

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

City of Astoria, Oregon

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

**CERTIFICATION REGISTRATION NUMBER
SCS-FM/COC-00053N**

Submitted to:

**City of Astoria
Public Works Department
City Hall
1095 Duane Street
Astoria, Oregon 97103
USA**

Lead Author: Sterling Griffin

Date of Field Audit: October 18-19, 2007

Date of Report: 1/14/08

Certified: 2/11/2008

By:

**SCIENTIFIC CERTIFICATION SYSTEMS
2200 Powell St. Suite Number 725
Emeryville, CA 94608, USA
www.scscertified.com**

SCS Contact: Dave Wager dwager@scscertified.com

City of Astoria Contact: Ken Cook kcook@astoria.or.us

Organization of the Report

This report of the results of our evaluation is divided into two sections. Section A provides the public summary and background information that is required by the Forest Stewardship Council. This section is made available to the general public and is intended to provide an overview of the evaluation process, the management programs and policies applied to the forest, and the results of the evaluation. Section A will be posted on the SCS website (www.scscertified.com) no less than 30 days after issue of the certificate. Section B contains more detailed results and information for the use of the City of Astoria, Oregon.

FOREWORD

Scientific Certification Systems, a certification body accredited by the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC), was retained by the City of Astoria, Oregon to conduct a recertification evaluation of its Astoria, Oregon USA forest estate. Under the FSC/SCS certification system, forest management operations meeting international standards of forest stewardship can be certified as “well managed”, thereby enabling use of the FSC endorsement and logo in the marketplace.

In October 2007, the company’s Senior Certification Forester was sent by SCS to conduct the evaluation. The auditor collected and analyzed written materials, conducted interviews and completed a one day field and office audit of the subject property as part of the certification evaluation. Upon completion of the fact-finding phase of the evaluation, the auditor determined conformance to the 56 FSC Criteria in order to determine whether award of recertification was warranted.

This report is issued in support of a recommendation to award FSC-endorsed certification to the City of Astoria, Oregon for the management of its Astoria, Oregon forest estate. In the event that a certificate is awarded, Scientific Certification Systems will post this public summary of the report on its web site (www.scs-certified.com).

Foreword.....	3
Section A- Public Summary and Background Information	5
1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION.....	5
1.1 FSC Data Request	5
1.2 Management Context	7
1.2.1 Environmental Context	8
1.2.2 Socioeconomic Context	8
1.3 Forest Management Enterprise	8
1.3.1 Land Use	8
1.3.2 Land Outside Scope of Certification.....	9
1.4 Management Plan.....	9
1.4.1 Management Objectives.....	9
1.4.2 Forest Composition.....	10
1.4.3 Silvicultural Systems	10
1.4.4 Management System.....	10
1.4.5 Monitoring System.....	10
1.4.6 Estimate of Maximum Sustainable Yield	10
1.4.7 Estimated, Current and Projected Production.....	11
1.4.8 Chemical Pesticide Use.....	11
1.5 SLIMF Qualifications	11
2.0 Guidelines/Standards Employed.....	11
3.0 THE CERTIFICATION ASSESSMENT PROCESS.....	11
3.1 Assessment Dates.....	11
3.2 Assessment Team.....	11
3.3 Assessment Process	12
3.3.1 Itinerary.....	12
3.3.2 Evaluation of Management System	12
3.3.5 Stakeholder Consultation	12
3.4 Total Time Spent on audit.....	14
3.5 Process of Determining Conformance	14
4.0 Results of the Evaluation	15
Table 4.1 Notable strengths and weaknesses of the forest management enterprise relative to the P&C.....	15
4.2 Preconditions.....	18
5.0 Certification Decision	18
5.1 Certification Recommendation	18
5.2 Initial Corrective Action Requests.....	18
6.0 Surveillance Evaluations.....	19
7.0 Summary of SCS Complaint and appeal Investigation Procedures.....	19

SECTION A- PUBLIC SUMMARY AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION
1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1 FSC Data Request

