes: Forest Management Only. The specific SFIS Performance Measures and Indicators that are outside the scope of the Program Participant's SFI Program are described in Attachment 1 "Readiness Review Summary Sheet".

The wording of the scope of the SFIS Certification as described on the NSF Facility Record Sheet (FRS) has been reviewed with a representative of the Program Participant. The proposed scope: "Forest management activities in the Lakeview Sustained Yield Unit of the Freemont-Winema National Forest."

 Is correctly listed on the FRS form Has been modified as follows:**F. Proprietary Issues:**

Are there any proprietary issues? (e.g., restricted access to areas of the site; restricted access to information such as attorney-client privileged compliance documents, etc.) Yes No
(check one box)

If Yes, please explain:

 Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

G. Readiness Review Summary:

The SFIS Readiness Review (RR) visit was performed at the Fremont-Winema National Forest's offices in Lakeview, Oregon and selected field sites. Participants are documented in Attachment 3. The primary objectives of the review were to define the audit scope, define audit criteria, determine if the Program Participant is ready to continue with the NSF-ISR SFIS Certification process, and develop an audit plan.

1. During the RR visit the lead auditor reviewed the following items with the Program Participant's management representative(s): (check all that apply)

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NSF SFI Procedures | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The SFIS Certification Audit Matrix |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Safety Awareness Issues | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Population of Field Sites for Inspection |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Provided Corrective Action Requests | <input type="checkbox"/> Identified Interviewees |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The Composition of the Audit Team and the need for any Special Expertise | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reviewed the Program Participant's SFI Program and supporting documentation | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Drafted the Audit Plan | <input type="checkbox"/> Completed the Audit Plan |

2. The review conducted by the lead auditor confirms the following items: (check all that apply)

- Program Participant has customized indicators and evidence to demonstrate conformance with the SFI Standard? (If yes, attach SFIS indicators documents to the SFIS Audit Plan.)
- Program Participant has sufficient documentation of SFIS Conformance to proceed with Audit.
- The Program Participant's SFI Program appears to address each of the SFIS Performance Measures and Indicators that apply, including written policies as required under (LIST).
- The Program Participant has notified the Sustainable Forestry Board that it is initiating independent certification.
- At least one BMP Monitoring and Management Review cycle has been completed.
- Other: Comments: As noted above, this is a pilot project, and significant gaps exist in SFI requirements.

H. Agreement Not to Disclose and Consult:

All findings and reports generated as a result of the RR visit are confidential and governed by the provisions for confidentiality, which are described in the NSF-ISR Policies for Confidentiality and summarized on the Agreement to Not Disclose and to Not Consult (Attachment 2).

Appendices:

- 1-1 Readiness Review Summary Sheet
 - 1-2 Agreement(s) to Not Disclose and to Not Consult
 - 1-3 Participants in Scoping / Readiness Review Meetings
 - 1-4 Summary of Events, including Sites Visited
- Note: Tentative SFI Audit Plan is a separate document

Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

APPENDIX 1-1
NSF-ISR SFI Readiness Review Summary Sheet
2005-2009 Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard ®

Reviewed by: Michael FerrucciDate of Review: November 8-10

Program Participant Name and Location: Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit of the Fremont-Winema National Forests

Clause	Performance Measure Description	Indicators Which Do Not Apply	Programs & Documents Are Complete *	Programs & Documents Are <u>Not</u> Complete
Objectives 1 to 7	Requirements for Land Management			
1.1	Sustainable Long-Term Harvest Levels		All others	1.1.4
2.1	Reforestation		All	
2.2	Minimize Use of Chemicals		All	
2.3	Forest & Soil Productivity		All	
2.4	Forest Protection		All others	2.4.2
3.1	Best Management Practices		All	
3.2	Riparian Protection Measures	3.2.5	All others	
4.1	Conservation of Native Biodiversity		All	
4.2	Application of Research & Science		All	
5.1	Visual Quality of Harvests		All	
5.2	Clear-cut Size, Shape, Placement	All		
5.3	“Green Up” or Alternative Methods	All		
6.1	Identification & Management of Special Sites		All	
7.1	Efficient Utilization		All	
Objective 8	Requirements for Procurement	All N.A.		
8.1	Good Forestry Practices for Landowners	All N.A.		
8.2	Use of Qualified Professionals	All N.A.		
8.3	Inventory and Procurement Practices	All N.A.		
8.4	Monitor BMP and Reforestation	All N.A.		
8.5	Prevent Illegal Logging	All N.A.		
8.6	Encourage Sound Practices	All N.A.		

* Preliminary review indicates a program exists that aligns with SFI Requirements, and that documentation exists. Additional evidence to be reviewed by full audit team.

Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

Clause	Performance Measure Description	Indicators Which Do Not Apply	Programs & Documents Are Complete *	Programs & Documents Are <u>Not</u> Complete
	Requirements for All Program Participants (unless out of scope)			
Objective 9	Requirements for Research, Science, & Technology			
9.1	Funding for Research		All	
9.2	Analysis of Regeneration, Cut/Drain, BMP Implementation, & Biodiversity Information		All	
Objective 10	Requirements for Training and Education			
10.1	Training of Contractors and Personnel		All others	10.1.1, 10.1.4
10.2	Improved Wood Producer Professionalism		All others	10.2.1
Objective 11	Requirements for Legal & Regulatory Compliance			
11.1	Forestry Law/Reg. Compliance System		All	
11.2	Social Law Compliance		All	
Objective 12	Requirements for Public & Landowner Involvement			
12.1	Cooperative Efforts for Sustainable Forestry		All others	12.1.1
12.2	Outreach, Education, Involvement		All others	12.2.1
12.3	Public Lands Planning Involvement		All	
12.4	Public Lands Conferring with Native Peoples		All	
12.5	Inconsistent Practices or Concerns		All	
12.6	Annual Reporting	12.6.3		12.6.1 and 2
Objective 13	Requirements for Management Review and Continual Improvement			
13.1	Management Review System			All

* Preliminary review indicates a program exists that aligns with SFI Requirements, and that documentation exists. Additional evidence to be reviewed by full audit team.

Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

Attachment 1-1 continued

Details for Gaps Found

1.1.4	Periodic updates of inventory and recalculation of planned harvests.
Notes	Interviews with Fremont-Winema National Forest forest-wide staff regarding preparing for development of revised forest plan revealed that funding for inventory and preparation stages was limited and late. No specific funding was received for the development of a current vegetation layer. Instead current personnel will find a way to get this done. Funding is available for an extensive system of continuous forest inventory, updated on a ten-year rolling cycle. CSA plots are now all re-measured within last 10 years. Plots are being converted to FIA, and 40% of these are done, with all to be completed within 6 years. As of the conclusion of the Readiness Review the Lead Auditor was not convinced that the recalculation portion of the indicator was met.
2.4.2	Management to promote healthy and productive forest conditions to minimize susceptibility to damaging agents.
Notes	Staffing levels and long, expensive, and under-funded planning process delays treatments in some cases until after stands are unhealthy. Few green tree harvests in recent years, as staff time and planning resources have been devoted to salvage efforts following major fires in 1998, 2000, 2002, and 2004. This has prevented the implementation of needed thinning and other treatments that would have served to maintain or improve forest health.
10.1.1	Written statement of commitment to the SFI Standard communicated throughout the organization, particularly to mill and woodland managers, wood procurement staff, and field foresters.
Notes	The Forest Service has not committed to certification nor to the 2005-2009 Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard ®
10.1.2	Assignment and understanding of roles and responsibilities for achieving SFI Standard objectives.
Notes	The Forest Service has not committed to certification nor to the 2005-2009 Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard ® . Forest Service personnel have not been given SFI responsibilities.
10.1.4	Contractor education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities.
Notes	There is no aptitude 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 moves towards more and more restoration contracting. 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.
10.2	Program Participants shall work closely with state logging or forestry associations, or appropriate agencies or others in the forestry community, to foster improvement in the professionalism of wood producers.
10.2.1	Participation in or support of SFI Implementation Committees to establish criteria and identify delivery mechanisms for wood producers' training courses that address a. awareness of sustainable forestry principles and the SFI Program; b. BMPs, including streamside management and road construction, maintenance, & retirement; c. regeneration, forest resource conservation, and aesthetics; d. awareness of responsibilities under the U.S. Endangered Species Act, the Canadian Species at Risk Act, and other measures to protect wildlife habitat; e. logging safety; f. U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration regulations, wage and hour rules, and other employment laws; g. transportation issues; h. business management; and i. public policy & outreach.
Notes	The Forest Service has a separate State and Private Forestry Program to provide such assistance, although no evidence was provided that such program involve logger training. Note that this indicator involves SFI-specific activities that would be expected to occur in concert with the SFI Committee.

Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

12.1	Program Participants shall support and promote efforts by consulting foresters, state and federal agencies, state or local groups, professional societies, and the American Tree Farm System® and other landowner cooperative programs to apply principles of sustainable forest management.
12.1.1	Support for efforts of SFI Implementation Committees.
Notes	Forest Service has a separate State and Private Forestry Program to provide such assistance. However, if certification is sought some involvement with SIC will be needed. Forest Service personnel are involved in the Resources and People (RAP) Camp
12.2	Program Participants shall support and promote, at the state, provincial or other appropriate levels, mechanisms for public outreach, education, and involvement related to forest management.
12.2.1	Support for the SFI Implementation Committee program to address outreach, education, and technical assistance (e.g., toll-free numbers, public sector technical assistance programs).
Notes	Although Forest Service has a separate State and Private Forestry Program to provide assistance to private landowners, this indicator involves SFI-related activities.
12.5	Program Participants shall establish, at the state, provincial, or other appropriate levels, procedures to address concerns raised by loggers, consulting foresters, employees, the public, or Program Participants regarding practices that appear inconsistent with the SFI Standard principles and objectives.
12.5.1	Support for SFI Implementation Committee efforts (toll-free numbers and other efforts) to address concerns about apparent nonconforming practices.
Notes	Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit and the Fremont-Winema National Forests are not currently SFI Program Participants.
12.6	Program Participants shall report annually to the SFI Program on their compliance with the SFI Standard.
12.6.1	Prompt response to the SFI annual progress report.
12.6.2	Recordkeeping for all the categories of information needed for SFI annual progress reports.
Notes	Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit and the Fremont-Winema National Forests are not currently SFI Program Participants. All Program Participants receive a survey from AF&PA regarding a range of forest management and outreach activities. These surveys are reviewed as part of all SFI Audits. See http://www.aboutsfi.org/Certified Public Agency Conservation Group and Other NonIndustrial Forestland.doc
13.1	Program Participants shall establish a management review system to examine findings and progress in implementing the SFI Standard, to make appropriate improvements in programs, and to inform their employees of changes.
13.1.2	System for collecting, reviewing, and reporting information to management regarding progress in achieving SFI Standard objectives and performance measures.
Notes	Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit and the Fremont-Winema National Forests are not currently SFI Program Participants, and thus have not developed a system to manage and improve their SFI Program.
13.1.3	Annual review of progress by management and determination of changes and improvements necessary to continually improve SFI conformance.
Notes	Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit and the Fremont-Winema National Forests are not currently SFI Program Participants, and thus have not developed a system to manage and improve their SFI Program.

APPENDIX 1-2

Agreement(s) Not to Disclose and Not Consult

AGREEMENT TO NOT DISCLOSE AND TO NOT CONSULT

IN CONSIDERATION of my appointment to represent NSF International Strategic Registrations, Ltd. (NSF-ISR) and conduct management systems audits of the documentation, operations, and facilities of:

Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit, Fremont-Winema National Forests, Lakeview, Oregon (hereinafter called "NSF-ISR's Client") for registration by NSF-ISR, I agree as follows:

1. I will not at any time during or subsequent to this agreement disclose or use in any way any information or knowledge or data I receive or develop while providing service for NSF-ISR, including but not limited to, plans, lists, prospects lists, and trade secrets of NSF-ISR or its client.
2. While representing NSF-ISR, I may have access to confidential business information from NSF-ISR's client and others, and may be authorized to handle this information in the performance of my responsibilities. I can assume that this is proprietary information to the client or parties supplying it, and agree it may not be revealed by me to others outside NSF-ISR. I agree to maintain this information in a secure manner that prevents any accidental disclosure. Unauthorized disclosure or handling of confidential business information may result in disciplinary action, including but not limited to cancellation of my appointment to represent NSF-ISR. Should my authorization to handle confidential information be revoked while I am appointed to represent NSF-ISR, or as a result of cancellation of my appointment to represent NSF-ISR, I understand that my obligation not to reveal confidential business information will still be in force.
3. Upon cancellation of my appointment to represent NSF-ISR for any reason, I agree to promptly deliver to NSF-ISR all physical property, plans, designs, computer programs, computer lists, prospect lists, records, letters, notes, reports, and all other materials relating to NSF-ISR or its client in my possession or under my control.
4. I hereby attest that I have not provided consultation or other services related to the SFI program or management system to NSF-ISR's client for at least two years, and to preclude any actual or perceived conflict of interest, I agree to not enter into any agreement, provide consultation or other services to NSF-ISR's client (for whom I participated in any audit) except for services under this agreement, for a period of two years after completion of services under this agreement. Certification or auditing under a recognized standard is not subject to the above prohibitions.
5. I shall not participate in an appraisal or advise a potential purchaser or broker a purchase of property audited within the prior three years without the written permission of the audited party. I shall notify the audited party of participation in such activities after the three-year period immediately upon initiation of such activities for a period of at least 10 years following the audit. I shall disclose to the party requesting this audit any prior land appraisal or assessment work or land brokerage activity I or my employers has conducted related to the property to be audited.

Michael Ferrucci, NSF Lead Auditor
November 8, 2005

(signed copy on file at NSF Offices)

AGREEMENT TO NOT DISCLOSE AND TO NOT CONSULT

IN CONSIDERATION of my appointment to represent NSF International Strategic Registrations, Ltd. (NSF-ISR) and conduct management systems audits of the documentation, operations, and facilities of:

Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit, Fremont-Winema National Forests, Lakeview, Oregon (hereinafter called "NSF-ISR's Client") for registration by NSF-ISR, I agree as follows:

1. I will not at any time during or subsequent to this agreement disclose or use in any way any information or knowledge or data I receive or develop while providing service for NSF-ISR, including but not limited to, plans, lists, prospects lists, and trade secrets of NSF-ISR or its client.
2. While representing NSF-ISR, I may have access to confidential business information from NSF-ISR's client and others, and may be authorized to handle this information in the performance of my responsibilities. I can assume that this is proprietary information to the client or parties supplying it, and agree it may not be revealed by me to others outside NSF-ISR. I agree to maintain this information in a secure manner that prevents any accidental disclosure. Unauthorized disclosure or handling of confidential business information may result in disciplinary action, including but not limited to cancellation of my appointment to represent NSF-ISR. Should my authorization to handle confidential information be revoked while I am appointed to represent NSF-ISR, or as a result of cancellation of my appointment to represent NSF-ISR, I understand that my obligation not to reveal confidential business information will still be in force.
3. Upon cancellation of my appointment to represent NSF-ISR for any reason, I agree to promptly deliver to NSF-ISR all physical property, plans, designs, computer programs, computer lists, prospect lists, records, letters, notes, reports, and all other materials relating to NSF-ISR or its client in my possession or under my control.
4. I hereby attest that I have not provided consultation or other services related to the SFI program or management system to NSF-ISR's client for at least two years, and to preclude any actual or perceived conflict of interest, I agree to not enter into any agreement, provide consultation or other services to NSF-ISR's client (for whom I participated in any audit) except for services under this agreement, for a period of two years after completion of services under this agreement. Certification or auditing under a recognized standard is not subject to the above prohibitions.
5. I shall not participate in an appraisal or advise a potential purchaser or broker a purchase of property audited within the prior three years without the written permission of the audited party. I shall notify the audited party of participation in such activities after the three-year period immediately upon initiation of such activities for a period of at least 10 years following the audit. I shall disclose to the party requesting this audit any prior land appraisal or assessment work or land brokerage activity I or my employers has conducted related to the property to be audited.

