



**Bureau Veritas Certification
North America, Inc.
SFI Forest Management Audit Report**

390 Benmar Drive, Suite 100
Houston, TX 77060
Phone (281) 986-1300: Toll Free (800) 937-9311

Company Name	Upper Hudson Woodlands ATP LP
Contact Person	John Godbee Jr.
Address	10 Pine Street , Glen Falls, NY 12804
Phone / Fax	229 395 2823
PQC Code	E01E-Forestry, logging related
Contract Number	US.1956792

Certification Audit:		Re-Certification Audit:		Surveillance Audit:	# 1	Scope extension audit:	
----------------------	--	-------------------------	--	---------------------	-----	------------------------	--

Audit Summary

Introduction

This report provides a summary of the first surveillance audit of the Upper Hudson Woodlands ATP LC (UHW) forest management operations based in Glens Falls, NY. The audit was conducted October 20-22, 2015. Craig Howard, RPF, conducted the audit on behalf of Bureau Veritas Certification.

Audit Scope, Objectives and Process

The scope of the audit was forest and land management activities conducted by Upper Hudson Woodlands ATP LLC on 37,245 hectares of privately owned forest lands distributed largely within the Adirondack Park (AP) boundaries in upstate New York. Forest management is conducted within the normal regulatory parameters governing New York forest operations. In addition, operations must also comply with regulations specific to the area within the defined borders of Adirondack Park. These specify additional restrictions in terms of recreational leases, harvest type, and size.

The objectives of the audit were to review the UHW SFI program documentation in accordance with the requirements of the SFI 2015-2019 standard and verify the effective implementation of the SFI program in the way planning and on-the-ground management activities are conducted. Specifically, two objectives of the audit were to:

1. Verify that the Program Participant's SFI Program is in conformance with the SFI Objectives, Performance Measures, and Indicators, and any additional indicators that the Program Participant chooses, and
2. Verify whether the Program Participant has effectively implemented its SFI Standard program requirements on the ground.

The audit assessed conformance against the fifteen SFI Program Objectives in the 2015 standard. All performance measures and all applicable indicators were assessed within each Objective. There were no substitutions or modifications of SFI indicators. Standard Bureau Veritas Certification protocols and forms were applied throughout the audit as provided by the most recent version of the Bureau Veritas Certification SFI Auditor Handbook available on the auditor access website

Audit Plan

A copy of the audit plan was distributed to the company on 28 September. A copy of the audit plan has been appended to this report.

Company Information

The Upper Hudson Woodland (UHW) property is owned by an investment fund. The fund managers contracts F&W Forestry Inc. to complete the day to day forestry operations on the UHW property. F&W Forestry is an international forest resource management and consulting firm, currently operating in 11 states throughout the US. F&W performs/manages all aspects of forest management on the UHW ownership, including forest inventory and mapping, management planning, forecasting, harvesting contractor selection/monitoring, harvest scheduling, harvest layout and active harvest oversight, marketing of various harvested wood products and other responsibilities upon request from the Fund manager. F&W utilizes sub-contractors to complete the harvesting and hauling aspects of each individual timber sale. Contractors involved in harvesting and hauling operations are required to maintain New York Logger Training (NYLT) certification, which is a state sponsored training program that provides annual continuing education courses. Each contractor is monitored by F&W via the NYLT website to ensure maintenance of continuing education.

The entire UHW ownership (92,037 acres) is within the boundaries of the Adirondack State Park, located in northern New York state. Well stocked stands of northern hardwoods are the dominant cover type present within the UHW ownership. This cover type is consistently found in much of the forested area of the north eastern US and is a major source of commercial forest products. This dominant northern hardwood forest type comprises approximately 63% of the UHW ownership. Species associated with northern hardwood forest types are generally sugar maple, American beech, yellow birch, black cherry and white ash. The second largest forest type present on the property is mixed wood (~30%) and is generally comprised of red maple, yellow birch, white spruce and balsam fir. The remaining 7% of the forested area is comprised of spruce-fir flats. The majority of these stands are well stocked, with northern hardwood and mixed wood stands averaging a residual basal area of 85ft²/ac and softwood stands averaging a residual basal area of 95ft²/ac. Total forested area is currently 83,612 acres. The remaining 8,424 acres is open water or denuded area.

The Adirondack Park includes a mix of private land publically owned land (about 52 per cent of the land is privately-owned). This area contains 102 towns and villages. The total area of the AP is 6.1 million acres (2.4 \million ha) and include more than 10,000 lakes, 30,000 miles of rivers and streams, and a wide variety of habitats including wetlands and old-growth forests.