Applicant entity	City of Astoria, Oregon
Contact person	Ken Cook
Address	Public Works Department City Hall 1095 Duane Street Astoria, Oregon 97103 USA
Telephone	503-338-5173
Fax	
E-mail	kcook@astoria.or.us
Certificate Number	SCS-FM/COC-00053N
Certificate/Expiration Date	2/11/20080-02/11/2013
Certificate Type	<i>Single FMU</i>
SLIMF if applicable	<i>a low intensity SLIMF certificate</i>
Number of FMU's	<i>one</i>
Number of FMUs in scope that are	
less than 100 ha in area	#
100 - 1000 ha in area	#
1000 - 10 000 ha in area	#1
more than 10 000 ha in area	#
Location of certified forest area	
Latitude	<i>-123.83W</i>
Longitude	<i>46.188N</i>
Forest zone	<i>temperate,</i>
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is included in FMUs that:	
are less than 100 ha in area	
are between 100 ha and 1000 ha in area	
meet the eligibility criteria as <i>low intensity SLIMF FMUs</i>	<i>1495 ha</i>
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is:	
privately managed ¹	<i>ha or ac</i>
state managed	<i>ha or ac</i>
community managed ²	<i>ha or ac</i>
Number of forest workers (including contractors) working in forest within scope of certificate	15
Area of forest and non-forest land protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for conservation objectives	<i>Approximately 400 ac</i>
Area of forest protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for the production of NTFPs or services	

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

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

Area of forest classified as 'high conservation value forest'	36 ac
List of high conservation values present ³	HCV 4
Chemical pesticides used	none
Total area of production forest (i.e. forest from which timber may be harvested)	1095 ac
Area of production forest classified as 'plantation' for the purpose of calculating the Annual Accreditation Fee (AAF)	0
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by replanting ⁴	0
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by natural regeneration	1095 ac
List of main commercial timber and non-timber species included in scope of certificate (botanical name and common trade name)	Western hemlock, Sitka spruce, Douglas-fir, western red cedar, true fir, and red alder
Approximate annual allowable cut (AAC) of commercial timber	800 mbf
Approximate annual commercial production of non-timber forest products included in the scope of the certificate, by product type	0
List of product categories included in scope of joint FM/COC certificate and therefore available for sale as FSC-certified products (include basic description of product - e.g. round wood, pulp wood, sawn timber, kiln-dried sawn timber, chips, resin, non-timber forest products, etc.)	Round wood Pulp wood chips

Conversion Table English Units to Metric Units

Length Conversion Factors

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

Area Conversion Factors

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

Volume Conversion Factors

Volume

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

1 acre = 0.404686 hectares

1,000 acres = 404.686 hectares

³ High conservation values should be classified following the numbering system given in the ProForest High Conservation Value Forest Toolkit (2003) available at www.ProForest.net

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

1 board foot = 0.00348 cubic meters
1,000 board feet = 3.48 cubic meters
1 cubic foot = 0.028317 cubic meters
1,000 cubic feet = 28.317 cubic meters
Breast height = 1.4 meters, or 4 1/2 feet, above ground level

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

1.2 Management Context

As a municipal forest enterprise located in the Pacific Coast region, management of the Bear Creek Watershed is subject to a host of local, state and federal regulations. The principal regulations of greatest relevance to forest managers in the Pacific Coast region are associated with the following statutes:

Pertinent Regulations at the Federal Level:

- Endangered Species Act
- Clean Water Act (Section 404 wetland protection)
- Occupational Safety and Health Act
- National Historic Preservation Act
- Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act
- Americans with Disabilities Act
- U.S. ratified treaties, including CITES
- The Safe Drinking Water Act (SWDA)

Pertinent Regulations at State and Local Level:

- Oregon Forest Practices Act
- Oregon Endangered Species Act
- The Oregon Drinking Water Quality Act of 1981

Regulatory Context for State and Local Regulations:

Oregon has a forest practices act authorizing the development of regulations for statewide regulation of forest practices. The act serves as a statutory framework for a program that includes rules, technical assistance, and monitoring. Oregon's forest practices regulations cover the establishment, management and harvest of forest tree species, including such activities as road construction and maintenance, treatment of slash, reforestation, harvesting, and use of pesticides and fertilizers. The regulations primarily address issues raised in even-age silviculture, such as the need to establish a viable plantation of young trees after final harvest of the previous stand. For an operation primarily utilizing uneven-age silvicultural techniques, the regulations are most pertinent as they relate to road construction and maintenance, protection of riparian areas, and addressing wildlife (i.e., spotted owl) habitat requirements.

1.2.1 Environmental Context

The City of Astoria's watershed forest is located in the Willapa Hills ecoregion in the forested, rural landscape of northern Clatsop County. The Willapa Hills ecoregion is characterized by low rolling hills and mountains with medium gradient streams. Wickiup Mountain (elevation 2703 feet), which forms the eastern boundary of the watershed, was formed by basalt flows, and surrounding areas are underlain by the "Astoria Formation" of thick sandstone and other sedimentary rocks.

The City's forest experiences a coastal temperate climate strongly influenced by the Pacific Ocean and related weather patterns. Precipitation occurs mostly as rain and is estimated at between 100 and 110 inches per year, with summers being relatively dry.

Forests are highly productive, and surrounding lands are primarily in industrial forest production. Hampton Tree Farms owns large blocks of land immediately to the east of the watershed, and to the southwest, Weyerhaeuser is the primary owner. To the north and west, many non-industrial forest ownerships occur. A large unit of the Clatsop State Forest is less than a mile from the City's forest.

1.2.2 Socioeconomic Context

The Clatsop peoples inhabited the region encompassing the City of Astoria's watershed forest prior to European settlement. There are no remnants of that tribe in the region. The population of the larger Nicolai-Wickiup Watershed is concentrated in the lower elevations and is mostly associated with rural development. The City of Astoria has a population of approximately 10,000, and population has actually declined slightly over the past ten years. Declines in the fishing industry, which has always played an important role in Astoria, have occurred in recent years as well. Per capita personal income in Clatsop County in 1997 was \$21,176, slightly less than the average for all Oregon counties.

Since 1950, the population of Oregon has doubled. Historically, population growth in Oregon has been associated with shifts in natural resource industries. However, recent changes in population have shown a tendency to be associated with in-migration due to quality of life concerns. Population growth in the area attributed to in-migration is predicted to increase, leading to increased pressures and demands on natural resources such as water supply and water quality.

1.3 Forest Management Enterprise

1.3.1 Land Use

The focus of the evaluation was the 3,700-acre (1,498 ha) watershed forest owned by the City of Astoria, located approximately 10 miles southeast of the city in northern Clatsop County, Oregon. Often referred to as the Bear Creek Watershed, the forest actually includes

both the Bear Creek and Cedar Creek drainages. The City of Astoria owns additional forestlands (approximately 800 acres) in various parcels near the city and in other locations. Management of these other parcels was not within the scope of this evaluation.

The watershed forest is dominated by mixed softwoods on soils of sedimentary and volcanic origin. Western hemlock is the primary timber species, with Sitka spruce, Douglas-fir, silver fir, and western red cedar also occurring. Red alder is the dominant hardwood species, occurring primarily along streams. The land was owned by private timber companies, including Crown Zellerbach, until the 1950s, when the City of Astoria acquired title and full control of all lands within the watershed boundary. The forest was almost entirely logged in the 20-year period between the 1930s and 1950s.

Since the 1890s, the City of Astoria has used the water originating in the watershed to supply the municipality. In 1912, a concrete dam was built on Bear Creek, the major stream draining the watershed.

The forest is managed primarily for water quality and quantity, and forestry activities have been intermittent and of low impact. From 1984 to 1994, the City conducted a thinning program, harvesting approximately 1 million board feet each year. Since 1994, only a few relatively small harvests have occurred.