Dr. Robert Hrubes, NSF Auditor
November 8, 2005

(signed copy on file at NSF Offices)

APPENDIX 1-3**Participants in Scoping / Readiness Review Meetings****Attendees at All Meetings**

Robert Hrubes, SCS, FSC Lead Auditor, SFI Auditor
 Mike Ferrucci, NSF-ISR, SFI Lead Auditor, FSC Auditor
 Jerry Haugen, Environmental Coordinator
 Ric Rine, Deputy Forest Supervisor

November 8, 2005**Opening Meeting: Fremont-Winema National Forest Interagency Office**

Karen Ishimamoto, Forest Supervisor
 Ric Rine, Deputy Forest Supervisor
 Norm Michaels, Forest Silviculturist
 Dave Pawelek, Forest Hydrologist
 Dave Hogen, Forest Fisheries Biologist
 Karen Zamudio, Forest Ecologist
 Terry Sodorff, District Ranger, Lakeview Ranger District
 Jerry Haugen, Environmental Coordinator

Paisley Ranger Station

Rick Elston, Silver Lake Ranger District Environmental Coordinator
 Martina Keil, North Zone Range Management Specialist

Fremont-Winema National Forest Interagency Office Stakeholder Meeting

Ric Rine, Deputy Forest Supervisor
 Jerry Haugen, Environmental Coordinator
 Terry Sodorff, District Ranger, Lakeview Ranger District
 Paul Harlan, Collins Companies
 Jim Walls, Lake County Resource Initiative
 Diana Johnston, Lakeview Stewardship Group
 Melvin Dick, Lake County Commissioner
 Bill Duke, Lake County Resource Initiative
 Ryan Benham, Lake County Examiner
 Kerry Hart, The Collins Companies, Freemont Sawmill

November 9, 2005**Lakeview Ranger District**

Terry Sodorff, District Ranger, Lakeview Ranger District

Bryan Watt, SE Zone Silviculturist

Jim Leal, Fish Biologist, SE Zone (Bly and Lakeview Ranger Districts)

Jody Perozzi, Writer/Editor – Acting Environmental Coordinator, SE Zone

James Price, Fuels Specialist, Lakeview Ranger District

November 10, 2005**Closing Meeting: Fremont-Winema National Forest Interagency Office**

Karen Ishimamoto, Forest Supervisor

Jack Shehan, Natural Resources Staff Officer

David Hogen, Forest Fish Biologist

Dave Pawelek, Forest Hydrologist

Desi Zamudio, Soil Scientist

Norm Michaels, Forest Silviculturist

John Kaiser, Forest Archeologist

Jerry Panter, Project Engineer

Richard Kehr, Engineering and Lands Staff

APPENDIX 1-4**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 Klamath Falls to Lakeview with Jerry Haugen, Forest Service Certification Coordinator

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

- 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 individuals¹, all residents of Lake County

Wednesday, November 9

8 AM: 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

 Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

- 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
- 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 Haugen

- travel to Klamath Falls

Friday, November 11

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

Attachment 2
Tentative Audit Plan

**Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Standard
2005-2009 Edition**



**for the
Lakeview Sustained Yield Unit
of the
Freemont-Winema National Forest**

**April 7, 2006
Revised June 2, 2006**

NSF International Strategic Registrations, Ltd.

789 North Dixboro Road

Ann Arbor, MI 48105

888-NSF-9000

www.nsf-isr.org

Project Background

A field assessment of the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit on the Fremont-Winema National Forest will be completed as part of a pilot test of forest certification being conducted by the USDA Forest Service and the Pinchot Institute. The project will be structured as if the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit was seeking independent certification that its SFI Program conforms to the requirements of the Sustainable Forestry Initiative® (SFI) Standard, 2005-2009 Edition. This Audit Plan describes the conduct of the SFIS Certification Audit conducted by an audit team assembled by NSF-ISR to determine SFI conformance.

Additional information about NSF-ISR's SFIS Certification Audits is contained in the NSF-ISR SFIS Certification Process Standard Operating Procedure (AA-971-0003), which is consistent with the Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Audit Procedures and Qualifications (SFI APQ) 2005–2009 Edition. Audits for SFI Standard are also conducted in accordance with the principles of auditing contained in the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) 19011:2002 guidelines for quality and/or environmental management systems auditing.

SFIS Certification Scope and Objective

The SFIS Certification Audit will apply to the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit's SFI Program implementation including its forest management operations and other related activities that are covered by the SFI Standard. The audit objective is to establish whether the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit's SFI program is in conformance with the SFIS Objectives, Performance Measures, and Indicators

Certification Criteria

Determination of conformance to the SFI Standard will be based solely on the requirements of the 2005-2009 Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Standard. Findings will be based upon the standard language of the SFIS Objectives, Performance Measures and Indicators. The NSF-ISR Audit Team will not impose additional requirements that are not specified in the SFI Standard.

The verification indicators to be used are as listed in the 2005-2009 Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard® (see <http://www.aboutsfb.org/sfiprogram.cfm>). The SFIS Performance Measures that are included in and excluded from the scope of the SFIS Certification Audit are outlined in Appendix 1: Readiness Review Summary Sheet.

The Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Audit Procedures and Qualifications (SFI APQ) allows for the substitution or modification of SFI Indicators under certain conditions, or

the use of additional indicators.⁹ No substitute or additional indicators are to be utilized in this project.

Note: This plan is intended primarily to meet the requirements for a formal audit plan under the SFI Program. However it is also designed to meet the needs of the FSC Assessment. The major difference in the two programs is that the FSC reviews are somewhat less scripted, with greater flexibility during the field audits, and more ad hoc decisions regarding audit locations. This plan retains this flexibility, which is also a needed part of any SFI audit. Thus Forest Service personnel involved in the audit should be prepared for changes to this plan and actual audit activities. The FSC Lead Auditor, SFI Lead Auditor, and Fremont-Winema National Forest Certification Management Representative will all work jointly to ensure a smooth audit.

Roles and Responsibilities

The Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit's management representative with respect to this SFIS Certification Audit will be Jerry Haugen, Operations Research Analyst / Environmental Coordinator, Fremont-Winema National Forests or his clearly designated representative. Other members of the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit's SFI Team that will be involved in the SFIS Certification Audit include:

Here's the "Certification Team" as per Karen:

Karen Shimamoto, Forest Supervisor
 Ric Rine, Deputy Forest Supervisor *
 Carolyn Wisdom, Silver Lake/Paisley District Ranger *
 Terry Sodorff, Lakeview/Bly District Ranger
 Jack Sheehan, Ecosystems Management Staff Officer
 Rich Kehr, Forest Engineer
 Matt Web, Forest Fire Staff Officer
 Norm Michaels, Forest Silviculturist
 Jerry Haugen, Forest Certification Coordinator/Planning Team Lead (new assignment)
 Al Hahn, Timber Program Manager
 Michelle Daluz, Assistant Forest Planner

* indicates people who will not be available for all field time

The NSF-ISR lead auditor will be Michael Ferrucci. The other members of the audit team will include: Robert Hrubes, Ph.D. Forest Economist and Registered Professional Forester; Jim Spitz, Forestry Consultant; Dave Vesely, Pacific Wildlife Research,

⁹ 6.1.3. Substitution and Modification of SFI Program Participants, with consent of the audit firm, may substitute or modify indicators to address local conditions based on a thorough analysis and adequate justification to the audit firm, which is responsible for ensuring that revised indicators are consistent with the spirit and intent of the SFI Standard performance measures and indicators, and that changes are appropriate for the specific local conditions and circumstances and the Program Participant's scope of operation. Additional indicators beyond those identified in the SFI Standard, if included by the Program Participant, shall be audited like all other indicators.

 Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

Corvallis, Oregon; and Dr. David Perry, Professor, University of Hawaii at Manoa. Audit procedures and auditor qualifications are consistent with Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Audit Procedures and Qualifications (SFI APQ) 2005–2009 Edition. Information regarding auditor qualifications is provided in Appendix 4-A.

Confidentiality and Conflict of Interest

All NSF-ISR auditors will maintain complete and strict confidentiality regarding all aspects of the audit. The Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit reserves the right to release NSF-ISR and its subcontractors from specific terms of this confidentiality agreement. NSF-ISR will retain one copy of the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit’s SFIS Indicators and evidence for its records.

All NSF audit team members will sign confidentiality agreements that include provisions regarding the avoidance of conflict of interest, including requirements of the SFI Standard. Prior to finalizing the audit team, the auditor and audit team members shall disclose to Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit any prior land appraisal or assessment work or land brokerage activity they or their employers conducted related to the property to be audited.

Readiness Review and Report

A Readiness Review meeting between Forest Service staff and the lead auditor was held at the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit’s offices on November 8, 2005. A thorough document review was performed at that time, the lead auditor’s credentials were confirmed, and the overall substance of the audit plan was discussed. As an outcome of that meeting, the lead auditor determined that the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit is prepared, and necessary documentation is sufficient, to undergo a full SFIS Certification Audit as outlined in this plan. The lead auditor has prepared a Readiness Review Report documenting that the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit is ready to proceed with the SFIS Certification Audit, with appropriate cautions regarding exiting gaps and the nature of the pilot project.

Project Timeline, Full Certification Assessments

April, 2006	Lead Auditors review documents on project web site Request any additional documents finalize Audit itinerary; FSC: completion of “special considerations” and 30-day public notice
June 6-9, 2006	On-site full assessments
July 10, 2006	Delivery of draft reports
July 31, 2006	Comments from Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit due on the reports
August 14, 2006	Reports sent out for peer review
September 4, 2006	Delivery of final reports
Sept./Oct. 2006	Presentation of results in Lakeview

Field Sites and Interviewees

Potential Field Visit Sites

The NSF-ISR audit team will inspect a variety of field sites to assess conformance with the SFI Standard. During audit planning the Lead Auditor and the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit's representative reviewed the range of field activities and formulated a sampling plan. Selection of actual sites will be based on a list of all projects that are proposed, active, or which have been closed in 2005. This list will be developed by Fremont-Winema National Forest staff and provided to the lead auditor by January 31, 2006 (the date that comments on this report and plan from Lakeview FSU are due).

After receiving the project list, the lead auditor will select field sites with the goal of covering a range of treatments and forest types, and including planned, on-going, and completed projects. The Lead Auditor will use randomized selection methods to prioritize available sites and to make initial selections that fit the proposed field visit time schedule (see page 22).

The Lead Auditor and Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit representatives will jointly review the initial selections, assessing their range and how representative they are. Projects which received high priority random number selection will be considered first, with substitutions made by the Lead Auditor where logistics and sampling goals so dictate.

The final selection list will be slightly larger than the number of sites expected to be visited, allowing adjustments during the audit to ensure flexibility and allow for additional samples as needed. Once selections are made, Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit staff will schedule appropriate field site visits in a manner that balances efficiency of travel routes, and the priority number for sites. The complete project list and the final field site selections will be listed in Appendix 4-B of this report.

Potential Audit Interviewees

The NSF-ISR lead auditor has identified the following categories of potential interviewees that may be contacted during the SFIS Certification Audit. Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit personnel are requested to develop and organize a list of names and contact information so that the audit team may conduct appropriate interviews.

- Top ten (10) Contract Loggers that harvest stumpage sales;
- Contract workers or organizations (planting, fuel management, chemical application);
- Key staff of relevant Oregon forestry associations;
- Staff or leadership of the SFI program State Implementation Committees;
- State or other Federal regulatory personnel responsible for the region; and
- Personnel of the Fremont-Winema National Forest

A tentative contact list for interviewees is contained in Appendix 4-C.

 Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

SFIS Certification Audit Schedule

The Pilot Joint SFIS Certification Audit / FSC Assessment is scheduled for Tuesday June 6 through Friday June 9, 2006. The agenda for the office and field audit to be performed by the NSF-ISR and SCS audit team is outlined below, with additional details found in the following paragraphs.

Event	Date	Time	Meeting Location	Organizer
Audit Team Meeting	Monday, June 5	6:30 pm	Mexican restaurant next to Best Western in Lakeview	Ferrucci, Hrubes
Opening Meeting and Interviews	Tuesday, June 6	7 am to 2:30 pm	Supervisor's Office, Lakeview	Haugen
Field Visit – Lakeview		2:30 to 5:30 pm	Front parking lot, Forest Headquarters, Lakeview	Sodorff and Huddleston-Lorton
Office Discussions, Paisley Ranger District	Wednesday, June 7	7 to 8:30 am	Paisley RD Office; Lakeview Stewardship Group will attend	Haugen
Field Visit, Paisley Ranger District	Wednesday, June 7	8:30 am to 5 pm	Assemble in vehicles in front parking lot	Wisdom, Elston and Blazer
Daily Closing Briefing		5 to 6 pm	Paisley RD Office	Ferrucci
Office Discussions, Lakeview RD	Thursday, June 8	7 to 8:00 am	Lakeview RD Office; * Lakeview Stewardship Group will attend	Haugen
Field Visit, Lakeview Ranger District	Thursday, June 8	8 am to 2 pm	Assemble in vehicles in front parking lot	Sodorff and Huddleston-Lorton
Daily Closing Briefing		2 pm (15 minutes)	Lakeview RD Office	Ferrucci
Auditor Deliberations		Afternoon and evening	Supervisor's Office, Lakeview	Haugen, Ferrucci
Auditor Deliberations	Friday, June 9	Through 4 pm	Supervisor's Office, Lakeview	Haugen, Ferrucci
Closing Meeting		4 to 6 pm	Supervisor's Office, Lakeview	Haugen, Ferrucci
Auditors Leave		6 pm		

Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

Mike/Robert,

We'd like to have you brief the Lakeview Stewardship Group from 7-8AM at the Klamath Ranger Station on June 8. The Lakeview District people will also be available so you can address them as well.

The 'organizers' for the Lakeview Field Trips are Terry Sodorff and Rachelle Huddleston-Lorton The 'organizers' for the Paisley Field Trips are Carolyn Wisdom, Rick Elston and Katie Blazer (although Katie won't be able to participate in the tour).

Here's the "Certification Team" as per Karen:

Karen Shimamoto, Forest Supervisor

Ric Rine, Deputy Forest Supervisor (will not be available for all field time)

Carolyn Wisdom, Silver Lake/Paisley District Ranger (will not be available for all field time) Terry Sodorff, Lakveview/Bly District Ranger Jack Sheehan, Ecosystems Management Staff Officer Rich Kehr, Forest Engineer Matt Web, Forest Fire Staff Officer Norm Michaels, Forest Silviculturist Jerry Haugen, Forest Certification Coordinator/Planning Team Lead (new assignment)

Al Hahn, Timber Program Manager

Michelle Daluz, Assistant Forest Planner

I apologize for the delay in getting this confirmed.

Breakfast at the Fremont Inn starts at 6AM, I believe. It takes 45 minutes to drive to Paisley, thus it will be difficult to begin a meeting there at 7AM. The food at the 24 hour place is, well, maybe you'd rather delay the start of the meeting until 7:30?

Looks like we'll need sack lunches on Wed and Thurs. We'll take orders on Tuesday.

Do you know when you and your cohorts be arriving in K-Falls? I'm expecting on the 3PM flight. The tentative plan is to drive everyone over to Lakeview Monday afternoon in government rigs - if that works for you. I need a firm head count so I can get the right kind of vehicles. Maybe the local folks will be driving themselves or carpooling over?

-Jerry-

Audit Team Meeting

The NSF-ISR Audit Team will receive introductory materials in advance of the audit, and may have preliminary e-mail and telephone discussions regarding the assignments and logistics. The audit team will meet prior to conducting the audit to review the audit plan and make any final adjustments. This meeting will occur the night before the opening meeting, in Lakeview, Oregon.

Opening Meeting and Interviews

The Opening Meeting will be held at Forest Supervisor's offices in Lakeview, Oregon on Tuesday, June 6 at 7 am. Attendance at the Opening Meeting will include the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit's leadership and NSF-ISR's Audit Team. The purpose of the meeting is to introduce all parties, review the SFIS Certification Indicators, confirm the audit plan and responsibilities, and attend to any outstanding issues.

The lead auditor will explain the audit procedures contained in the SFIS Certification Audit Matrix and the appropriate lines of communication between the NSF-ISR lead auditor and the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit's management representative. Similar issues will be covered for the FSC portion of the assessment, in discussions led by the SCS lead auditor.

The audit schedule will be reviewed including the dates, times and locations of meetings. The specific field sites and routes to be traveled will be finalized, based upon weather and access constraints. The interviewees will be identified and contact information will be arranged. Other aspects of the audit plan will be discussed including the content of the final and summary reports, tentative dates of publication of the final and summary reports, procedures in the event that the final report is delayed, confidentiality procedures, the NSF-ISR dispute resolution process, and the tentative date for issuance of the NSF-ISR certificate of SFIS conformance.

At the conclusion of the Opening Meeting, the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit will present an overview of its operations, with a focus on inventory, planning, monitoring, and public involvement, and other details regarding its conformance with the certification requirements. Any health and safety and emergency procedures will also be discussed.