As noted above, operations within the AP involve extra conditions in terms of harvest and recreational operations. The categorization of the state owned lands as “Forever Wild” provides a huge area of lands that are adjacent or nearly adjacent to UHW ownership where development is prohibited.

Audit Results

The audit included a review of supporting documentation pertaining to Objectives 1-15 in the 2015-2019 SFI standard. This information was well organized and showed a high level of conformance to the requirements of the standards. The auditor visited 7 sites that were the subject of either current or recent harvest or other operational activities. In summary form ,the specific features evaluated by the auditors is as follows:

- Harvest – 5 sites

- Roads – 6
- Water crossings – 3
- Recreational Trails – 2
- Harvest Plan – 5

The auditors also interviewed most UHW staff that had responsibilities for the forest management program.

A summary of technical findings is presented below:

Objective 1-Forest Management Planning: The company's Forest Management Plan (FMP) is comprehensive. It is based on a robust forest inventory and includes direction on long term wood and habitat supply under several different. The FMP has been supplemented by the High Conservation Value and Pre industrial condition reports CV and PIC reports, prepared in support of the company's FSC certification, which updates key ecological assessments. The Annual Allowable Cut is updated annually. A detailed analysis is undertaken that examines a range of scenarios with the best information available (including new forest inventory). The land base is netted down to the operable land base with reserves removed. The company has consistently under harvested, with actual harvest volumes averaging about 84% of planned volumes over the last six years.

Objective 2-Forest Health and Productivity: The company relies on natural regeneration which is suitable given the forest type and harvest systems. The company has an ongoing monitoring program to assess regeneration success. No herbicides are used on the forest and there has been no requirement for other pesticide use. There are no current pest management issues on the forest. Two invasive species have been identified and are being monitored.

Objective 3-Protection and Maintenance of Water Resources: The company uses state Best Management Practices as guidance for forest operations, including specific pre-harvest planning conditions (i.e. areas susceptible to rutting, harvested during dry or frozen conditions) and, harvesting and reforestation rules to prevent soil compaction and erosion.

A non-conformance had been issued on previous audits concerning the steep slope in short culverts observed on one road corridor. The company had done an excellent job of addressing this noted deficiency, including the commission of an independent third party assessment of BMP application on the forest.

The auditor observed several excellent, newly constructed bridges. They were installed to replace culverts, and in every case, should provide excellent protection from sediment run off (Figure 1).



Figure 1. This bridge was an example of excellent installations observed on the forest

One legacy bridge observed was substandard, as it had significant amount of gravel accumulation that had mounded into a 7 inch berm along the edge of the bridge (Figure 2). The auditor did not observe material from this berm falling into the stream, but, in the opinion of the auditor, this was likely to occur once hauling over the bridge increased. A grading that moved material off the bridge would likely to mitigate the potential for sediment deposition from the bridge in the short term and installation of bumpers along the sides of the bridge, which were observed on other bridges, would likely provide a long term solution that would meet the standard requirement. As this was a legacy bridge that had not been used operationally on recent harvests, and the company had demonstrated a high standard of installation and maintenance of water crossings elsewhere, the auditor identified this as an opportunity for improvement rather than a non-conformance.



Figure 2. This bridge showed a buildup of sand and gravel that had been built up through a period of time when no operational hauling was occurring.

No soil disturbance was noted on any harvest sites.

Interviews with harvest operators showed a high degree of understanding of the harvest plan requirements, including direction provided by harvest plans, State BMP and AP policy. Field visits confirm an active and effective roads management program.

Objective 4-Conservation of Biological Diversity: UHW maintains a comprehensive program to conserve biological diversity at both the stand and landscape scales, through planning, implementation, and monitoring. The program is guided by the requirements of the FMP, AP Policy and by harvest and renewal practices that leaves significant residual stand structure on site and utilizes natural systems to regenerate the stand. There is little change in the tree species composition of stands observed or expected pre and post-harvest. The floral biodiversity of the system changes in terms of tree age but is effectively stable in terms of species mix.

Living wildlife trees were evident on all harvested areas. There is abundant coarse woody material of all species present because harvesting is done via processing at the stump.

The company monitors known species of concern. Across the region, the most limited habitat tends to be early successional forest. This is not surprising as harvesting is not allowed on the state owned lands in the AP. The harvest operations conducted by UHW contribute an annual supply of this limited habitat. All occurrences of species of concern are taken into account during planning and implementation, and managed appropriately. The identification and management program for species of concern has been formalized by the company's High Conservation Value report.