1.3.2 Land Outside Scope of Certification

The entire ownership is within the scope of the assessment.

1.4 Management Plan

1.4.1 Management Objectives

The management objectives for the Bear Creek Watershed Forest are described in the City's Forest Resource Management Plan, which is a controlling document for management of the forest. The overall goals for management of the forest are to:

- Provide the very best quality and greatest quantity of potable water for customers;
- Maintain a diversity of native tree and plant species, age classes, and stand composition;
- Protect unique areas to enhance the diversity of the forest;
- Contribute to the economic and social vitality of the communities and industries it serves through its primary resource, water, and secondary resource, timber.
- Produce forest products as a means of enhancing forest health and diversity without adversely affecting water quality or quantity.
- Support and enhance habitat for native wildlife, consistent with water quality objectives.
- Maintain an ecosystem with the capacity across the watershed for renewal, recovery from disturbances and retention of ecological diversity.

1.4.2 Forest Composition

Primarily hemlock and spruce at lower elevations, with Douglas-fir and silver fir becoming more prevalent at higher elevations. Red alder occurs primarily on the edge of the reservoirs and along streams. Western red cedar, once a dominant species in parts of the forest, now is a very minor component.

1.4.3 Silvicultural Systems

The primary method used in the past has been intermediate treatments (i.e., thinning) in young stands. This method was applied in the City's first thinning program, conducted between 1984 and 1994. The system used was even-age in nature, although the stands remained immature and thus never reached the stage where final harvest was prescribed. In 2000, the City conducted another thinning, also not designed as a regeneration harvest.

The current management plan envisions utilizing primarily uneven-age techniques, including single tree and group selection, to regenerate the forest. The overall approach can be described as structure-based management, where desired vertical structure and diversity is obtained through the selection system, with retention of older trees and snags.

1.4.4 Management System

The entire watershed property (1498 ha) is considered one Forest Management Unit. As a publicly owned municipal watershed property, management decisions ultimately are made by the Astoria City Council. The city has hired Mike Barnes, Consulting Forester, to write the management plan and provide direct management services for implementing the management plan. Mike works with Ken Cook, Public Works Director, to prepare service contract for management activities.

1.4.5 Monitoring System

The monitoring system uses a variety of formalized inventories along with continuous surveillance of the watershed by city employees. The formal monitoring activities include maintaining permanent plots, stand management records, timber inventories, and wildlife inventories. City employees patrol the watershed looking maintenance issues, forest disturbances, changes in roadside vegetation, and unauthorized activities. When any of the monitoring activities indicate the need for changes in the management, the management plan is modified to incorporate new strategies.

1.4.6 Estimate of Maximum Sustainable Yield

The calculated allowable annual cut (AAC) for the entire watershed is 4 million board feet (MMBF). Actual harvest has been substantially less than that. For the period 1984 to 1994, actual harvest was approximately 10 MMBF, or 1 MMBF per year (roughly converted from tonnage). Since 1994, total harvest has been less than 1 MMBF.

1.4.7 Estimated, Current and Projected Production

The forest was mostly regenerated in the 1950s and 1960s, so stands are typically now approaching 50 to 60 years old. Although the calculated AAC is 4 MMBF, the forest management plan calls for a conservative harvest level of no more than 20% of growth or 800,000 BF annually. Interviews with forest managers indicate that even this figure may not be reached, since the operating season is relatively brief (June through September) due to the rainy climate.

1.4.8 Chemical Pesticide Use

Because the City of Astoria manages the upper Bear Creek watershed primarily for domestic water, they have adopted a policy of no herbicide use in the basin

1.5 SLIMF Qualifications

The city is committed to harvesting no more than 20% or the mean annual increment each year. This qualifies the watershed property to be considered as a Small or Low-Intensity Managed Forest under the FSC SLIMF guidelines.

2.0 GUIDELINES/STANDARDS EMPLOYED

As the applicants group members' properties are located in California, the certification evaluation that is the subject of this report was conducted against the duly-endorsed FSC Pacific Coast Standard (v 9.0) The standard is available at the FSC-US web site (www.fscus.org) or is available, upon request, from Scientific Certification Systems (www.scscertified.com).