Following the Opening Meeting audit team members and Fremont-Winema National Forest specialists will meet in smaller groups to conduct focused discussions regarding certification requirements. The table on the following page provides an indication of the primary focus for each auditor, keyed to the SFI Standard. For ease of understanding the general emphasis for each auditor is described below:

Mike Ferrucci	Inventory, Planning, Outreach and Involvement
Robert Hrubes	FSC, stakeholder involvement
Cal Mukumoto	Silviculture, Chemical Use, Invasive Control, Tribal
John Hayes	RTE Protection, Special Sites, Wildlife Management, Fisheries
David Perry	RTE Protection, Special Sites, Wildlife Management, Fisheries

 Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

SFI Objectives and Assignments

Legend: Lead in **Bold**; primary support role - not bold; all team members are able to participate in review of any indicator

Criterion/Indicator	Robert Hrubes	Kathryn Fernholz	Jim Spitz	Dave Vesely	David Perry	Mike Ferrucci	Field Relevant Criteria
Objective 1			1.1			1.1	1.1
Objective 2	2.2		2.1 2.3 2.4			2.1 2.3 2.4 2.5	2.1 to 2.4
Objective 3			3.1 3.2			3.1 3.2	3.1 3.2
Objective 4				4.1 4.2	4.1 4.2		4.1 4.2
Objective 5			5.1 5.2 5.3			5.1 5.2 5.3	5.1 to 5.3
Objective 6				6.1	6.1		6.1
Objective 7			7.1			7.1	7.1
Objective 8-- NA							NA
Objective 9			9.2	9.2		9.1 9.2	-
Objective 10	10.1		10.2			10.1 10.2	10.1
Objective 11	11.2	11.2	11.2			11.1	11.1
Objective 12	12.3 12.4	12.3 12.4	12.4	12.2, 12.3		12.1 12.2 12.3 12.5 12.6	-
Objective 13						13.1	-

Mike Ferrucci: Office and Cell 203-887-9248; mferrucci@iforest.com

Robert Hrubes: Phone: (510) 452-8007 Cell: (510) 913-0696; rhrubes@scscertified.com

Kathryn Fernholz: Phone 651-762-4007 Cell 612-414-8041; katie@dovetailinc.org

Jim Spitz- 541-389-5978; jspitz@bendcable.com

Dave Vesely; Phone: (541)745-5025; dvesely@pwri.com

Dave Perry- 541-597-4650; dave_perry38@msn.com

Also the Lead Auditors will review the list of interviewees in Appendix 4-C to determine Fremont-Winema National Forest personnel who might be scheduled during this interview portion of the first day.

Tuesday, June 6

Field Visit – Lakeview (2:30 to 5:30 pm)

The initial field site visits will include the entire audit team working together. The location will be the portion of the Lakeview Ranger District east of Lakeview. Site selection will be at the discretion of the Fremont-Winema National Forest staff, with the goal of visiting a good cross-section of activities that will allow for a general understanding of the scope and sweep of management activities in the district. Approximately three to five sites will be visited during the afternoon.

For the remainder of the audit the audit team will work in two groups. Field sites will be visited by each half of the audit team in the company of the responsible manager for that site. The two auditor sub-teams will go in separate vehicles to visit different sites each day.

Daily Briefings

Each day of the SFIS Certification Audit will begin with a brief opening meeting to document the day's schedule, responsibilities, and arrangements; to obtain any needed documents; and to answer other preliminary questions. Each day will conclude with a brief closing meeting to review the day's findings, to confirm plans for the evening, and to plan for activities the following day.

Any potential areas of minor or major non-conformance shall be identified during the field audit and discussed at the daily closing meeting. Any additional evidence or field site investigations that could clarify the areas of non-conformance should be identified and prepared for the following day.

Wednesday, June 7

Office Discussions, Paisley Ranger District (7 to 8:30 am)

The entire Paisley RD staff should be available for this meeting. The District Ranger will provide an overview of the district and its management issues. Auditors will then ask questions and conduct interviews with district personnel. These discussions will continue throughout the day as auditors and district staff members interact during the field visit. The district should ensure that sufficient vehicles are available so that the 5 audit team members can travel from site to site with different staff members, which will facilitate discussions.

Field Visit, Paisley Ranger District

The auditors will go on two separate tours on the second day to visit 5-7 project sites for each team. These sites will be pre-selected (see "Potential Field Visit Sites" section above), and short information packets should be provided to each auditor that include:

- Location and project maps

- Brief project description
- Supplemental information at the discretion of Paisley RD staff or Fremont-Winema National Forest specialists

Daily Closing Briefing (5 to 6 pm)

The auditors will meet back at the Paisley RD Office for about an hour and then conduct a Closing Meeting at the end of the second day. The purposes include a review of the days findings, including any non-conformances, and an opportunity to revise the next day's schedule based on issues under review. Paisley RD staff should also be prepared to provide additional documentation from their files (paper or computer) that will help the auditors in their assessment of conformance to the standards.

Thursday, June 8

Office Discussions, Lakeview RD (7 to 8:00 am)

The entire Lakeview RD staff should be available for this meeting, although during the closing briefing the previous day the Lead Auditors may be able to narrow the scope of discussions and the list of personnel needed. Since the general approach to management of Lakeview RD will have been demonstrated during the field visit on Tuesday, no overview presentation is needed. Instead, the auditors will ask questions in a group session and/or conduct one-on-one interviews with district personnel to follow-up on issues identified in the previous two days. These discussions will continue throughout the day as auditors and district staff members interact during the field visit. The district should ensure that sufficient vehicles are available so that the 5 audit team members can travel from site to site with different staff members, which will facilitate discussions.

Field Visit, Lakeview Ranger District (8 am to 2 pm)

The auditors will go on two separate tours on the second day to visit 3-6 project sites for each team. These sites will be pre-selected (see "Potential Field Visit Sites" section above), and short information packets should be provided to each auditor that include:

- Location and project maps
- Brief project description
- Supplemental information at the discretion of Paisley RD staff or Fremont-Winema National Forest specialists

Daily Closing Briefing (2 pm, 15 minutes)

A very short daily closing meeting will be held at the Lakeview Ranger District office to discuss any findings or request additional documentation.

Auditor Deliberations (Afternoon and evening)

The audit team will require space at the Forest Supervisor's office, including telephone and internet access. The team will work together to review findings and reach preliminary conclusions regarding both SFI and FSC requirements.

Friday, June 9**Auditor Deliberations (8 am - 4 pm)**

Auditor deliberations will continue throughout Friday as well.

Closing Meeting (4 to 6 pm)

The closing meeting will be held in the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit's headquarters office. The audit team and all interested Fremont-Winema National Forest staff will participate.

The audit team will make an oral presentation of audit findings, discuss any minor or major non-conformances, and the lead auditor's recommendation regarding overall conformance with the SFI Standard. Possible audit recommendations including Immediate Certification, Pending Certification and Deny Certification are detailed in NSF-ISR's SFIS Certification Process SOP.

Any minor or major non-conformances shall be fully documented in the SFIS Certification Audit Matrix and Corrective Action Requests (CARs) and presented to the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit for review and discussion. The Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit will have the opportunity to discuss and clarify any outstanding issues related to the CARs and any other aspects of the audit. Each of the Corrective Action Request forms will be signed by the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit's management representative.

Every effort will be made to resolve all questions and issues related to the SFIS Certification Audit before the end of the Closing Meeting. The Lead Auditor shall fully explain the next steps of producing the draft final and summary reports for review by the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit. Timeframes for completing the audit report process and issuing the final report will be finalized.

Dispute Resolution Process

The NSF Lead Auditor is responsible for making a recommendation for certification. The NSF Certification Review Board member will review the audit report, consider the Lead Auditor's recommendation, and make a final determination regarding ability of the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit to achieve certification, should it be sought.

In the event that there is a dispute between the lead auditor and the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit over interpretations of the SFI Standard or any other aspect of the certification audit the first step is for the Program Participant's management representative to call the Audit Manager (888-NSF-9000) to resolve the dispute. If the dispute continues, the formal dispute resolution process of NSF-ISR (AE-989-0002) will be followed.

Reporting**Process for Preparation and Review of the Final Report**

The lead auditor will draft an unofficial final report consistent with the format and contents outlined in the NSF-ISR SFIS Certification Process SOP. The lead auditor shall arrange to have the NSF-ISR CB Member conduct a review of the report and provide a certification

Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

recommendation at that time. The CB reviewer normally makes the final decision regarding certification and provides editing comments or suggested changes to the Lead Auditor in a timely manner.

The lead auditor shall make necessary revisions and then forward the draft final report to the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit for a review of factual accuracy by July 10, 2006. The Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit should submit comments to the lead auditor by July 31, 2006. The lead auditor will incorporate appropriate suggestions from the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit and then forward the Final Report to the NSF-ISR SFI CB reviewer within one week of receipt of comments.

The SFI CB reviewer will review the Final Report for thoroughness and completeness and will send the Final Report to NSF and will ensure that a copy is provided to the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit by September 4, 2006. If additional time is required the SFI Program Manager and/or the Lead Auditor will so notify the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit.

Summary Report

If this were a standard certification, a Public Summary Report would be provided to the Sustainable Forestry Board. The content of the summary report would be agreed to by NSF-ISR and the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit to ensure that it captured all of the relevant findings. The lead auditor will develop a Draft Public Summary and will work with the management representative to finalize this audit summary. The summary shall include the audit scope and process, the names of the auditors, the indicators used, and a summary of relevant findings.

Distribution of Reports

The final and summary reports are the sole property of the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit. The distribution of the final and summary reports will be at the discretion of the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit. Consistent with the requirements of the Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Audit Procedures and Qualifications (SFI APQ) 2005–2009 Edition, the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit should submit a copy of the summary report to the Sustainable Forestry Board and AF&PA.

All working documents, draft and final and summary reports in the possession of the audit team members and lead auditor shall be destroyed at the end of the SFIS Certification Audit process, unless agreed to in writing by NSF-ISR and the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit. NSF-ISR and the lead auditor shall retain one copy of all documents related to the SFIS Certification in permanent files for purposes of conducting surveillance audits and re-audits, and for other legitimate purposes.

Certificate of Conformance will not be Issued

In a normal assessment, upon successful completion of the SFIS Certification Audit process as contained in this Audit Plan, NSF-ISR would issue a formal certificate of conformance with the SFI Standard. The content of the SFIS Certificate is outlined in the NSF-ISR SFIS Certification Process Standard Operating Procedure. As this is only a pilot project no certificate will be issued.

Surveillance Audit and Re-audit Schedule

The final step in the audit planning process is normally to tentatively schedule periodic surveillance audits. If this were a formal certification, the periodic surveillance audits would be scheduled within twelve months of the initial audit, and will generally occur annually.

Appendices for Audit Plan

Appendix 2-A: Qualifications of Auditors

Appendix 2-B: Potential Field Sites

Appendix 2-C: Potential Interviewees

Appendix 2-A

Qualifications of Auditors

Mike Ferrucci, Master of Forestry, BS Forestry.

Role: SFI Team Leader Scoping and Full Assessments

Mike Ferrucci is the SFI Program Manager for NSF – International Strategic Registrations and is responsible for all aspects of the firm’s SFI Certification programs. Mike has led Sustainable Forest Initiative (SFI) certification and precertification reviews throughout the United States. He has also led joint SFI and Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) certification projects in Wisconsin, Michigan, Maryland, Maine, and Connecticut and a joint scoping or precertification gap-analysis project on tribal lands throughout the United States. He is qualified as a RAB EMS Lead Auditor (ISO 14001 Environmental Management Systems), as an SFI Lead Auditor, as an FSC Team Leader, and as a Tree Farm Group Certification Lead Auditor.

Mike has 26 years of forest management experience. His expertise is in sustainable forest management planning; in certification of forests as sustainably managed, in the application of easements for large-scale working forests, and in the ecology, silviculture, and management of mixed species forests, with an emphasis on regeneration and management of native hardwood species. He has also developed expertise in the conservation of forest biodiversity at multiple spatial scales through his involvement in the founding and administration of The Conservation Forestry Network and through his work with the Northern Forest Protection Fund.

Mike has conducted or participated in assessments of forest management operations throughout the United States, with field experience in Maine, New Hampshire, New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, West Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, Georgia, Alabama, Minnesota, Michigan, Wisconsin, Arizona, California, Oregon, and Washington. Mike is a 26-year member of the Society of American Foresters and is active in the Association of Consulting Foresters and the Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island State Implementation Committee (SIC) for the Sustainable Forestry Initiative.

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

Role: FSC Team Leader on Scoping and Full Assessments

Dr. Robert Hrubes is Senior Vice-President of Scientific Certification Systems. In that capacity, Dr. Hrubes is responsible for all natural resource and recycled content certification activities of the company. While providing senior leadership of these programs, Dr. Hrubes remains an active certification practitioner. He continues to lead certification evaluation teams throughout the world as well as represent both SCS and FSC and numerous public fora. He is internationally recognized as a leading authority and practitioner of third-party forest management certification.

Prior to assuming his present duties at SCS in 2000, Dr. Hrubes owned and managed, for 6 years, a forestry and natural resource economics consultancy based in northern California. During those years, he served on the founding Board of Directors of the Forest Stewardship Council.

Additionally, he served as the founding Chair, Board of Directors of the Forest Stewards Guild, a U.S.-based professional society of progressively minded practicing foresters. Previous to the creation of his own consultancy, Dr. Hrubes was for 6 years a managing principal of LSA Associates, Inc., a California-based environmental consulting firm. And prior to that, Dr. Hrubes was employed for 14 years by the USDA Forest Service in a variety of positions from field forester to research economist, operations research analyst and acting Group Leader for Land Management Planning.

It is of special significance that Dr. Hrubes has had direct and extensive prior exposure to the Lakeview Federal Sustainability Unit. In the late 1990's, Dr. Hrubes served on a blue-ribbon panel that reviewed the then Lakeview Sustained Yield Unit relative to generic ecological standards. In that capacity, Dr. Hrubes visited the Unit on several occasions and, in doing so, acquired a robust exposure to the breadth of programs and policies then in place.

Dr. Hrubes holds the following degrees:

Ph.D., Forest Economics, UC-Berkeley

M.A., Economics, UC-Berkeley

M.S., Resource Systems Management, Univ. of Michigan, Ann Arbor

B.S., Forest Management, Iowa State University, Ames

Dave Wager, M.Sc.

Role: Staff Support and Stakeholder Contacts

Mr. Wager is Director of Forest Management Certification for SCS. During his 4.5 years as Director, Mr. Wager has administered Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) endorsed assessments on over 17 million acres of forestland worldwide. As a Forest Certification practitioner, he has led and/or participated in assessments of 18 forest management operations including Pennsylvania State Forests (2.2 million acres), Massachusetts State Forests (500,000 acres), and Wisconsin County Forests (2.1 million acres), as well as operations in Malaysia, Canada, Costa Rica, and Japan. Recent evaluations conducted by Mr. Wager include full assessment of Wisconsin County Forests, State of PA Bureau of Forestry, State of Massachusetts, White Mountain Apache Forest lands, and Collins Lakeview Forest. In his role as Program Director, Mr. Wager oversees all first-time certification evaluations, annual audits, and contract renewal certifications on 65 active clients. In other natural resources work, Mr. Wager played a key role in the development of Starbucks CAFE Practices- a program to ensure procurement of sustainably grown and processed coffee. Mr. Wager has expertise in business and forest ecology (B.S. business, Skidmore College; M.S. Forest Resources, Utah State University) and utilizes both in his position with SCS. While studying forest ecology at Utah State University, Mr. Wager was awarded a NASA Graduate Student Research Fellowship to develop dendrochronological techniques to assess Douglas-fir growth reduction in Utah's Central Wasatch Mountains.

Dave Vesely, M.S. Forest Science

Role: Ecology, Wildlife Biology

Dave currently works as a Natural Resources Consultant to state and federal agencies, watershed councils, and private companies. Previously he was president, Pacific Wildlife Research, Inc. His professional experiences and responsibilities have included a wide variety of natural resources

projects, including: biological assessments of wildlife and their habitats, natural resource problem analyses, design and implementation of wildlife studies, and developing recommendations for managing wildlife habitats. His skills include technical writing and editing, advanced knowledge of wildlife and forestry survey methods, statistical analyses, using GIS for cartography and landscape analyses, and leading teams of interdisciplinary specialists. Dave's education includes three college degrees:

M.S. Forest Science, 1996. Oregon State University.

B.F.A. Illustration, 1991. Oregon State University.

B.A. Psychology, 1977. University of Minnesota.

Dr. David Perry, Professor, University of Hawaii at Manoa

Role: Ecology, Wildlife Biology

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

Role: Audit Team Member, Forest Industries 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 in Bend, Oregon.

Kathryn Fernholz

Role: Stakeholder Issues, Tribal Issues

Kathryn has worked on development and forest management issues in a range of roles. She currently is Executive Director of Dovetail Partners, Inc. Starting in 2004 Kathryn served as Forestry Program Director for Dovetail. 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 in the Upper Midwest 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.

Appendix 2-B Potential Field Visit Sites

For field review planning see:

- * FSC 5.4.a for a list of recreation oriented locations
- * FSC 6.1 for a list of environmental analyses underway or completed.
- * <http://www.fs.fed.us/r6/frewin/projects/cert/fsc6.4ecosystem> for a list of special areas. If any of the analyses or locations look promising for a field trip in June, let me know and I'll sort out the status of related on-the-ground projects and see what I can find for background info.