Site visits and interviews with field workers confirmed that values were well-protected. Operators had general awareness of SAR and sensitive species and would stop work and report sightings to supervisors if a SAR was encountered. Cut blocks are walked before harvesting by both UHW and the contractor, increasing the likelihood that unmapped values will be found and appropriate

precautions taken.

Objective 5-Management of Visual Quality and Recreational Benefits: The FMP requires UHW to take visual quality and impacts on recreational benefits into account during planning and implementation. Company work is consistent with the indicators under this objective. Clear cut harvest blocks are required to be less than 10 ha (25 acres) in size. The company is operating within the SFI standard that limits disturbance sizes to 100 acres.

Two days of site visits in 2015 confirmed that disturbance patches caused by forest harvesting are not excessively large or a negative ecological issue on this landscape. In the opinion of the auditor, since the landscape contains many natural meadows, the visual appearance of cutblocks from a distance is greatly mitigated.

The forest management area is in a region that is very heavily used by recreationists, residents, and tourists. The New York government regulates land use in the AP and UHW complies with those land use decisions.

The Company's planning maps indicate state lands, private land, trails, wildlife values, cultural values, and many other features. It was confirmed in the field at numerous snow machine, hiking, biking, and ski trails that UHW strives to ensure that the safety of designated trails in or near cut blocks and hauling roads is not compromised by forest management activity.

Objective 6-Protection of Special Sites: During development of the FMP and HCVF reports, UHW identified a wide variety of sites that need special conservation effort. Management approaches are outlined in those documents.

The Company's database of values is extensive. The HCVF report contain lists of rare and sensitive species and their occurrences in the forest. The list of sensitive species and sites is updated annually with information supplied by the government.

Objective 7-Efficient Use of Fiber Resources: UHW implements a forest operations monitoring program through regular compliance inspections on all their operations. There have been no infractions against UHWs in the past two years. Utilization observed on the audit was very good.

Objective 8: Recognize and Respect Indigenous People's Rights: UHWs has a written policy that recognizes indigenous peoples rights, the need for communication and the promotion of economic opportunities within UHW's control. The company has not completed any outreach to aboriginal peoples. As this is a new requirement of the 2015 SFI standard, and an Opportunity for Improvement has been issued.

Objective 9-Legal and Regulatory Compliance: The company has a comprehensive list of applicable laws and regulations that apply to its forest management and operations. These are supported by the company's management planning process, operational compliance program, and to a lesser extent, government compliance inspections. The auditors inspected 7 sites. All had adequate protection of soils and water. Road maintenance was well done.

Objective 10-Forestry Research, Science and Technology: UHW has made a commitment to follow an adaptive management model in the planning and implementation of its forest management activities on the forest. Consistent with that commitment, the Company supports a wide variety of research and monitoring programs through a variety of other agencies largely through participation in the SFI State Implementation Committee (SIC).

The Company conducts an annual survey of its recreational lessees. These surveys quantify a number of qualitative aspects of the user experience. Survey requires lessees to report on user days, including hunting, fishing, hiking, snowmobiling, bicycling, cross-country skiing, and requests a summary of leaseholder sightings of 19 wildlife species and 12 species of fish. The survey is issued to each of the 105 leaseholder clubs which encompasses a total of over 1,400 individual users over a total leased area of some 79,000 acres (85% of the UHW owned area). The summary of the surveys shows a total of over 14,000 user days. The data requested for wildlife and fisheries observations has the potential to supply terrific information on wildlife population trends. This simple survey is a significant effort that addresses the requirement of this indicator to develop social, cultural, and economic benefit assessments. This was identified as a notable practice by the auditor.

Objective 11-Training and Education: The training program for staff and loggers meets the requirements of this objective. Staff has been designated as responsible for particular components of the SFI program and interviews showed a good level of understanding in this regards. Contractors participate in an annual training program. They demonstrated a solid understanding of the operating ground rules and had a working knowledge of both rare, threatened and endangered species and invasive species that could be found in the operating area.

Objective 12-Community Involvement and Landowner Outreach: UHW is a member of the FI Implementation Committee. The SIC financially supports groups with an interest in forestry related values and forest practices through an application process. The annual fee paid by UHW as a member of SIC goes toward this program.

The SFI Implementation committee has a landowner outreach program for small woodlot owners to assist with training and resources with the goal of promoting and improving sustainable forest management.

Objective 13: Public Land Management Responsibilities: This is not applicable as the company does not manage on public lands.

Objective 14-Communications and Public Reporting: Company is fully aware of the requirement to post the audit report and has done so.