3.0 THE CERTIFICATION ASSESSMENT PROCESS

3.1 Assessment Dates

The office and field visit portion of the assessment occurred on October 18-19, 2007.

3.2 Assessment Team

Sterling Griffin, RPF #2805: Sterling Griffin is a Senior Certification Forester with Scientific Certification Systems. He is a Registered Professional Forester in the State of

California with 10 years professional experience in private and public forest management. He is a graduate of Purdue University with a B.S in Forestry and has conducted Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) endorsed assessments on over 6 million acres of forestland in North and South America. Recent FSC assessments have included public lands administered by Fort Lewis, WA Forestry Branch, Michigan DNR, Indiana DOF, New York DEC, Maryland DNR and numerous private operations in Maine, Pennsylvania, Oregon, Washington, and California. Prior to joining SCS, he was the founder of a private consulting firm in Northern California specializing in sustained yield management, fuels reduction, and forest health management. His professional career also includes silvicultural and ecosystem research for the U.S. Forest Service. Areas of research activities include stand level response to vegetative competition and Long-Term Ecosystem Productivity (LTEP) in the Pacific Northwest.

3.3 Assessment Process

3.3.1 Itinerary

October 18, 2007 – Field visit to the Watershed property

October 19, 2007 – Office visit and consultation

3.3.2 Evaluation of Management System

The process by which Scientific Certification Systems evaluated the systems employed by the City of Astoria entailed the following components:

- Use of Certification Forester with demonstrated credentials and expertise in forest certification, auditing protocols, forest management, wildlife management as well as a working knowledge of the forest types found in California.
- Review of pertinent documents.
- Interviews and review of written comments from a broad cross-section of stakeholders.
- Field reconnaissance of a broad array of forest conditions and past and present management activities that comprised the sample for the assessment.

3.3.5 Stakeholder Consultation

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

To solicit input from affected parties as to the strengths and weaknesses of the City of Astoria, relative to the standard, and the nature of the interaction between the company and the surrounding communities.

To solicit input on whether the forest management operation has consulted with stakeholders

regarding identifying any high conservation value forests.

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

- City of Astoria employees, including headquarters and field
- contractors
- adjacent property owners
- Pertinent Tribal members and or representatives
- Members of the Pacific Coast FSC Working Group/National Initiative
- FSC International
- Local and regionally-based environmental organizations and conservationists
- Local and regionally-based social interest organizations
- Forest industry groups and organizations
- Purchasers of logs harvested on City of Astoria forestlands
- Local, State and Federal regulatory agency personnel
- User groups, such as hikers, ATV users, and others
- Other relevant groups

Prior to, during, and following the site evaluation, a wide range of stakeholders from the regional area were consulted in regard to their relationship with the Sample Company, and their views on the management of the Sample Forest. Stakeholders included FSC contact persons, government and non-government organizations involved in forest management, local citizens and groups, employees, contractors, and others. Stakeholders were contacted with a notification mailing soliciting comment and/or phone contact. Comments were received via meetings and personal interviews “face-to-face”, phone interviews (“Interview”), and through written responses. Individuals or groups not offering feedback are labeled “no response” (“NR”). Additional comments may have been received from individuals not wishing to reveal their identities.

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

A summary of the comments on the standard and major perspectives and concerns expressed by the stakeholders that were consulted during the course of this evaluation include:

Comment/Concern	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is important to us that the City continue with FSC certification of the watershed property 	Comment Noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They seem to be managing the watershed primarily for water production purposes 	Comment Noted.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I would like to see more timber harvested on the property 	Timber harvest levels are consistent with overall resource management objectives.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City Forester really does a good job with the property 	Comment Noted.

3.4 Total Time Spent on audit

One auditor day was spent reviewing documents and conducting stakeholder interviews. Two auditor days were spent conducting the field visits and two days were spent writing the assessment report. In all, a total of 5 auditor days were spent assessing the City of Astoria for conformance with the FSC Pacific Coast Standard.