There is a list of NEPA analyses under FSC 6.1 that you can use to focus in on your June agenda. I'll add the Bly District projects shortly. If you choose the NEPA projects you have an interest in, we can identify the specific implementation projects that came out of the NEPA decision (timber sale, thinning contract, culvert replacement or whatever). The dates shown are decision dates, the on-the-ground work may or may not be done.

Project Level Environmental Impact Assessment

Paisley Ranger District:

Selection	Access/Location	
No		Bald Butte/Bear Fence Construction Project (Under Development)
No, small, similar to next one		Green Creek Restoration (Under Development)
Yes		Jakabe Watershed Restoration Project (Under Development)
Yes		Winter Fire Reforestation (scoping to start soon)
Yes		February 20, 2004: Winter Fire Salvage Project (Complete)
Yes		May 7, 2002: Joker II Restoration Project and Forest Plan Amendment #23 Creating Bald Eagle Management Area (Not started)
Yes		July 26, 2001: Chewaucan Grazing Analysis (Continuing)
No		September 8, 2005: Centurytel Round Pass Mountain Phone Line Replacement and New Phone Line Installation Project (Underway)
No		June 23, 2005: Happy Camp Road Repair and Culvert Replacements (Not started)

Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

Yes		March 10, 2005: Jakabe Prescribed Burn Project (Not started)
No		October 27, 2004: UPC Anemometer Sites (Underway)
Yes		June 21, 2004: Jakaby Road Closures (Completed)
Yes		June 9, 2004: Jakaby Aspen/Juniper/Meadow Project (Nearly complete)
No		April 6, 2004: Dead Horse Rim, Cache Cabin, Dead Cow Creek and Lakes Loop Trails Reconstruction/Maintenance Project (Complete) Note: Cache Cabin and Lake Loop portions are in the unit
No		March 22, 2004: Spring Development - East Doe Pasture (Completed)
Yes		February 19, 2004: Headwaters Fuels (Underway)
No		April 22, 2003: Oregon Department of Forestry Amendment of Communications Lease (Round Mountain) (Underway)
No		October 10, 2002: Chewaucan Watershed - Fish Passable Culverts [94K - PDF] [47K - MSWord] (Completed)
No		April 26, 2002: Authorization for Special Use Permit and Temporary Area Closure for 2002 Rendezvous (Completed)
No		March 22, 2001: South Creek Basin Pre-Commercial Thin [36K - PDF] (Completed)

Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

Lakeview Ranger District:

Selection	Access/ Location	NEPA Analyses
FW	NE of LKV	May 6, 2005: Grassy Fire Salvage
No	SE of LKV T39S, R22E, Sec 17 NW1/4, NW1/4; Sec 18 NE1/4, NE1/4	July 1, 2004: Hickey Reservoir Special Use Authorization (implemented)
Yes	W of LKV - T38S, R16E	April 3, 2003: Cub Fire Restoration and Salvage (complete)
FW	NE of LKV T37S, R21E, Sec31,32; T38S, R21E, Sec 5.	December 2, 2005: Crooked Creek Juniper Reduction Project
No	W of LKV - T38S R18E, Sec 32, SE1/4	October 21, 2005: Favell Powerline and Private Road Easement
No	NE of LKV - T38S R22E	October 21, 2005: Drake Peak Communication Facility
FW	NE of LKV - T 38S R21E	July 27, 2005: Recreation Corrals Project (complete)
No	SE of LKV - T39S R22E	July 11, 2005: Amaral Reciprocal Road Easements (in progress)
No	?	June 24, 2005: Porcupine/Little Cove Deferred Grazing System (implemented)
No	SW of LKV - T40S R17E, Sec 22 SW1/4	June 7, 2005: Dog Lake Boat Launch Project (not started)
No	SW of LKV - T40S R 17E	June 7, 2005: Dog Lake Tree Vigor Project (not started)
Tenta- tive	SW of LKV - T41S, R16E, Sec 19, 20	May 17, 2004: Wildhorse Creek Restoration (complete)
FW	SE of LKV - T40S, R22E	March 23, 2004: South Warner Private Road Easement (implemented)
Yes	W of LKV - T41S, R 16E	March 9, 2004: Logan Fire Reforestation (complete)
Yes	W of LKV - T37S T38S, R17E-19E	October 16, 2003: Bald Stacking Level Control and Hazardous Fuels Reduction

Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

		(underway)
Yes	W of LKV - T38S, R 16E	July 1, 2003: Cub Fire Salvage Reforestation and Understory Thinning (underway)
Tentative	NW of LKV - T38S, R18E, Sec. 8	Cottonwood Creek Trail Rehabilitation
Tentative	NW of LKV - T38S, R18E, Sec. 8	Cottonwood Creek Trail Rehabilitation Part Deux (under development)
FW	NE of LKV - T38S, R 20E	Collins Timber Company Private Road Easement (under development)
FW	NE of LKV - T38S, R 20E	Taylor Ranch Fish Screen (under development)
FW	SE of LKV - T40S, R21E	Crane Creek Flood Repairs (under development)
FW	SE of LKV - T41S, R22E, Sec 16	Dismal Shelter Project (cancelled)
FW	SE of LKV	Burnt-Willow Restoration Project (under development)
FW	SE of LKV - T40S, R21E, Sec 1,12, 13; T40S, R22E, Sec 15,6,7,8,18	April 17, 2002: South Warner Fire Salvage and Restoration (complete)
FW	E of LKV - various	February 11, 1999: Warner Mountain Grazing Analysis (implemented)
No	SW of LKV - T41S, R15E, Sec13, 21, 22, 23, 24; T41S, R16E,	February 13, 2003: Stateline Unit 2 Maintenance Underburn (complete)
No	NW of LKV - T37S, R19E, Sec 11, NW 1/4	April 3, 2003: Bauers Creek Culvert Replacement (complete)
No	NE of LKV - T38S, R22E, Sec 5, NW SW 1/4	February 13, 2003: Drake Peak Toilet Replacement (complete)
No	NE of LKV - T38S, R21E, Sec 34 NE 1/4 SW1/4	September 13, 2002: High Desert Stormtroopers Snowmobile Storage Building and Access Road [42K - PDF] [34K - MSWord] (complete)

 Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

No	E of LKV - T39S	September 12, 2002: Oregon Semaphore Grass Conservation Project (implemented)
No	W of LKV - T38S, R18E, Sec 32, SE1/4 SE1/4.	August 22, 2002: Grizzley Peak Powerline Project [64K PDF] (complete)

Silver Lake Ranger District (no selections):

Toolbox Fire Recovery Project (small portion in the unit)

Bly Ranger District (no selections):

September 9, 2005: Barnes Valley-Long Branch Restoration and Enhancement Project (small part in unit)

November 8, 2005: Upper Sycan Allotment Management Plans (partly in unit)

April 28, 2004: Stateline Thinning and Underburn (underway)

May 20, 2003: Dairy Creek Fish Passage Project (complete)

Special Areas

- Gearhart Wilderness (7,200 acres)
- Semi-primitive Recreation (53,800 acres)
- Augur Creek Research Natural Area (2,200 acres)
- Old Growth Forest (10,800 acres)
- Other Areas (8,100 acres)

Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

Selection	Access/ Location	NEPA Analyses
	NE of LKV - T37S, R22E, Sec 5,6; T36S, R22E, Sec 29-32; T37S, R21E, Sec 1.	May 6, 2005: Grassy Fire Salvage
	SE of LKV - T39S, R22E, Sec 17 NW1/4, NW1/4; Sec 18 NE1/4, NE1/4	July 1, 2004: Hickey Reservoir Special Use Authorization (implemented)
	W of LKV - T38S, R16E	April 3, 2003: Cub Fire Restoration and Salvage (complete)
	NE of LKV - T37S, R21E, Sec31,32; T38S, R21E, Sec 5.	December 2, 2005: Crooked Creek Juniper Reduction Project
	W of LKV - T38S, R18E, Sec 32, SE1/4	October 21, 2005: Favell Powerline and Private Road Easement
	NE of LKV - T38S, R22E, Sec 5 NW1/4 SW 1/4	October 21, 2005: Drake Peak Communication Facility
	NE of LKV - T 38S, R21E, Sec 11 NW1/4, SE1/4	July 27, 2005: Recreation Corrals Project (complete)
	SE of LKV - T39S, R22E, Sec 6 S1/2	July 11, 2005: Amaral Reciprocal Road Easements (in progress)
	?	June 24, 2005: Porcupine/Little Cove Deferred Grazing System (implemented)
	SW of LKV - T40S, R17E, Sec 22 SW1/4	June 7, 2005: Dog Lake Boat Launch Project(not started)
	SW of LKV - T40S, R17E, Sec 22	June 7, 2005: Dog Lake Tree Vigor Project (not started)
	SW of LKV - T41S, R16E, Sec 19, 20	May 17, 2004: Wildhorse Creek Restoration (complete)
	SE of LKV - T40S, R22E	March 23, 2004: South Warner Private Road Easement (implemented)
	W of LKV - T41S, R16E, Sec 10,15	March 9, 2004: Logan Fire Reforestation (complete)
	W of LKV - T37S, T38S, R17E-19E	October 16, 2003: Bald Stocking Level Control and Hazardous Fuels Reduction

Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

		(underway)
	W of LKV - T38S, R16E....	July 1, 2003: Cub Fire Salvage Reforestation and Understory Thinning (underway)
	NW of LKV - T38S, R18E, Sec 8	Cottonwood Creek Trail Rehabilitation
	NW of LKV - T38S, R18E, Sec 8,	Cottonwood Creek Trail Rehabilitation Part Deux (under development)
	NE of LKV - T38S, R20E, Sec25 NW1/4,NW1/4	Collins Timber Company Private Road Easement (under development)
	NE of LKV - T38S, R20E, Sec 6	Taylor Ranch Fish Screen (under development)
	SE of LKV - T40S, R21E, Sec 5, 8	Crane Creek Flood Repairs (under development)
	SE of LKV - T41S, R22E, Sec 16 NE1/4, SW1/4	Dismal Shelter Project (cancelled) back on the Schedule of Proposed Actions
	SE of LKV	Burnt-Willow Restoration Project (under development)
	SE of LKV - T40S, R21E, Sec 1,12, 13; T40S, R22E, Sec 5,6,7,8,18	April 17, 2002: South Warner Fire Salvage and Restoration (complete)
	E of LKV - various	February 11, 1999: Warner Mountain Grazing Analysis (implemented)
	SW of LKV - T41S, R15E, Sec13, 21, 22, 23, 24; T41S, R16E, Sec 15-22.	February 13, 2003: Stateline Unit 2 Maintenance Underburn (complete)
	NW of LKV - T37S, R19E, Sec 11, NW 1/4	April 3, 2003: Bauers Creek Culvert Replacement (complete)
	NE of LKV - T38S, R22E, Sec 5, NW SW 1/4	February 13, 2003: Drake Peak Toilet Replacement (complete)
	NE of LKV - T38S, R21E, Sec 34 NE 1/4, SW1/4	September 13, 2002: High Desert Stormtroopers Snowmobile Storage Building and Access Road [42K - PDF] [34K - MSWord] (complete)
	E of LKV - T39S, R22E, Sec 5, S 1/4; Sec 6 SE1/4, SE1/4; Sec 6 SW1/4, SE1/4.	September 12, 2002: Oregon Semaphore Grass Conservation Project (implemented)

Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

	-----+	-----+	-----+	
	W of LKV - T38S,	August 22, 2002: Grizzley Peak Powerline		
	R18E, Sec 32, SE1/4,	Project [64K PDF] (complete)		
	SE1/4.			

Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

Certification Tour June 7, 2006 Paisley Ranger District***DRAFT***

Access/Location/Time	Route Name -Tour Lead	Project	Project Lead	Information
Before Lunch	Jakabe Route- Carolyn	Jakabe Watershed Restoration Project	Carolyn or Sue	DN Signed 4/20 (“ <i>Jakabe Restoration Project</i> ”). DN legal ad 4/24/06. Kava TS
Before Lunch		Jakabe Prescribed Burn Project	Mike H. or Jason	DM Signed 3/10/05. Implementation began April 2006
Before Lunch		Jakabe Road Closures	Carolyn	DM Signed 6/21/04. Completed
Before Lunch		Jakabe Aspen/Juniper/Meadow Project	Amy	DM Signed 6/9/04. (Nearly complete)
Before Lunch		Chewaucan Grazing Analysis	Mike N. or Martina Keil	DN Signed 7/26/01. Ongoing
Before or After Lunch		Headwaters Fuels	Mike H. or Jason	Decision Signed 2/19/04. (Underway)
After Lunch – may need viewing from Hwy 31 or Govt. Harvey	Winter Route- Sue	Winter Fire Salvage Project	Sue	DN Signed 2/20/04 (Complete)
After Lunch – Find way to look at w/o entering Danger		Winter Fire Reforestation	Sue	DM signed 12/20/05

Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

After Lunch	Joker Route - Lee	Joker II Restoration Project and Forest Plan Amendment #23 Creating Bald Eagle Management Area	Lee (TS) and Amy (BEMA)	DN Signed 5/7/02. Joker II sold and should start sometime this summer
-------------	-------------------	---	-------------------------	---

- **Tour Lead is responsible for being in the lead vehicle as we travel .**
- **Project Lead is responsible for nominating/selecting specific Stops. In practice, these will subject to change by the Auditors**

There will be a before lunch route/tour in which we are all together. After lunch (tentatively at Dairy Point), the group will split into two tours.

The (3) routes/tours will be called “Jakabe”, Winter” and “Joker”:

Jakabe: Carolyn Wisdom, Sue Puddy, Lee Bowers, Mike Haddock, Jason Baldwin, Amy Markus, Mike Nevill and/or Martina Keil, Rich Pyzik, Rick Elston

Winter: Sue Puddy, Mike Haddock, Rick Elston, Mike Nevill or Martina Keil

Joker: Lee Bowers, Carolyn Wisdom, Jason Baldwin, Amy Markus, Rich Pyzik, Martina Keil or Mike Nevill

As a part of the Winter Route, an old growth stand will be viewed. Possibly in the general vicinity of Slide Lakes. Sue will select the area.

R.Elston
5/19/06

Appendix 2-C Potential Audit Interviewees

The NSF-ISR lead auditor has identified the following categories of potential interviewees that may be contacted during the SFIS Certification Audit. Forest Service personnel are requested to develop and organize a list of names and contact information so that the audit team may conduct appropriate interviews.

- Top ten (10) Contract Loggers that harvest stumpage sales;
- Contract workers or organizations (planting, fuel management, chemical application);
- Key staff of relevant Oregon forestry associations;
- Staff or leadership of the SFI program State Implementation Committees;
- State or other Federal regulatory personnel responsible for the region; and
- Personnel of the Fremont-Winema National Forest (provide staff listing)

Contractors

Contract Number	Date	Project	Amount	District	Contractor	Phone Number
AG-04U3-C-05-001	9/6/2005	Fire Restoration	Variable	Silver Lk & Paisley	Luis Coria Coria Contracting	503-399-1044
AG-52-04P5-5-0075A	5/25/2005	Noxious Weed Treatment	101,300	SL/Pais/	Floyd Holbrook Echosystems Management	541-576-2117
53-04P5-5-0500	10/12/2004	Fire Restoration	Variable	Silver Lk & Paisley	Coria Contracting	503-399-1044
50-04P5-4-12DB	6/25/2004	Govt Harvey Road Resurface	934,836	Paisley	James Dean Construction	James Dean 509-364-3537
50-04P5-4-0039	1/20/2004	Dog Lake Road	13,719	Lakeview	Steve Rajnus (pronounced 'Rainus')	541-545-6605
52-04P5-RD504	9/10/2002	Culture,PCT, Slash IDIQ	97,748	Bly/LV	Noberto Cuevas, NCQ Reforestation	541-779-6737 Cell: 541-621-4799

Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

Attachment 3

Certification Audit Matrix

NSF-ISR auditors use this document to record their findings for each SFIS Performance Measure and Indicator. If a non-conformance is found the reasons are documented on the Corrective Action Request (CAR) form. N/A in the Auditor column indicates that the associated Performance Measure or Indicator does not apply.

MF: Mike Ferrucci RH: Robert Hrubes JS: Jim Spitz KF: Katie Fernholz DV: Dave Vesely DP: David Perry

Findings are indicated by an X mark. Because conformance is required against indicators and performance measures in some cases there is non-conformance at the indicator level but conformance at the performance measure level, or vice-versa.

FC: Conformance EXR: Exceeds the requirements OFI: Opportunity for Improvement

Maj: Major Gap Min: Minor Gap

Objective 1: To broaden the implementation of sustainable forestry by ensuring long-term harvest levels based on the use of the best scientific information available.