Objective 15-Management Review: In the FMP, UHW has made a commitment to follow an adaptive management framework for sustainable forest management. Forestry staff explained that UHW performs an annual internal review of its programs. Presentations and meeting minutes confirm that UHW holds annual training sessions with staff and contractors in which changes to procedures as a result of the annual review are discussed.

Findings

Previous non-conformances: No non-conformances were issued previously.

Non-conformances: No non conformances were identified in this audit.

Opportunities for Improvement: Two opportunities for improvement were issued on this audit: OFI 2015-1 – Indicator 2.3 .3requires the Use of erosion control measures to minimize loss of soil and site productivity. One legacy bridge observed was substandard, as it had significant amount of gravel accumulation that had mounded into a 7 inch berm. The auditor did not observe material from this berm falling into the stream, but, in the opinion of the auditor, this was likely to occur once hauling over the bridge increased. A grading that moved material off the bridge would likely to

mitigate the potential for sediment deposition from the bridge in the short term and installation of bumpers along the sides of the bridge, which were observed on other bridges, would likely provide a long term solution that would meet the standard requirement. As this was a legacy bridge that had not been used operationally on recent harvests, and the company had demonstrated a high standard of installation and maintenance of water crossings elsewhere, the auditor identified this as an opportunity for improvement rather than a non-conformance

2015-2 – Indicator 8.3.1 The standard requires program participants to be aware aware of traditional forest-related knowledge, such as known cultural heritage sites, the use of wood in traditional buildings and crafts, and flora that may be used in cultural practices for food, ceremonies or medicine. The company did not supply evidence that they were aware of this information. As this is a new indicator in the 2015 standard, an OFI was issued.

Notable Practices: Indicator 10.2.1:

- 1) Requirement of the Indicator: Participation, individually and/or through cooperative efforts involving SFI implementation committees and/or associations at the national, state, provincial, or regional level, in the development or use of some of the following;
 - a) regeneration assessments
 - b) growth and drain assessments
 - c) best management practices implementation and conformance;
 - d) biodiversity conservation information for family forest owners; andsocial, cultural or economic benefit assessments.

Notable Practice: The Company conducts an annual survey of its recreational lessees. These surveys quantify a number of qualitative aspects of the user experience. Survey requires lessees to report on user days, including hunting, fishing, hiking, snowmobiling, bicycling, cross- country skiing, and requests a summary of leaseholder sightings of 19 wildlife species and 12 species of fish. The survey is issued to each of the 105 leaseholder clubs which encompasses a total of over 1,400 individual users over a total leased area of some 79,000 acres (85% of the UHW owned area). The summary of the surveys shows a total of over 14,000 user days. The data requested for wildlife and fisheries observations has the potential to supply terrific information on wildlife population trends. This simple survey is a significant effort that addresses the requirement of this indicator to develop social, cultural and economic benefit assessments.

Logo/label use: The company has not used any logos to date and is not expected to in the near future.

SFI reporting: This will be verified on the first surveillance audit.

Conclusions

A closing meeting was held on October 22. The auditor indicated that no non-conformances had been identified at that time but that an opportunity for improvement had been issued based on a legacy water crossing, and that further non-conformances may be identified as a result of further document review or stakeholder input. A second opportunity for improvement was issued concerning communications with Aboriginal peoples.

This did not diminish the auditor's conclusion that UHW is operating a forest management program that meets the requirements of the SFI 2015-2019 forest management standard. The company has a comprehensive forest management plan that is available for public review. Its harvest operations are well done, with good residual structure and downed woody debris evident on all blocks. The

company's interaction with its recreational leaseholders is positive.

The auditors recommend that full certification to the SFI 2015-2019 SFI Forest Management standard be issued without delay.

SEE SF61 FOR AUDIT NOTES

Audit Report	
Opening Meeting	Participants: > Craig Howard , John Godbee Jr., Philip Weigel, Wayne Tripp, Tom Discussions: Sargent, Peter Nichols, Zach Slocum > Introductions > Scope of the audit > Purpose of stage 1 audit > Nonconformance types – Major / Minor > Review of previous nonconformances - 0. > Process approach to auditing and audit sampling > Confidentiality agreement > Termination of the audit > Appeals process > Closing meeting timing
Closing Meeting	Participants: > Craig Howard, John Godbee Jr., Philip Weigel, Wayne Tripp, Tom Discussions: Sargent, Peter Nichols, Zach Slocum > Introductions and appreciation for selecting Bureau Veritas Certification. > Review of audit process - process approach and sampling. > Nonconformances (to be addressed before stage 2)- 0 > Areas of concern that could result in non-conformances during stage 2 - 0 > Recommendation to proceed to stage 2 -0 > Stage 2 audit plan