3.5 Process of Determining Conformance

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

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

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

Major CARs/Preconditions: Major non-conformances, either alone or in combination with non-conformances of other indicators, result (or are likely to result) in a fundamental failure to achieve the objectives of the relevant FSC Criterion given the uniqueness and fragility of each forest resource. These are corrective actions that must be resolved or closed out prior to award of the certificate. If major CAR's arise after an operation is certified, the timeframe for correcting these non-conformances is typically shorter than for minor CAR's. Certification is contingent on the certified operations response to the CAR within the stipulated time frame.

Minor CARs: These are corrective action requests in response to minor non-conformances,

which are typically limited in scale or can be characterized as an unusual lapse in the system. Corrective actions must be closed out within a specified time period of award of the certificate.

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

4.0 RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION

Table 4.1 below, contains the evaluation team's findings as to the strengths and weaknesses of the subject forest management operation relative to the FSC Principles of forest stewardship. The table also presents the corrective action request (car) numbers related to each principle.

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

Principle/Subject Area	Strengths Relative to the Standard	Weaknesses Relative to the Standard	CAR/REC #s
P1: FSC Commitment and Legal Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There are no known violations of any federal, state, or county laws or regulations. ▪ Best Management practices are exceeded in most cases. Roads are well maintained, waterbars are well designed, and slash is used extensively to cover exposed soil. Water quality protection is primary concern in all operations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No known weaknesses 	
P2: Tenure & Use Rights & Responsibilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Uses that are determined to be consistent with protection of quality water production are accommodated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There are no known disputes over tenure or use rights. 	
P3: Indigenous Peoples' Rights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Watershed Forester has done undocumented research on the American Indian use of the area and has not identified any significant cultural resources. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The City of Astoria has not actively sought participation from local tribes to identify American Indian resources. See CAR 2007.1 	CAR 2007.1
P4: Community Relations & Workers' Rights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Local contractors are chosen through a bid process. Employees are well compensated with good benefit packages. ▪ All workers, including Foresters and logging contractors, are highly trained and experienced. ▪ Public notices are sent and management activities must be approved by the City Council at open public meetings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No observed weaknesses 	

P5: Benefits from the Forest	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The City is committed to long-term management has made significant investments to ensure the watershed is maintained in a quality condition. ▪ The City is not dependent on cash flow from timber sales. ▪ The City Forester works to explore new markets, such as carbon offset credits, when new opportunities arise. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The harvest levels are being based on an inventory that was conducted by undergraduate students. The City is planning to update the inventory. 	
P6: Environmental Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Long-term ecological functioning is an important consideration for the watershed management and efforts are made to mitigate threats to these processes. ▪ The City attempts to maintain a broad range of habitat types while generally moving a larger portion of the forest to older age classes. ▪ Stands with characteristics of late successional forests are identified as unique areas and protected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The ownership is not large enough to provide undisturbed core habitats, but does provide rare habitat. 	
P7: Management Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The written management plan includes well defined management objectives. ▪ Workers appear to be well trained and effectively carrying out the management plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None noted. 	
P8: Monitoring & Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There are inventories conducted at different time scales, one being after harvests, to assess implementation. These inventories include permanent plots, stand management records, timber inventories, and wildlife inventories. ▪ Changes in habitat structure would be detected through the inventory and monitoring components of the management plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The baseline from the current inventory is of undetermined quality. The City is planning a new inventory. 	
P9: Maintenance of High Conservation Value Forest	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The city Forester is in good communication with other forestry operations within the landscape and HCVF management approaches are openly shared. ▪ Monitoring of HCVF areas is designed to assess changes through time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No observed weaknesses. 	

4.2 Preconditions

Preconditions are major corrective action requests that are placed on a forest management operation after the initial evaluation and before the operation is certified. Certification cannot be awarded if open preconditions exist.

No preconditions were placed on the City of Astoria during the evaluation.