Performance Measure/ Indicator		Audit -or	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				OFI
			FC	EXR	Maj	Min	
1.1	<i>Program Participants shall ensure that long-term harvest levels are sustainable and consistent with appropriate growth and-yield models and written plans.</i>	MF JS	X				
1.1.1	A long-term resource analysis to guide forest management planning at a level appropriate to the size and scale of the operation, including: a. a periodic or ongoing forest inventory; b. a land classification system; c. soils inventory and maps, where available; d. access to growth-and-yield modeling capabilities; e. up-to-date maps or a geographic information system (GIS); f. recommended sustainable harvest levels; and g. a review of nontimber issues (e.g., pilot projects and economic incentive programs to promote water protection, carbon storage, or biological diversity conservation).	MF JS	X			X*	
1.1.2	Documentation of annual harvest trends in relation to the sustainable forest management plan.	MF JS	X				
1.1.3	A forest inventory system and a method to calculate growth.	MF JS	X				
1.1.4	Periodic updates of inventory and recalculation of planned harvests.	MF JS	X				X
1.1.5	Documentation of forest practices (e.g., planting, fertilization, and thinning) consistent with assumptions in harvest plans.	N.A.					

Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

Objective 2: To ensure long-term forest productivity and conservation of forest resources through prompt reforestation, soil conservation, afforestation and other measures.

Performance Measure/ Indicator		Audit -or	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				OFI
			FC	EXR	Maj	Min	
2.1	<i>Program Participants shall reforest after final harvest, unless delayed for site-specific environmental or forest health considerations, through artificial regeneration within two years or two planting seasons, or by planned natural regeneration methods within five years.</i>	JS MF	X				
2.1.1	Designation of all management units for either natural or artificial regeneration.	MF JS	X				
2.1.2	Clear Requirements to judge adequate regeneration and appropriate actions to correct under-stocked areas and achieve desired species composition and stocking rates for both artificial and natural regeneration	MF, JS	X				
2.1.3	Minimized plantings of exotic tree species and research documentation that exotic tree species, planted operationally, pose minimal risk.	MF	X				
2.1.4	Protection of desirable or planned advanced natural regeneration during harvest.	JS	X				
2.1.5	Artificial reforestation programs that consider potential ecological impacts of a different species or species mix from that which was harvested.	JS, MF	X				
2.2	<i>Program Participants shall minimize chemical use required to achieve management objectives while protecting employees, neighbors, the public and the forest environment.</i>	RH, JS	X				
2.2.1	Minimized chemical use required to achieve management objectives.			X			
2.2.2	Use of least toxic and narrowest spectrum pesticide narrowest spectrum and least toxic pesticides necessary to achieve management objective.		X				
2.2.3	Use of pesticides registered for the intended use and applied in accordance with the label requirements.		X				
2.2.4	Use of Integrated Pest Management where feasible.		X				
2.2.5	Supervision of forest chemical applications by state-trained or certified applicators.		X				
2.2.6	Use of best management practices appropriate to the situation; for example: adjoining landowners or nearby residents notified of applications and chemicals used; appropriate multi-lingual signs or oral warnings used; public road access controlled during and after applications; streamside and other needed buffer strips appropriately designated; positive shut-off and minimal drift spray valves used; drift minimized by aerially applying forest chemicals parallel to buffer zones; water quality monitored or other methods used to assure proper ...		X				

Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

Performance Measure/ Indicator		Audit -or	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				OFI
			FC	EXR	Maj	Min	
2.2.6	... equipment use and stream protection of streams, lakes and other waterbodies; chemicals stored at appropriate locations; state reports filed as required; or methods used to ensure protection of federally listed threatened & endangered species		X				
2.3	<i>Program Participants shall implement management practices to protect and maintain forest and soil productivity.</i>	JS MF	X				
2.3.1	Use of soils maps where available.	DV	X				
2.3.2	Process to identify soils vulnerable to compaction and use of appropriate methods to avoid excessive soil disturbance.		X				
2.3.3	Use of erosion control measures to minimize the loss of soil and site productivity.		X				
2.3.4	Post-harvest conditions conducive to maintaining site productivity (e.g., limited rutting, retained down woody debris, minimized skid trails).		X				
2.3.5	Retention of vigorous trees during partial harvesting, consistent with silvicultural norms for the area.		X				
2.3.6	Criteria that address harvesting and site preparation to protect soil productivity.		X				
2.3.7	Minimized road construction to meet management objectives efficiently.		X				
2.4	<i>Program Participants shall manage so as to protect forests from damaging agents such as environmentally or economically undesirable wildfire, pests and diseases to maintain and improve long-term forest health, productivity and economic viability.</i>	MF JS			X		
2.4.1	Program to protect forests from damaging agents.		X				
2.4.2	Management to promote healthy and productive forest conditions to minimize susceptibility to damaging agents.				X		
2.4.3	Participation in, and support of, fire and pest prevention and control programs.		X				
2.5	<i>Program Participants that utilize genetically improved planting stock including those derived through biotechnology shall use sound scientific methods and follow all applicable laws and other internationally applicable protocols.</i>	MF	X				
2.5.1	Program for appropriate research, testing, evaluation and deployment of genetically improved planting stock including trees derived through biotechnology.	MF	X				

Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

Objective 3: To protect water quality in streams, lakes and other water bodies.

Performance Measure/ Indicator		Audit -or	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				OFI
			FC	EXR	Maj	Min	
3.1	<i>Program Participants shall meet or exceed all applicable federal, provincial, state and local water quality laws and meet or exceed Best Management Practices developed under Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)-approved state water quality programs other applicable federal, provincial, state or local programs.</i>	JS MF	X				
3.1.1	Program to implement state or provincial equivalent BMPs during all phases of management activities.					X	
3.1.2	Contract provisions that specify BMP compliance.		X				
3.1.3	Plans that address wet weather events (e.g., inventory systems, wet weather tracts, defining acceptable operational conditions, etc.).		X				
3.1.4	Monitoring of overall BMP implementation.		X				
3.2	<i>Program Participant shall have or develop, implement, and document, riparian protection measures based on soil type, terrain, vegetation and other applicable factors.</i>	MF JS	X				
3.2.1	Program addressing management and protection of streams, lakes and other water bodies and riparian zones.		X				
3.2.2	Mapping of streams, lakes and other water bodies and riparian zones, and where appropriate, identification on the ground.		X				
3.2.3	Implementation of plans to manage or protect streams, lakes and other water bodies.		X				
3.2.4	Identification and protection of nonforested wetlands, including bogs, fens, vernal pools and marshes of significant size.		X				
3.2.5	Where regulations or BMPs do not currently exist to protect riparian areas, use of experts to identify appropriate protection measures.	N.A.					

Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

Objective 4: Manage the quality and distribution of wildlife habitats and contribute to the conservation of biological diversity by developing and implementing stand- and landscape- level measures that promote habitat diversity and the conservation of forest plants and animals including aquatic fauna.

Performance Measure/ Indicator		Audit -or	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				OFI
			FC	EXR	Maj	Min	
4.1	<i>Program participants shall have programs to promote biological diversity at stand- and landscape- scales.</i>	DV DP	X				
4.1.1	Program to promote the conservation of native biological diversity, including species, wildlife habitats, and ecological or natural community types, at stand and landscape levels.		X				
4.1.2	Program to protect threatened and endangered species.		X				
4.1.3	Plans to locate and protect known sites associated with viable occurrences of critically imperiled and imperiled species and communities. Plans for protection may be developed independently or collaboratively and may include Program Participant management, cooperation with other stakeholders, or use of easements, conservation land sales, exchanges, or other conservation strategies			X			
4.1.4	Development and implementation of criteria, as guided by regionally appropriate science, for retention of stand-level wildlife habitat elements (e.g., snags, mast trees, down woody debris, den trees, nest trees).		X				
4.1.5	Assessment, conducted individually or collaboratively, of forest cover types and habitats at the individual ownership level and, where credible data are available, across the landscape, and incorporation of findings into planning and management activities, where practical and when consistent with management objectives.		X				
4.1.6	Support of and participation in plans or programs for the conservation of old-growth forests in the region of ownership.		X				
4.1.7	Participation in programs and demonstration of activities as appropriate to limit the introduction, impact, and spread of invasive exotic plants and animals that directly threaten or are likely to threaten native plant and animal communities.		X				
4.1.8	Program to incorporate the role of prescribed or natural fire where appropriate.		X				
4.2	<i>Program Participants shall apply knowledge gained through research, science, technology, and field experience to manage wildlife habitat and contribute to the conservation of biological diversity.</i>	DV DP	X				

Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

Performance Measure/ Indicator		Audit -or	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				OFI
			FC	EXR	Maj	Min	
4.2.1	Collection of information on critically imperiled and imperiled species and communities and other biodiversity-related data through forest inventory processes, mapping, or participation in external programs, such as NatureServe, state or provincial heritage programs, or other credible systems. Such participation may include providing nonproprietary scientific information, time, and assistance by staff, or in-kind or direct financial support.	DV, DP	X				
4.2.2	A methodology to incorporate research results and field applications of biodiversity and ecosystem research into forest management decisions.	DV, DP	X				

Objective 5: To manage the visual impact of harvesting and other forest operations.

Performance Measure/ Indicator		Audit -or	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				OFI
			FC	EXR	Maj	Min	
5.1	<i>Program Participants shall manage the impact of harvesting on visual quality.</i>	MF JS	X				
5.1.1	Program to address visual quality management.		X				
5.1.2	Incorporation of aesthetic considerations in harvesting, road, landing design and management, and other management activities where visual impacts are a concern.		X				
5.2	<i>Program Participants shall manage the size, shape, and placement of clearcut harvests.</i>	N.A.					
5.2.1	Average size of clearcut harvest areas does not exceed 120 acres, except when necessary to respond to forest health emergencies or other natural catastrophes.	N.A.					
5.2.2	Documentation through internal records of clearcut size and the process for calculating average size.	N.A.					
5.3	<i>Program Participants shall adopt a green-up requirement or alternative methods that provide for visual quality.</i>	N.A.					
5.3.1	Program implementing the green-up requirement or alternative methods.	N.A.					
5.3.2	Harvest area tracking system to demonstrate compliance with the green-up requirement or alternative methods.	N.A.					
5.3.3	Trees in clearcut harvest areas are at least 3 years old or 5 feet high at the desired level of stocking before adjacent areas are clearcut, or as appropriate to address operational and economic considerations, alternative methods to reach the performance measure are utilized by the Program Participant.	N.A.					

Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

Objective 6: To manage Program Participant lands that are ecologically, geologically, historically, or culturally important in a manner that recognizes their special qualities.

Performance Measure/ Indicator		Audit -or	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				OFI
			FC	EXR	Maj	Min	
6.1.	<i>Program Participants shall identify special sites and manage them in a manner appropriate for their unique features.</i>	DV DP		X			
6.1.1	Use of existing natural heritage data and expert advice in identifying or selecting sites for protection because of their ecologically, geologically, historically, or culturally important qualities.	DV DP		X			
6.1.2	Appropriate mapping, cataloging, and management of identified special sites.	DV DP		X			

Objective 7: To promote the efficient use of forest resources.

Performance Measure/ Indicator		Audit -or	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				OFI
			FC	EXR	Maj	Min	
7.1	<i>Program Participants shall employ appropriate forest harvesting technology and “in-woods” manufacturing processes and practices to minimize waste and ensure efficient utilization of harvested trees, where consistent with other SFI Standard objectives.</i>	JS MF	X				
7.1.1	Program or monitoring system to ensure efficient utilization, which may include provisions to ensure a. landings left clean with little waste; b. residues distributed to add organic and nutrient value to future forests; c. training or incentives to encourage loggers to enhance utilization; d. cooperation with mill managers for better utilization of species and low-grade material; e. merchandizing of harvested material to ensure use for its most beneficial purpose; f. development of markets for underutilized species and low-grade wood; g. periodic inspections and reports noting utilization and product separation; or h. exploration of alternative markets (e.g., energy markets).		X				X

Not applicable (N.A.): Objective 8: To broaden the practice of sustainable forestry through procurement programs.

Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

Objective 9: To improve forestry research, science, and technology, upon which sound forest management decisions are based.

Performance Measure/ Indicator		Audit -or	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				OFI
			FC	EXR	Maj	Min	
9.1	<i>Program Participants shall individually, through cooperative efforts, or through associations provide in-kind support or funding, in addition to that generated through taxes, for forest research to improve the health, productivity, and management of forest resources.</i>	MF	X				
9.1.1	Current financial or in-kind support of research to address questions of relevance in the region of operations. The research will include some or all of the following issues: a. forest health, productivity, and ecosystem functions; b. chemical efficiency, use rate, and integrated pest management; c. water quality; d. wildlife management at stand or landscape levels; e. conservation of biological diversity; and f. effectiveness of BMPs.	MF	X				
9.2	<i>Program Participants shall individually, through cooperative efforts, or through associations develop or use state, provincial, or regional analyses in support of their sustainable forestry programs.</i>	MF JS DV	X				
9.2.1	Participation, individually or through cooperative efforts or associations at the state, provincial, or regional level, in the development or use of a. regeneration assessments; b. growth-and-drain assessments; c. BMP implementation and compliance; and d. biodiversity conservation information for family forest owners.	MF JS DV	X				

Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

Objective 10: To improve the practice of sustainable forest management by resource professionals, logging professionals, and contractors through appropriate training and education programs.

Performance Measure/ Indicator		Audit -or	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				OFI
			FC	EXR	Maj	Min	
10.1	<i>Program Participants shall require appropriate training of personnel and contractors so that they are competent to fulfill their responsibilities under the SFI Standard.</i>	MF JS RH			X		1
10.1.1	Written statement of commitment to the SFI Standard communicated throughout the organization, particularly to mill and woodland managers, wood procurement staff, and field foresters.				X		
10.1.2	Assignment and understanding of roles and responsibilities for achieving SFI Standard objectives.				X		
10.1.3	Staff education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities.		X				X
10.1.4	Contractor education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities.				X		
10.2	<i>Program Participants shall work closely with state logging or forestry associations, or appropriate agencies or others in the forestry community, to foster improvement in the professionalism of wood producers.</i>	MF JS	X				
10.2.1	Participation in or support of SFI Implementation Committees to establish criteria and identify delivery mechanisms for wood producers' training courses that address <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. awareness of sustainable forestry principles and the SFI Program; b. BMPs, including streamside management and road construction, maintenance, & retirement; c. regeneration, forest resource conservation, and aesthetics; d. awareness of responsibilities under the U.S. Endangered Species Act, the Canadian Species at Risk Act, and other measures to protect wildlife habitat; e. logging safety; f. U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration regulations, wage and hour rules, and other employment laws; g. transportation issues; h. business management; and i. public policy and outreach. 				X		

Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

Objective 11: Commitment to comply with applicable federal, provincial, state, or local laws and regulations.

Performance Measure/ Indicator		Audit -or	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				OFI
			FC	EXR	Maj	Min	
11.1	<i>Program Participants shall take appropriate steps to comply with applicable federal, provincial, state, and local forestry and related environmental laws and regulations.</i>	MF	X				
11.1.1	Access to relevant laws and regulations in appropriate locations.	MF	X				
11.1.2	System to achieve compliance with applicable federal, provincial, state, or local laws and regulations.	MF	X				
11.1.3	Demonstration of commitment to legal compliance through available regulatory action information.	MF	X				
11.1.4	Adherence to all applicable federal, state, & provincial regulations and international protocols for research & deployment of trees derived from improved planting stock & biotechnology.	MF	X				
11.2	<i>Program Participants shall take appropriate steps to comply with all applicable social laws at the federal, provincial, state, and local levels in the country in which the Program Participant operates.</i>	RH	X				
11.2.1	Written policy demonstrating commitment to comply with social laws, such as those covering civil rights, equal employment opportunities, antidiscrimination and anti-harassment measures, workers' compensation, indigenous peoples' rights, workers' and communities' right to know, prevailing wages, workers' right to organize, and occupational health and safety.		X				

Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

Objective 12: To broaden the practice of sustainable forestry by encouraging the public and forestry community to participate in the commitment to sustainable forestry and publicly report progress.