5.0 CERTIFICATION DECISION

5.1 Certification Recommendation

As determined by the full and proper execution of the SCS *Forest Conservation Program* evaluation protocols, the evaluation team hereby recommends that the City of Astoria be awarded FSC certification as a “Well-Managed Forest” subject to the corrective action requests stated in Section 5.2. The City of Astoria has demonstrated that their system of management is capable of ensuring that all of the requirements of the Pacific Coast Standard v9.0 are met over the forest area covered by the scope of the evaluation. The City of Astoria has also demonstrated that the described system of management is being implemented consistently over the forest area covered by the scope of the certificate.

5.2 Initial Corrective Action Requests

Background/Justification: Forest managers should seek input from indigenous peoples in order to protect sites of special cultural, ecological, economic, or religious significance. The consultation should include a request for the location of known cultural resource sites along with a statement of confidentiality and an assessment of the potential for unidentified sites to occur on managed forestlands. The consultation should also request information on traditional uses of managed properties. If cultural sites are found or traditional uses exist, forest managers should consult with tribal representatives to develop mitigations to protect resource sites and manage the use of the forestlands.	
CAR 2007.1	The City of Astoria shall implement measures to consult with tribal representatives. These measures shall include a notification letter to local tribes to request information on known or potentially significant cultural sites and shall include a statement of confidentiality.
Deadline	2008 Annual Audit
Reference	FSC Indicator 3.3a

6.0 SURVEILLANCE EVALUATIONS

If certification is awarded, surveillance evaluations will take place at least annually to monitor the status of any open corrective action requests and review the continued conformance of the City of Astoria to the Pacific Coast Standard v9.0. Public summaries of surveillance evaluations will be posted separately on the SCS website (www.sscertified.com).

7.0 SUMMARY OF SCS COMPLAINT AND APPEAL INVESTIGATION PROCEDURES

The following is a summary of the SCS Complaint and Appeal Investigation Procedures, the full versions of the procedures are available from SCS upon request. The SCS Complaint and Appeal Investigation Procedures are designed for and available to any individual or organization that perceives a stake in the affairs of the SCS Forest Conservation Program and that/who has reason to question either the actions of SCS itself or the actions of a SCS certificate holder.

A **complaint** is a written expression of dissatisfaction, other than **appeal**, by any person or organization, to a certification body, relating to the activities of staff of the SCS Forest Conservation Program and/or representatives of a company or entity holding either a forest management (FM) or chain-of-custody (CoC) certificate issued by SCS and duly endorsed by FSC, where a response is expected (ISO/IEC 17011:2004 (E)). The SCS Complaint Investigation Procedure functions as a first-stage mechanism for resolving complaints and avoiding the need to involve FSC.

An “**appeal**” is a request by a certificate holder or a certification applicant for formal reconsideration of any adverse decision made by the certification body related to its desired certification status. A certificate holder or applicant may formally lodge an appeal with SCS against any adverse certification decision taken by SCS, within thirty (30) days after notification of the decision.

The written Complaint or Appeal must:

- Identify and provide contact information for the complainant or appellant
- Clearly identify the basis of the aggrieved action (date, place, nature of action) and which parties or individuals are associated with the action
- Explain how the action is alleged to violate an SCS or FSC requirement, being as specific as possible with respect to the applicable SCS or FSC requirement
- In the case of complaints against the actions of a certificate holder, rather than SCS itself, the complainant must also describe efforts taken to resolve the matter directly with the certificate holder
- Propose what actions would, in the opinion of the complainant or appellant, rectify the matter.

Written complaints and appeals should be submitted to:

Dr. Robert J. Hrubes
Senior Vice-President
Scientific Certification Systems
2200 Powell Street, Suite 725

Emeryville, California, USA94608
Email: rhrubes@scscertified.com

As detailed in the *SCS-FCP Certification Manual*, investigation of the complaint or appeal will be confidentially conducted in a timely manner. As appropriate, corrective and preventive action and resolution of any deficiencies found in products or services shall be taken and documented.