Performance Measure/ Indicator		Audit -or	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				OFI
			FC	EXR	Maj	Min	
12.1	<i>Program Participants shall support and promote efforts by consulting foresters, state and federal agencies, state or local groups, professional societies, and the American Tree Farm System® and other landowner cooperative programs to apply principles of sustainable forest management.</i>	MF		X			1
12.1.1	Support for efforts of SFI Implementation Committees.				X		
12.1.2	Support for the development and distribution of educational materials, including information packets for use with forest landowners.		X				X
12.1.3	Support for the development and distribution of regional or statewide information materials that provide landowners with practical approaches for addressing biological diversity issues, such as specific wildlife habitat, critically imperiled or imperiled species, and threatened and endangered species.		X				
12.1.4	Participation in efforts to support or promote conservation of working forests through voluntary market-based incentive programs (e.g., current-use taxation programs, Forest Legacy, or conservation easements).		X				
12.1.5	Program Participants are knowledgeable about credible regional conservation planning and priority-setting efforts that include a broad range of stakeholders. Consider the results of these efforts in planning where practical and consistent with management objectives.		X				
12.2	<i>Program Participants shall support and promote, at the state, provincial or other appropriate levels, mechanisms for public outreach, education, and involvement related to forest management.</i>	MF	X				
12.2.1	Support for the SFI Implementation Committee program to address outreach, education, and technical assistance (e.g., toll-free numbers, public sector technical assistance programs).				X		
12.2.2	Periodic educational opportunities promoting sustainable forestry, such as a. field tours, seminars, or workshops; b. educational trips; c. self-guided forest management trails; or d. publication of articles, educational pamphlets, or newsletters, or e. support for state, provincial, and local forestry organizations and soil and water conservation districts.		X				
12.2.3	Recreation opportunities for the public, where consistent with forest management objectives.			X			

Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

Performance Measure/ Indicator		Audit -or	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				OFI
			FC	EXR	Maj	Min	
12.3	<i>Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall participate in the development of public land planning and management processes.</i>	RH KF MF DV		X			
12.3.1	Involvement in public land planning and management activities with appropriate governmental entities and the public.	KF, MF		X			
12.3.2	Appropriate contact with local stakeholders over forest management issues through state, provincial, federal, or independent collaboration.	KF, MF		X			
12.4	<i>Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall confer with affected indigenous peoples.</i>	Tea m		X			
12.4.1	Program that includes communicating with affected indigenous peoples to enable Program Participants to a. understand and respect traditional forest related knowledge; b. identify and protect spiritually, historically, or culturally important sites; and c. address the sustainable use of nontimber forest products of value to indigenous peoples in areas where Program Participants have management responsibilities on public lands.	Tea m		X			
12.5	<i>Program Participants shall establish, at the state, provincial, or other appropriate levels, procedures to address concerns raised by loggers, consulting foresters, employees, the public, or Program Participants regarding practices that appear inconsistent with the SFI Standard principles and objectives.</i>	MF	X				
12.5.1	Support for SFI Implementation Committee efforts (toll-free numbers and other efforts) to address concerns about apparent nonconforming practices.				X		
12.5.2	Process to receive and respond to public inquiries.		X				
12.6	<i>Program Participants shall report annually to the SFI Program on their compliance with the SFI Standard.</i>	MF			X		
12.6.1*	Prompt response to the SFI annual progress report. (*Note: This indicator will be reviewed in all audits.)				X		
12.6.2	Recordkeeping for all the categories of information needed for SFI annual progress reports.		X				
12.6.3	Maintenance of copies of past reports to document progress and improvements to demonstrate conformance to the SFI Standard	N.A.					

Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

Objective 13: To promote continual improvement in the practice of sustainable forestry and monitor, measure, and report performance in achieving the commitment to sustainable forestry.

Performance Measure/ Indicator		Audit -or	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				OFI
			FC	EXR	Maj	Min	
<i>13.1*</i>	<i>Program Participants shall establish a management review system to examine findings and progress in implementing the SFI Standard, to make appropriate improvements in programs, and to inform their employees of changes. (*This Performance Measure will be reviewed in all audits.)</i>	MF			X		
13.1.1	System to review commitments, programs, and procedures to evaluate effectiveness.	MF			X		
13.1.2	System for collecting, reviewing, and reporting information to management regarding progress in achieving SFI Standard objectives and performance measures.	MF			X		
13.1.3	Annual review of progress by management and determination of changes and improvements necessary to continually improve SFI conformance.	MF			X		

Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

Auditor Notes

Requirement	Notes
1.1.1	<p>Minor Gap: Clearly connecting the goals and objectives of the Freemont Plan to the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit would be required to maintain SFI Certification.</p> <p>Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit is located within the Freemont National Forest. Reviewed the Freemont Forest plan and selected amendments and supporting documents, including selected watershed analyses (Deep Creek, Chewacan) special area plans (Sycan Wild and Scenic River), project plans (Winter Fire Salvage and Rehabilitation Project, Cub Salvage, Burnt Willow), and programmatic plans (1995 Inland Native Fish Strategy) on the Forest Service's web site (http://www.fs.fed.us/r6/frewin/projects/forestplan/index.shtml).</p> <p>The management of the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit is guided by the overall management plan for the Fremont-Winema National Forests, which consist of the two forest-level plans, their amendments, the Eastside Forest Screen, and the Northwest Forest Plan. The reauthorization of the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit also provides updated overall goals, which focus on ecological restoration. There are no separate standards or guidelines for the unit, other than the long-standing marketing restrictions giving priority to local processing facilities.</p> <p>Forest service plans are designed to provide forest-wide guidance, with additional guidance for specific special areas within the forest. These plans are developed by an extensive process that includes a detailed analysis of the situation, goals and objectives, extensive public review, provision of a range of alternatives, all documented in comprehensive Environmental Impact Statements (EIS) or in the final plan and its appendices. A preferred alternative is selected by the forest supervisor. Tiered to the overall plans are programmatic-related area specific plans. These also are subject to comprehensive EIS, specialist input, and public review. When these more focused plans are finalized they and their associated new and revised guidelines and standards must be incorporated into the overall forest plan by an amendment process. Planning has thus in the past been conducted within the NEPA framework. With the new Forest Service planning rule this will change, and only projects will be considered the decisions subject to NEPA, not forest plans.</p> <p>Watershed assessments designed to map forest-wide goals and objective onto site-specific, prioritized recommended treatment areas are an important part of the ecosystem management approach that is evident throughout the unit and the Fremont-Winema National Forests. Completed or nearly completed assessments currently cover about three-fourths of the unit. They use description of conditions, reference conditions, overall Fremont-Winema National Forests plan goals and objectives, and interdisciplinary analysis to determine priority treatment areas and recommendations. These watershed analyses are "non-decisional" documents, and are used to document the need for various treatments, including timber harvests.</p> <p>A process exists to prioritize watersheds to determine order of watershed treatments with a new the prioritization plan for watershed analysis being finalized. Confirmed b., c., d., e., f., and g. by review of 1989 plan, Watershed Analyses,</p>

Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

	<p>EA/EIS process and documents, and project plans. See below for 1.1.1a. The plan has been updated by 26 amendments, the most recent of which was passed October 11, 2006. Development of a new forest management plan is now scheduled to start in earnest in FY 2007. Completion of the new plan is anticipated in 2009 or 2010.</p>
1.1.2	<p>Confirmed table provided in the Certification Dual Assessment Case Study web site providing actual harvests (volume offered) for the past 10 years. Volumes offered range from 4.6 to 37.1 million board feet in any given year. Most of the harvest volume (107,727 mbf of the total 136,993 mbf) is salvage timber. Harvest trends are clearly lower than past determinations of sustainable harvest levels. This information is expected to be updated with the new Fremont-Winema National Forests plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service has been steadily moving away from timber production over the past two decades. The addition of the “East-side screens” as a forest plan amendment in 1993 was the most recent part of this transition. Under this approach no trees larger than 21 inches can be harvested. An array of other provisions designed to implement an ecosystem management approach is also included, and were made a part of the plan through a plan amendment.</p> <p>Current management practices are not driven by the forest-wide plan, which is being revised (a draft is expected by mid-2008, and an approved plan by the end of 2008). The Allowable Sale Quantity is currently viewed as a maximum, not a target for harvests, which instead are determined on a project basis. Planning is done at the watershed level and forest treatments, including harvests, are incorporated into projects designed to implement goals determined by watershed analysis.</p>
1.1.1a 1.1.3 1.1.4	<p>The totality of inventory data are deemed to be sufficient to understand growth, harvest, and inventory levels considering that harvest levels are far below growth. Confirmed that the forest was inventoried prior to the development of the 1989 plan. Confirmed that there is a method to calculate growth, using the CFI plots. This CFI system is based on the FIA-design plots, spaced more closely so that the intensity is four times greater than standard FIA inventory. Funding is available for an extensive system of continuous forest inventory, updated on a ten-year rolling cycle. CSA plots (old system) were all re-measured during 2002-2005. Plots are being converted to FIA, and 40% of these are done, with all to be completed within 6 years. “The FIA plots are applicable at a large scale only, they are not dense enough to obtain satisfactory statistics to use at a project scale.”</p> <p>The current stand-level inventory is “stale” and will be updated on an ad hoc basis, either through new measurements or by growing forward the old data. One issue is that the digital data from the previous inventory has been lost, so the information must be re-keyed from field cards.</p> <p>Interviews with Fremont-Winema National Forest staff regarding preparing for development of revised forest plan indicate that funding for inventory and preparation stages thus far is quite limited. No specific funding was received for the development of a current vegetation layer. Instead, current personnel indicate that they will find a way to get this done. Funding is available for the above mentioned extensive system of continuous forest inventory, updated on a ten-year rolling cycle.</p>

Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

	The Ecological Unit Inventory does not currently cover any part of the LSU, it is only collected on the Winema at the present. This data has a focus on soils and vegetation, with older data for these resources covering all of the unit.
1.1.4	OFI: There is an opportunity to improve in the implementation of planned harvest levels. Overstocking, heavy fuel loads, lack of road maintenance, and numerous other problems have resulted from the lack of a minimum timber harvest program. Conformance was judged using “Planned Treatments” from watershed assessments. The Allowable Sale Quantity has not been recalculated since 1989, despite major changes in management approach. Other methods exist to understand forest inventory levels and their implications for management decisions. The lack of an up-to-date harvest goal, or a realistic maximum allowable sale quantity, at both the unit level as well as forest-wide was determined to not be relevant to the intent of the indicator. Because harvest volumes are clearly below sustainable levels the recalculation of harvest levels is not critical to achieving conformance.
1.1.5	This indicator is not applicable. The phrase “assumptions in harvest plans” within the indicator was interpreted to involve silvicultural treatments that drive the calculation of the long-term harvest levels. There was no allowable cut effect in the overall growth and annual allowable harvest calculations referenced in 1.1.4 above, which is no longer treated as a goal but instead is a maximum. Instead, the team attempted to assess the intent of the indicator given the current management context. For future pilot studies or possible actual certification assessments a revised indicator might be more appropriate. Current harvests are conducted as projects, which are derived from watershed assessments and which are designed in the framework of ecosystem management. Harvest plans include descriptions of follow-up treatments, often including pre-commercial treatments (hand felling of trees or slashing /grinding of trees) and underburns. Certification field audit during June, 2006 revealed extensive and quite impressive follow up fuels treatments including hand or machine felling, slash-busting, and controlled slash reduction burns are conducted.
2.1.1	Document review confirmed indicator is met. The planning and execution of vegetation management treatments requires a prescription signed by a Certified Silviculturist. Details of the prescription (planting or natural regeneration) are documented and must be complete before any regeneration harvest is started.
2.1.2	Confirmed during certification field audit June, 2006. Prescriptions described in 2.1.1 above include planting density, thresholds for additional action, species appropriate to the site, and proportions of species. Stocking surveys are conducted at years 1, 3, and 5, and additional surveys can be commissioned as needed. Survey results are reported to managers annually. In 2004 the first-year survey showed 62% survival, and the third-year survey result was 69%. Planting levels are often above target or goal, allowing for some mortality so that goal can still be attained. Interview of forester for one site confirmed a target for 100-150 trees per acre established; actually planted with 200, immediate resurvey after one year, will keep surveying for five years. When fell below, they would schedule additional planning
2.1.3	Confirmed during certification field audit June, 2006 that exotics are not planted.

Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

2.1.4	Confirmed during certification field audit June, 2006 at all sites visited that all desirable trees, including desirable young trees, are protected during treatments. Throughout the unit at this time the silvicultural problem is too much natural regeneration of species not adapted to the long-term fire regime.
2.1.5	Composition and structure goals are driving silvicultural decisions, and a thorough multi-disciplinary analysis is conducted for every silvicultural treatment, as mandated by NEPA and confirmed by review of EAs for all sales visited and other sales not visited. There is documented invasion by white fir into sites where it is not well-adapted and where it contributes to forest health and fire protection problems described elsewhere in this matrix. See Indicator 2.4.2.
2.2.1	Exceeds the Standard: Chemicals are only used for noxious weed control, and are not used in normal silviculture. These chemicals have proven to be more effective than mechanical treatment or hand-pulling.
2.2.2	The Fremont-Winema National Forests currently use only picloram, glyphosate, and dicamba which are modern, narrow spectrum chemicals, and only for invasive plants.
2.2.3, 2.2.5, 2.2.6	Fremont-Winema National Forests contract for all chemical applications, using state-certified applicators. Forest Service's Botanist in charge is also state-certified. During application the full range of appropriate BMPs are employed, based on interviews and review of contracts.
2.2.4	Confirmed during audit that Fremont-Winema National Forests minimize chemical use by using less than label-rates. Track use in database. Post-application follow-up. All treatments are ground-based, or involve hand-application.
2.3.1	There is a soils layer within the GIS system, as confirmed through review of GIS
2.3.2	The Fremont-Winema National Forests and the US Fish and Wildlife Service have a ten-year grazing consultation that includes extensive monitoring protocols that are still being worked out. Presentation by Mike Neville, Forest Range Program Manager, interviews with grazing program staff, review of some monitoring data, and field observations confirm that range resource conditions are improving, with notable improvements in some riparian areas (willows and other indicator plants increasing in size and coverage). Biological opinions and mandatory annual reports to USFWS track and monitor impacts of grazing on soils. In the area of harvesting, soils scientists are involved in the preparation of prescriptions, review of ongoing harvests, and post-harvest mitigation, which effectively minimizes soils compaction.
2.3.3	Confirmed the use of erosion control measures to minimize the loss of soil and site productivity. Fremont-Winema National Forests has a Forest Hydrologist Program Manager. The Zone Biologists position was vacant for several years but was recently filled covering Bly and Lakeview Ranger Districts (Southeast Zone). Interviewed Dave Panecek, Forest Hydrologist, who provides analysis and support for projects (including timbersales). Also interviewed Desi Zamudo, Soil Scientist who provided an overview of his activities: as part of normal project planning samples to see if there is growth-limiting compaction; reviews restoration projects working with sale administration group. Reviewed Region 6 Handbook: General Water Quality Best Management

Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

	Practices, Pacific Northwest Region, November 1988, which provides a comprehensive “menu” of potential BMPs for particular projects. Specialists devise a customized set of BMPs for each proposed activity, including timber management, road construction, fire suppression, fuels management, watershed management, mining, recreation, vegetation management, or range management. Confirmed during certification field audit June, 2006 that erosion control measures are included in this customized set of BMPs for all forest management activities.
2.3.4	Confirmed conformance during certification field audit June, 2006 by field observations at all sites visited. Logging is nearly always ground-based, using track-mounted feller-bunchers and whole-tree grapple skidders. Trees are processed on the landing, so that slash is removed from the forest and concentrated in loading areas where it can easily be treated (normally burned). Any steep ground is helicopter yarded; cable yarding is not used. Staff stated that there is ample acreage of treatable land using locally-available, ground-based equipment. A strong emphasis is placed on prevention and management of rutting. While whole-tree logging is used to reduce fuel loads, and there is no monitoring of nutrient loss, the team concluded that these methods are sustainable because they are planned for one time only, with goal of re-introducing fire.
2.3.5	Field observations during readiness review and certification field audit June, 2006 confirmed the retention of vigorous trees consistent with silvicultural standards.
2.3.6	Confirmed during scoping audit November, 2006 and certification field audit June, 2006. Reviewed Region 6 Handbook: General Water Quality Best Management Practices, Pacific Northwest Region, November 1988, which provides a comprehensive “menu” of potential BMPs for particular projects. Specialists devise a customized set of BMPs for each proposed activity, including timber management, road construction, fire suppression, fuels management, watershed management, mining, recreation, vegetation management, or range management. Erosion control measures are included in this customized set of BMPs for all forest management activities.
2.3.7	Confirmed minimized road construction to meet management objectives efficiently. New roads are not constructed, with limited reconstruction of older, closed out road spurs. A Fremont-Winema National Forests “Roads Analysis” is nearing completion. According to Forest Service staff experts “without purchaser roads credits the current roads system is not affordable”. Over the past 10 years FW roads budget has been reduced by 75%. Focus on higher quality roads, including Class 4 and 5 (surfaced) and Class 3 (passenger vehicle-ready gravel), where 98% of road budget is spent. One result of reduced budget is that roads are not graded as often as in the past. According to the Jerry Panter, Lead Project Engineer, there is little road construction activity associated with timber sales. Confirmed by review of project documents and field observations of numerous decommissioned roads. Most of the activity involves decommissioning roads. In November of 2005 a new All-terrain vehicle (ORV) travel rule went into effect for entire Forest Service in which routes must be designated and use restricted to these routes. Designation of routes is to be done at the local (forest-wide) level, but will be site specific (i.e. specific - mapped - roads/trails/areas may be open for use). Confirmed roads analysis and during certification field audit June, 2006.

Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

2.4.1	<p>A program exists to protect forests from damaging agents, but there are challenges in implementation (see Major Gap in 2.4.2 below). There is a large and well-funded fire program, but over time this has led to unnatural high levels of biomass, contributing to forest stress. Specialists in forest pathology and entomology are available to provide advice and help design treatments. Confirmed that forests are flown annually and that a map showing areas of affected trees is produced (2005 Aerial Insect and Disease Survey for the USGS 100K Quad: Lakeview - A142120; 5N). This map and ground-based reconnaissance efforts help determine the need for salvage and sanitation harvests.</p>
2.4.2	<p>Major Gap: 72% of the stands in the unit are overstocked, leading to high risk of uncharacteristically severe, stand-replacing wildfire or insect infestation. In spite of progress that has been made, the audit team was not provided convincing evidence of a plan (including a timeline and resources needed) to address this overstocking and restore forest health. The “National Fire Plan” (see http://www.fireplan.gov/) is partially responsive, as is the “Fremont-Winema National Forests Five Year Action Plan for Acceleration of Vegetative Treatments to Improve Condition Class, May 19, 2004”. These plans do not include priorities, a timeline, and sufficient resources, nor are they specific to the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit.</p> <p>The Fremont-Winema National Forests and the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit have a significant forest health challenge involving overstocked stands resulting from long-term fire-exclusion policies. 72% of the stands in the unit are overstocked, leading to high risk of uncharacteristically severe, stand-replacing wildfire or insect infestation. Mixed conifer stands and the upper portions of the ponderosa pine type are characterized by having too much white fir. Invasion by white fir into sites where it is not well-adapted contributes to forest health and fire protection issues.</p> <p>The team saw insect maps showing that mountain or western pine beetle infestations have gotten started in the Lodgepole pine (natural, cyclic), and then are starting to spread into the pine-mixed conifer belt and even into the ponderosa pine areas, due to invasion of these lower vegetation bands by fir. These unnatural stand configurations are causing competition stress and create ladder fuels and unnaturally high fuel loading. These problems are decades in the making, due largely to fire exclusion, and will not be solved in one year or even within several years.</p> <p>Staffing levels and the long, expensive, harvest planning process can delay needed treatments, in some cases until after stands are unhealthy. There have been few green tree harvests in recent years, as staff time and planning resources have been devoted to salvage efforts following major fires in 1998, 2000, 2002, and 2004. This has prevented the implementation of needed thinning and other treatments that would have served to maintain or improve forest health. The pace of restoration treatments is set by federal funding and is limited by social acceptance of these dramatic treatments. Recently the forest has prioritized green-tree harvesting, and the pace of treatment appears to be accelerating somewhat.</p>

Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

	<p>The forest and the unit do have many demonstrated strengths in the management of forests to promote healthy forest conditions. A variety of management tools are used to manage and promote healthy stand conditions, including thinning, fuels treatments, treating stumps with Borax to prevent infection by decay causing organisms, and sanitation and salvage harvests. Restoration treatments in ponderosa stands to allow the reintroduction of fire and thinning of mixed conifer stands to eliminate ladder fuels are perhaps the most important tools, and the unit has received an increase in funding in recent years to implement these treatments. The capability of Forest Service staff and of local contractors to plan and implement the initial treatments, and of Forest Service fire staff to implement follow up underburns or maintenance burns, have all increased significantly in recent years.</p>
2.4.3	<p>There is a large and well-funded fire program in place on the forest which conducts many treatments in the unit, and is well-prepared to control wildfire. This Forest Service fire program is organized to coordinate effectively with fire prevention and control programs of state and other federal agencies. Federally funded fuels treatment projects can and do include adjacent private lands (Whitten amendment), where agreements are reached and where a demonstrable benefit is provided to federal lands.</p>
2.5.1, 11.1.4	<p>Seed sources are tracked, and plantings are done using local seed sources. There is no use of biotechnology or genetically improved planting stock (Products of tree improvement programs in which the parent trees were selected through Mendelian crosses for increased growth, pest resistance, or other desirable characteristics). Fremont-Winema National Forests has specific trees determined to be 'genetically superior' from which seeds are collected and seed orchards derived from those superior trees. Seeds keyed to elevation and other parameters are grown out in the nursery when there is a reforestation need. Staff indicated that it has recently been difficult to maintain nurseries on a large scale due to reduced planting</p>
3.1.1	<p>Minor Gap: A seasonal stream intersects a passenger-vehicle road (038) and does not have a culvert crossing the road at right angles, as per Forest Service road design and maintenance standards. Instead the stream flows in the uphill road ditch to a culvert crossing. This culvert outflows into a drainage that runs into the upper side of a recent major debris slide. It is possible that the stream water contributed to the slide, although evidence of significant landslide potential is evident.</p> <p>A local set of BMPs specific to the Fremont National Forests was derived from a larger set of BMPs developed by the Forest Service. Specialists then develop site-specific, customized BMPs for each project including timber sales, roads, vegetation treatments, and other issues. Timber sale officers (COR) implement BMPs. Sale administrator or contract officers conduct regular inspections, which are recorded in "daily dairies". Fremont-Winema National Forest has a Forest Hydrologist Program Manager and the Zone Hydrologist, position covering Bly and Lakeview Ranger Districts (Southeast Zone) was recently filled. These specialists assist in the design and follow-up monitoring of a variety of stream restoration projects. A forest level soil scientist is available to review projects and assist with monitoring, supplements by two staff from the ecological land unit survey team that help with projects when their regular funding is short. There is a hydrologist on the Lakeview District that also deals with soils issues. "In-Fish" standards for east-side</p>

Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

	forests mandate a 300 foot per side no-entry buffer on fish-bearing streams. Science is starting to reveal that some harvesting in buffers might be good, because historic Aspen-Sedge-Willow riparian vegetation are being lost to Conifer encroachment.
3.1.2	Each project has customized provisions that address soil erosion, compaction (see also notes under 2.3.3 and 3.1.1). During project analysis specialists identify BMPs that are needed to protect water quality. They then make the applicable BMPs site-specific by covering them in site analysis or part of contract clauses (c-clauses). Fremont-Winema National Forests has a MOU with Oregon Department of Environmental Quality as to how the Forest Service will address BMPs, TMDLs, and other regulations across the entire Forest Service Region 6.
3.1.3	Confirmed by reviewing selected contracts that provisions for wet weather events are included in sale contracts and in sale administration procedures. Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit is generally dry, although some soils are sensitive to compaction. During the project planning process careful analysis is done regarding soils and sensitivity to treatment, and acceptable operating conditions are included in all contracts for work. This applies to timber sale contracts and to contracts for restoration work.
3.1.4	Interviews indicated that the unit's staff recently began to implement BMP monitoring, and that they are starting to do implementation and effectiveness monitoring on a project by project basis. BMP monitoring is conducted and a report is issued.
3.2.1	Fremont-Winema National Forests has a Forest Hydrologist Program Manager and one Zone Hydrologist recently filled covering Bly and Lakeview Ranger Districts (Southeast Zone).
3.2.2	Fremont-Winema National Forests has an extensive GIS, and maps observed include riparian and wetlands features.
3.2.3	Interviews, document review and field observations at all sites visited confirmed the implementation of plans to manage or protect streams, lakes and other water bodies.
3.2.4	Review of GIS system and maps, as well as project-level documentation, confirms the identification and protection of nonforested wetlands, including bogs, fens, vernal pools and marshes of significant size.
3.2.5	(See notes under 2.3.3). N.A. because BMPs do exist. Have a MOU with Oregon Department of Environmental Quality as to how the Forest Service will address BMPs, TMDLs, and other regulations across the entire Forest Service Region 6.
4.1.1	NEPA-required assessments cover wildlife issues extensively, including biological diversity, habitat types, species requirements, and ecological community types at various spatial scales. Watershed analysis discusses ecological processes, disturbance regimes, common plants & animals Project level plans assess conditions at a smaller scale
4.1.2	T&E species protections are extensive and well-implemented. NEPA-required assessments include comparisons against "Historic Range of Variation". In eastside screens, current conditions for riparian, ecosystem, and wildlife are compared against historic conditions, along with recovery processes. Field biologists all

Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

	<p>readily aware of sources of information; watershed analysis, historic inventory data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management activities take clear consideration of existing species, • When survey's or databases show existence of species, management activities are taken • Zones have been created (BEMA's, etc.) Goshawk protection zones • Old growth areas are obligated for certain species (Marten, etc.) • Forest managers take care of downstream fish species (warner sucker, red banded trout) • Biologists and experts are on staff for consultation • Rare plant community protection zones are implemented
4.1.3	<p>Confirmed through interviews, document review, and field observations that this requirement to locate and protect known sites of critically imperiled and imperiled species is exceeded. Interview with Sara Malaby, Botanist confirmed that she has reviewed database for G1 and G2 species. Forest Service specialists have access to and use existing databases, but also conduct many surveys to add to existing knowledge. When survey's or databases show existence of species, appropriate conservation-oriented management activities are taken. Management activities take clear consideration of existing species before making recommendations</p>
4.1.4	<p>Stand-level habitat elements are addressed in plans for treatment areas, with biologists and experts on staff involved in planning and consultation. Field observations at all sites visited confirmed that these criteria are implemented, with ample structural retention incorporated into all harvest areas. Biologists are well-informed about regionally-appropriate science, although some of the fisheries-related requirements appear to be unduly oriented to science from the west side of the Cascade Mountains.</p>
4.1.5	<p>The Forest Service has designed and implemented a system of Research Natural Areas (RNAs) based on a regional analysis of conservation needs, which conforms to the landscape scale assessment. The Fremont-Winema National Forests were asked to help fill specific gaps. Watershed assessments are conducted throughout the forest, including wildlife and biodiversity considerations, which cover Forest Service and private lands within the forest. Assessments include comparisons against "Historic Range of Variation", usually composed from accumulated professional knowledge and outside research (GTR's from Fish and Wildlife); legacy information is also available and routinely used.</p>
4.1.6	<p>Old growth areas are designated in the forest-wide plan. Some of these areas can be managed for old-growth development, and others are off limits. Forest Service has many areas of designated old growth, and is the leader in such efforts.</p>
4.1.7	<p>The forest coordinates its weed control issues with counties, RAC, Lake County Weed Control. Interviewed Sara Malaby, Fremont-Winema National Forests' Botanist and confirmed the existence of a "Native Plant Guide" and an "Invasive Species Prevention Practices" guide. Region 6 recently completed its EIS for invasive plant programs, so Fremont-Winema National Forests staff is working on their EIS that will tier down from the regional document.</p> <p>Confirmed that all contracts require equipment to be washed when equipment is being transferred to or from a known source. Confirmed that this policy is rigidly enforced, with exception allowed when a federal employee can confirm that the</p>

Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

	equipment came from a known non-infested area.
4.1.8	There is a large and well-funded fire program. This program is organized to coordinate effectively with fire prevention and control programs of state and other federal agencies. Confirmed through review of project documents and Field observations at many sites visited during the Readiness Review that prescribed under burns are prescribed and implemented, generally following mechanical fuels treatments. This forest restoration approach has received increasing funding in recent years and appears to have broad public support. See also indicator 2.4.2.
4.2.1	Confirmed through interviews, document review, and field observations that this requirement is met. Forest Service has access to and uses existing databases including the listing of G1 and G2 species and communities, but also conducts many surveys to add to existing knowledge.
4.2.2	The NEPA-driven process for all decisions regarding management actions includes a scoping step, a review of relevant science, and Forest Service reviews and participation by a wide range of disciplinary experts. The Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit has on staff or available at the forest or regional level a range of expertise and staff are well-trained and regularly participate in science-based training (see 10.1.3).
5.1.1, 5.1.2	No adverse aesthetics were observed aside from legacy clearcuts or legacy salvage operations; overstocked stands and juniper may be considered non-aesthetic by some viewers, and this issue is pervasive here. The previously mentioned restoration treatments are gradually addressing this issue, and are carried out in a way that is deemed acceptable to very-involved local and regional citizens including the Lakeview Advisory Group. Visual concerns entered into forest management plan; at one time had a Landscape Architect on staff to manage visual effects. Defined visual quality corridors also exist.
6.1.1	The array of activities associated with the management and protection of , geologically, historically, or culturally important lands clearly exceeds the standard. Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit has specialists in wildlife, soils, botany, biology, fisheries, hydrology, silviculture, engineering and environmental analysis. Review of organizational chart confirmed numerous specialists, although specialist positions are often left open for extended periods. Much of the emphasis in the project planning process (which is very deep and broad) is on finding unique and special areas and ensuring that special sites, features, and resources are protected. Fremont-Winema National Forest employs a Forest Archeologist and Heritage Program Manager responsible for ensuring that forest activities do not degrade cultural values and sites. He works with Klamath Tribes, seeking information prior to conducting surveys, sharing information gained through surveys, and working to manage potential project impacts. Old growth forests are identified and protected, mapped and catalogued. There is a program for identifying cultural resources, cultural identification extensively addressed in the tribe MOU; did extensive survey in the 90's where anything over 50 years was considered historic. Although there is no formal program to survey for unique plant communities, this is done informally.
6.1.2	There is an opportunity to improve methods for retrieval of special-site information. Confirmed that special sites are mapped, listed in plans (except for cultural sites that must be kept confidential) and have special management prescriptions.

Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

	<p>Reviewed “Sycan Wild and Scenic River Plan”. List of “Management Areas Within Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit” contains 36 categories of special sites ranging from the 5,213 acre Gearhart Mountain wilderness to 26 acres of Special Management Areas within Mule Deer Winter.</p> <p>Many categories of “management areas” exist, such as semi-primitive roadless areas, deer winter range, visual corridors, eagle management areas. These are mapped in the forest plan, cataloged, and special treatments described in written documents. Currently are implementing the “FAUNA” database to organize information and allow staff to query for special sites. Confirmed GIS ability to map special management areas. Some information on special sites is kept in old paper files that some new staff are unfamiliar with.</p>
7.1.1	<p>OFI: There is an opportunity for improvement in small log utilization within the unit. (Note: Letters below correspond to letters of the indicator.)</p> <p>A. Confirmed landings are left clean with little waste; during certification field audit June, 2006</p> <p>B. Field observations of utilization at all sites visited showed that not all residues are distributed, but slash and non-utilized portions of harvested commercial timber trees are moved to the landing, piled, and burned, due to fire prevention needs.</p> <p>C. not providing incentives for utilization; using the contract hammer instead</p> <p>D. Lakeview unit works closely with Freemont Sawmill.</p> <p>E. Merchandizing opportunities are limited by local markets. Freemont Sawtimber is the only buyer with ability to process material within the unit, and thus has preference; they won’t purchase sale if merchantability specs are not what they want. Forest Service usually revises and rebids sale rather than offer it outside of the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit Markets for small logs (under 10 inches) and for smaller trees and portions of trees harvested for logs are quite limited in the unit, with preference given to the Freemont Sawmill located in Lakeview. Observed example of small diameter upper logs that buyer did not want. Forest Service required it be decked, and recently sold it for firewood.</p> <p>F., H: Fremont-Winema National Forest staff members are working extensively with firms and organizations that are seeking to develop biomass markets. The Forest Service would provide a significant portion of the biomass for a plant in Lakeview. Forest Service does not have a good handle on volumes that it could assure would be available, although a region-wide project (CROP) is attempting to project fiber offerings from forests in the region. Issues with length of contracts are difficult, and thus most biomass plants in other regions have not worked closely with the Forest Service. effort to commercialize juniper, has produced some flooring, furniture, art products</p> <p>The following discussion is from http://www.fs.fed.us/r6/frewin/projects/cert/fsc.shtml (FSC 5.2.b) "The Forest is currently working with several parties to define the feasibility of a power generation plant in Lakeview using otherwise non-commercial wood materials. In the past, the forest has put considerable effort in to commercializing juniper and encouraging further manufacturing of raw lumber. According to the State of Oregon the following secondary manufacturing firms in Lakeview are using wood from the unit in limited amounts: Tumbleweed Woodworks and McFarland Door. The ability to</p>

Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

	<p>economically process smaller diameter thinnings and fuels treatment residuals depends in large part on the ability to dispose of or market processing residuals (e.g. bark, sawdust, chips and shavings.). Without a market or use for the processing residuals a sawmill cannot function or survive. Fremont Sawmill uses a portion of its residuals in boilers (bark, sawdust, chips), and ships other residuals to Collins Products hardboard and particle board plants in Klamath Falls. (Note: links to commercial websites are provided for informational purposes only and imply no endorsement of any kind by the U.S. Forest Service). "</p> <p>Non-timber forest products (NTFP) harvested include: post and poles, firewood, Christmas trees, landscaping rock, mushrooms (very little in the unit), and boughs. Generally, Fremont-Winema National Forests respond to people who want these products, but doesn't market to them (there are limited resources to search out NTFP's and develop markets for them). Limited money is provided for NEPA or environmental analysis for NTFPs, but there is a firewood NEPA forest-wide. Forest Service is required to prepare a categorical exclusion for minor harvests when these harvests are not already part of the plan.</p> <p>G.: Foresters note utilization in daily logs of harvest inspections frequent inspections of utilization are conducted</p>
9.1.1	The US Forest Service has a separate research branch that conducts research into all of the listed subjects. Confirmed Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit supports such research by designating Research Natural Areas and by providing sites for research and assisting in some of the work.
9.2.1	<p>(Note: Letters below correspond to letters of the indicator.)</p> <p>A. and B. are met through Forest Service's Forest Inventory and Analysis (FIA) program.</p> <p>C. FS in the east funds BMP monitoring. TNC/FS/BLM monitoring of shared grazing allotment is publicly available. D. Not applicable - Forest Service has a separate State and Private Forestry Program to provide such assistance. A related issue, the forest coordinates its weed control issues with counties, RAC, Lake County Weed Control.</p>
10.1.1, 10.2.1 12.2.1, 12.5.1	<p>Major Gap: Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit and the Fremont-Winema National Forests have not committed to the SFI Program and are not involved with the Oregon SIC at this time.</p> <p>Note that these indicators involve SFI-specific activities that would be expected to occur in concert with the SFI Committee.</p>
10.1.2	Major Gap: Other than the forest planner, foresters and specialists have not received specific assignments for implementation of SFI requirements.
10.1.3	OFI: There is an opportunity to improve the awareness of and ability to utilize FIA data on the forest that is collected by and managed by regional Forest Service staff. Tested and confirmed staff education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities by asking selected personnel for their training records. Interviewed several senior managers. Confirmed that all professionals are required to develop and implement "Individual Development Plans". Staff education and training generally quite impressive. Fire training is quite rigorously tracked and managed.

Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

	<p>Beyond fire, training record system (TIPS) is not reliable, according to interviews. Others told us that the USFS no longer tracks training at the organizational level. Individuals maintain their own training records, and have a strong motivation to do so, for they must prove their credentials in order to qualify for new positions. Maintenance training has a higher priority than skill development training. Currently, budgets are maintained at the forest level, overall, not at the district level. However, there is no training budget per se, it is built into the project work plans. Individual development plans are supposed to be kept current, but may not be. Line item for training in each work plan, except for fire program which has a very structured approach. Otherwise, training budgets are quite disbursed across projects. Specialties that have certification programs include silviculture; various types of fire management officers, which are moving towards more stringent education requirements; contract officers, especially timber sale personnel, service and supply contracting officers. Many positions have positive education requirement, tied to the GS-level. Other jobs have follow-up. Management systems may not be in place to allow managers to easily ensure that staff training is sufficient to roles and responsibilities. Cultural awareness training is required of all Forest Service employees, and have extensive experience working cooperatively with tribes on many different projects. Confirmed MOU with Klamath Tribes. Safety is emphasized with formal and informal training, and there are staff safety specialists. All staff who work on EAs (most professional staff) received training "1900-1 Forest Plan Training".</p>
10.1.4	<p>Major Gap: There is no skill, training, or experience requirement for timber harvesters.</p> <p>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 moves towards more and more restoration contracting. 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.</p>
10.2, 10.2.1	<p>The Forest Service has a separate State and Private Forestry Program to provide such assistance, although no evidence was provided that such program involves logger training. Note that the single indicator involves SFI-specific activities that would be expected to occur in concert with the SFI Committee. Thus there is a Major Gap for the indicator, but conformance for the Performance Measure.</p>
11.1.1	<p>Confirmed that all relevant laws and regulations are available on USDA Forest Service web sites, and are updated regularly.</p>
11.1.2	<p>Confirmed Fremont-Winema National Forest employs Environmental Coordinators at Ranger District and forest-wide levels to ensure that laws and regulations are complied with. The focus of this work is on compliance with the NEPA process, but compliance with all regulations and laws is included.</p>
11.1.3	<p>Reviewed MOU between USDA Forest Service and Oregon Dept. of Environmental Quality To Meet State and Federal Water Quality Rules and Regulations.</p> <p>Confirm during certification field audit June, 2006.</p>

Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

	Contacted Oregon Department of Environmental Quality. Working on TMDL, Lost Creek, etc.
11.2.1	Reviewed policies listed in indicator, and all are covered. Confirmed that service contracts contain many clauses for social laws. Confirmed government –to-government interaction with Klamath Tribes; Union representation; strong emphasis on health and safety; require contractors to meet state OSHA; demographics of the staff highly diverse; contracts maintain social clause laws; NEPA and FOIA maintain high level of transparency
12.1	Exceeds the Standard: The forest service has a long record of leadership in sustainable forestry, and the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit is involved in many activities that continue and extend that tradition. The close working relationship between unit staff and the ad hoc Lakeview Stewardship Group, and the resulting on-the-ground results are a model of federal-citizen partnership in the application of sustainable forestry in a difficult working environment
12.1.1	Major Gap: There is currently no involvement with the Oregon SFI Implementation Committee (SIC). The Forest Service has a separate State and Private Forestry Program to provide such assistance in private forest management. Local Forest Service personnel are involved in the Resources and People (RAP) Camp.
12.1.2	OFI: There is an opportunity to improve in the area of landowner assistance documents for use in SFI information packets. Confirmed that a variety of informational materials have been developed with Fremont-Winema National Forests support. Forest Service also has a separate State and Private Forestry Program to provide such assistance.
12.1.3	Forest Service has a separate State and Private Forestry Program to provide such assistance. Lakeview Stewardship Group, Watershed Assessments that include all lands within the watershed, and the NEPA-related process all help build regional understanding and information about efforts and methods that can help restore altered habitats, particularly forests affected by past fire exclusion and streams affected by past uncontrolled grazing.
12.1.4	The Forest Service has a separate State and Private Forestry Program which administers the Forest Legacy Program. Working forest/ranch lands owned by TNC in the region (outside of the unit) are supported by cooperative research, analysis, planning, and management (range management for shared allotments).
12.1.5	Confirmed Forest Service involvement in the Northwestern Fire Learning Network, and support and involvement with the Sprague Watershed (landscape-scale) Project, which is on a small portion of the unit. Confirmed that the “Evaluate our Service” link on all Forest Service web sites. A related issue, the forest coordinates its weed control issues with counties, RAC, Lake County Weed Control. Confirmed that Fremont-Winema National Forests personnel are knowledgeable about many regional conservation planning and priority-setting efforts that include a broad range of stakeholders and that they consider the results of these efforts in all planning and management activities. Lakeview Stewardship Group is one example (see 12.3.2 below).
12.2.1	Major Gap: Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit and the Fremont-Winema National Forests have not committed to the SFI Program and are not involved with the

Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

	<p>Oregon SIC at this time.</p> <p>Although Forest Service has a separate State and Private Forestry Program to provide assistance to private landowners, this indicator involves SFI-related activities.</p>
12.2.2	<p>Observed a diversity of quality informational brochures in all three Forest Service offices located within the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit. Staff interviews confirmed frequent programs within schools, availability of resource-related coloring books and other educational materials, involvement with field trips for schools, free fishing day, Resources and People Camps, Fun with Fungi, and frequent informational tours for a variety of groups.</p>
12.2.3	<p>Exceeds the Standard: Confirmed through field inspections, interviews, review of plans, and review of recreation brochures that Forest Service has a very strong recreation program, and that this program is of equal importance to forest management, beyond when convenient for timber management. Extensive networks of trails, campgrounds, a well-designed and generally well-maintained passenger-vehicle road system, and good web-based and printed documentation of recreation opportunities exist, although the quality of this system is threatened by funding limitations.</p> <p>Fremont-Winema National Forest employ 2 Lands and Minerals Realty Specialists who routinely authorize special use permits to allow for special recreational events such as family group camps, festivals, camping events. No tribal requests on Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit recently.</p> <p>Off-highway vehicle planning has begun, and improved maps and information regarding public OHV opportunities (including a map) will be added to the current effort to highlight recreational opportunities throughout the unit and the forests.</p>
12.3.1 12.3.2	<p>Exceeds the Standard: USDA Forest Service has a comprehensive set of public involvement procedures that are well-known to the public and to interest groups. Confirmed that these procedures are utilized in the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit, the Fremont-Winema National Forest, at all levels of planning and project implementation. Reviewed 36 CFR Part 215: Notice, Comment, and Appeal Procedures for National Forest System Projects and Activities, an “Administrative practice and procedure that applies to all National forests”. Goal of Forest Service Chief is to involve the public early, and to obtain meaningful input without preconceived notions. Even for Categorical Exclusions there is a requirement to notify the public (SOPA) notify the interested parties, and solicit public comments and allow administrative appeal in some cases.</p> <p>Of note, a local advisory body, the Lakeview Stewardship Group is an exemplary public-private partnership that is a model for public involvement. Reviewed the “Long-Range Strategy for the Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit” prepared by the Lakeview Stewardship Group.</p>
12.4.1	<p>Exceeds the Standard: Activities that may affect tribal resources and sites are jointly planned by including tribal specialists and/or representatives on ID Teams. Fremont-Winema National Forests meet with tribes quarterly to discuss issues passed on the Schedule of Proposed Actions (SOPA). Jerry Haugan, Fremont-Winema National Forest Environmental Coordinator runs these meeting, and typical participants include Archeologist, District Rangers and their principal staff,</p>

Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

	<p>ROW and engineering representatives. Also consider “traditional cultural properties”, although tribe is reluctant to inform Forest Service where these may be. Fremont-Winema National Forest employs a Forest Archeologist and Heritage Program Manager. Confirmed through interview that he is responsible for ensuring that forest activities do not degrade cultural values and sites. He works with Klamath Tribes, seeking information prior to conducting surveys, sharing information gained through surveys, and working to manage potential project impacts. By law (Section 106), Forest Service must consider the effect of any undertaking on cultural values. In the 80s and 90s, tribes were mostly interested in hunting and firewood gathering, lithic scatter-sites of pre-historic obsidian gathering. Reviewed roads closely at first, over time expanding scope of inquiry. Surveys expanded to entire project area. Prioritize various parts of the projects based on probability (wet areas, rock outcrops, ridgelines). Rec-7 archeological technician training one week school to become “certified cultural resource technicians” who conduct surveys on the Fremont NF. Supplement by summer hire graduate students. Currently one at Silver Lake. Program is not as active as it once was. Fewer timber sales, so less need for field surveys. Mitigation options include logging over snow, avoidance, full-suspension logging. MOU with Klamath Tribes. Procedure to share draft SOPA one month in advance of release to public.</p>
12.5.1	<p>Major Gap: Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit and the Fremont-Winema National Forests have not committed to the SFI Program and are not involved with the Oregon SIC at this time.</p>
12.5.2	<p>Any request for information is channelled to the FOIA Officer, and a strong process is in place. All front offices (locations where the public can “walk in” and interact with the Forest Service) are staffed and equipped to provide information on recreation opportunities. Project-specific questions are directed to a specified contact for each project. Plan-related questions go to the Environmental Coordinator. Procedures are in place for taking correspondence and responding to it. Also confirmed that the NEPA process is a robust mechanism for responding to public concerns. Staff interviews and review of documents confirmed that the public input portion of the NEPA process includes a genuine and extensive effort to understand and respond to public concerns.</p>
12.6, 12.6.1	<p>Major Gap: Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit (or the Fremont-Winema National Forests or Forest Service) are not currently SFI Program Participants and thus do not participate in the SFI survey nor report annual to the SFI Program on compliance with the standard. All Program Participants receive a survey each year from AF&PA regarding a range of forest management and outreach activities. These surveys are reviewed as part of all SFI Audits. For a copy of the 2005 Survey for see http://www.aboutsfi.org/ .</p>
12.6.2	<p>Confirmed that despite not being involved in the SFI program, the categories of information needed to complete the survey are tracked.</p>
12.6.3	<p>Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit and the Fremont-Winema National Forests are not currently SFI Program Participants, and thus there are no past reports to maintain.</p>
13.1.1,	<p>Major Gap: Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit and the Fremont-Winema National</p>

Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

13.1.2, 13.1.3	<p>Forests are not currently SFI Program Participants, and thus have not developed a system for reviewing SFI-specific requirements, reporting information to management regarding progress in achieving SFI Standard objectives and performance measures, or to assess changes and improvements necessary to continually improve their SFI Program.</p> <p>As the unit has not adopted the SFI Standard the team initially considered the overall management system to place this indicator in context. The Fremont-Winema National Forest has a variety of methods to review programs and projects, including regular reviews at the ranger unit, forest, regional, and national levels. Monitoring programs are well-developed, cover a variety of resources including wildlife and fish populations, stream, riparian zone, soils, grazing impacts, and others. All forests in the National Forest System must implement an Environmental Management System before they can finalize their new forest plans, which for the Fremont-Winema National Forests will result in an EMS by 2009 or sooner. Environmental monitoring programs on the forest have ramped up recently, with data collection well ahead of analysis, and implementation monitoring further advanced than effectiveness monitoring. These monitoring programs are a critical part of the movement towards a fully-functioning adaptive management approach, which, when implemented, will further support the Forest Service's strengths in (internal) management review. The SFI-specific requirements are not included in the management review system.</p>
-------------------	---

Lakeview Stakeholder Contacts

Contacted & Responded

Surveys:

Mike Anderson, Lakeview Stewardship Group/The Wilderness Society
Bill Aney, Winema & Fremont Resource Advisory Committee
Dennis Becker, University of Minnesota
Rick Brown, Lakeview Stewardship Group/Defenders of Wildlife
Bill Duke, Winema & Fremont Resource Advisory Committee
Ian Hanna, Northwest Natural Resources Group
Clyde Hanson, Sierra Club (*declined to complete survey*)
Paul Harlan, Collins Companies
Doug Heiken, Oregon Natural Resources Council
Caro Johnson, Lake County Chamber of Commerce
Deanna Johnston, Chamber of Commerce
Chuck Kelley
Andy Kerr, Oregon Natural Resources Council
Wade Moseby, Collins Companies
Jane O'Keefee
Bill Hunt, Oregon Department of Forestry
Jim Walls, Lake County Resources Initiative
Kathy Rich, Klamath Tribes (*declined to complete survey*)
Cecilla Danks, former FSC-US Board Member and Chair

Interviews:

Tom Harris, Northwest Four Wheel Drive Association
Gretchen R. Burris, Recreation Planner, BLM Lakeview Resource Area
Dwayne Jones, Outfitter/Guide, retired Forest Service sales administrator
Keith Barnhardt: Outfitter/guide and active member of the Backcountry Horsemen of America
Mark Price, local mountain biker
Bob Hopper, Supervisory Rangeland Mgmt Specialist, BLM
Martin Lopez, M & N Reforestation
Ray Simms, Lakeview Town Manager
Bill Marlett, Director, Oregon Natural Deserts Association
Gary Johnson, Fremont Sawmill
James Dean, James Dean Construction
Cindy Deas, KLMS Recreation Working Group
Dick Leever, Region 6 Director of the Pacific NW 4WD Association
Dennis O'Leary, Mayor of Paisley

 Certification Dual Assessment Case Study - Lakeview Federal Stewardship Unit

Employees Interviewed

Tina Sazama, Union Member
 Catherine Callaghan, experience with recreational users
 Bob Gibbs, Contract Officer
 Larry Hills, USFS Trails Specialist, Lakeview
 Carrie O'Leary

Phone Calls:

Brad Winters, County Commissioner
 Frank Mitchum, Rosboro Lumber Co.
 Alan Jones, Forest Manager for Fort Bidwell
 Gene Cox, Stormtrooper Snowmobile Club
 Jay Goodwin, local mountain biker, rock climber: jgood1@centurytel.net, 947-5316 (emailed back, but no input)
 Charles Dill, Sales Administration, Ochoco National Forest
 Luis Coria, Coria Contracting
 Floyd Holbrook, EchoSystems Mgmt
 Steve Rajnus, contractor
 Noberto Cuevas, NCQ Reforestation

Interviews:

Gretchen R. Burris, Recreation Planner, BLM Lakeview Resource Area
 Dwayne Jones, retired sales administrator, outfitter/guide 541-943-3136, 6/7/06
 Keith Barnhardt: Outfitter/guide and active member of the Backcountry Horsemen of America; 947-5499, 6/7/06
 Mark Price, mtn biker, 6/7/06
 Bob Hopper, Supervisory Rangeland Mgmt Specialist, BLM: 947-6140, 6/7/06
 Martin Lopez, M & N Reforestation 6/8/06
 Larry Hills, USFS Trails Specialist, Lakeview
 Ray Simms, Lakeview Town Manager
 Bill Marlett, Director, Oregon Natural Deserts Association
 Gary Johnson, Fremont Sawmill 6/9/06
 James Dean, James Dean Construction 6/9/06
 Cindy Deas, KLMS Recreation Working Group 6/9/06
 Dick Leever, Region 6 Director of the Pacific NW 4WD Association 6/9/06
 Dick Leever
 Dennis O'Leary, Mayor of Paisley 6/14/06