Summary of Audit Findings:									
Audit Date(s):		From: October 20, 2015				To: October 22, 2015			
Number of SF02's Raised:			Major:		0		Minor:		0
Is a follow up visit required:		Yes	No	0	Date(s) of follow up visit:				
Follow-up visit remarks:									
Team Leader Recommendation:									
Corrective Action Plan(s) Accepted		Yes	No	N/A	x	Date:		Oct 22 2015	
Proceed to/Continue Certification		Yes	x	No	N/A	Date:		Oct 22 2015	
All NCR's Closed		Yes	No	N/A	x	Date:		Oct 22 2015	
Standard audit conducted against:									
1)	SFI FM 2015-2019			3)					
2)				4)					
Team Leader (1):			Team						

Craig Howard (RPF)					
	5)				
Scope of Supply: (scope statement must be verified and appear in the space below)					
<i>From the CEP:</i> Forest Management Activities Including planning, harvesting, silviculture, road construction and road maintenance.					
Accreditation's	ANAB				
Number of Certificates	1				
Proposed Date for Next Audit Event					
Date	October 2016				
Audit Report Distribution					
John Godbee (jgodbee@FWForestry.com)					
Dawn Komnick - dawn.komnick@us.bureauveritas.com					



**BUREAU
VERITAS**

Company	Upper Hudson Woodlands		
Contract Number	US.1465063		
Audit Type	Surveillance 1	Audit Dates	27-30 January 2015
Standards	FSC US Forest Management Standard V1.0, FSC-STD-20-007v3.0, SFI 2015-2019		
BVC– Audit Team:	Craig Howard		
Representative	Mr. John F Godbee Jr		
Opening Meeting:	Date:	20 Oct. 2015	
	Time:	08:00am	
	Place:	10 Pine Street , Glen Falls, NY 12804	
Closing Meeting:	Date:	22 Oct 2015	
	Time:	14:30	
	Place:	Glen Falls, NY	
Audit Scope:	Forest Management Activities Including planning, harvesting, silviculture, road construction and road maintenance. 37,425 hectares.		
Verification Indicators	FSC FM – All applicable indicators. SFI 2015-2019 – All indicators		

Audit Objectives –FSC FM certification/SFI LM certification shall establish:

1. Conformance of the organization’s program against the FSC and SFI standards listed above.
2. Evaluation of renewal of an existing certificate in good standing.

Documents required available at a central location (if possible).

1. Forest Management Plan
2. Environmental Impact Assessment
3. Social Impact Assessment
4. Potential field visit list (active harvests, harvests completed in the past year, Corrective Action clearance evidence, BMP implementation, recent roadwork, bridge/culvert installations, extreme slope harvests, cultural sites, RTE occurrence, varied silvicultural techniques, etc.)
5. Conservation Easement summaries/communications/meeting minutes.
6. Harvest Activity Summary, 2013 (volumes by tract, species, product etc.)
7. Harvest records
8. Sales documentation
9. Harvest Plans
10. Inspection Reports
11. Management plan
12. Complaint Register

Procedures and Protocols Used:

The certification audit will be conducted under environmental auditing methodologies identified in the BVC-NA Ultimate Auditors Handbook and the BVC FSC and SFI BMS. Standard Bureau Veritas protocols and forms will be applied throughout the verification.

Audit Schedule

Date	Time	Activity	BVC Representative	Company Representative
20 Oct 2015r	0800	Opening Meeting	Craig Howard (on-site)	John Godbee
	830	Document Review	Craig Howard	John Godbee
	1100	Field Sites Logistics/Document Review	Craig Howard	John Godbee
	1700	Daily Debrief	Craig Howard	John Godbee
21 Oct 2015	0700	Field Site inspections	Craig Howard	John Godbee
	1700	Daily Debrief	Craig Howard	John Godbee
22 Oct 2015	0730	Document Review	Craig Howard	John Godbee
	1300	Final Document Review	Craig Howard	John Godbee
	1600	Closing meeting	Craig Howard	John Godbee

Documentation

The auditors will need access to the following documents:

- Harvest records
- Sales documentation
- Harvest Plans
- Inspection Reports
- Management plan

Complaint

Summary of site visits

Site number	Block number	Feature	Comments
1	251	Harvest 2013; plant 2015; SIP 2014; road reclamation 2015; trail protection	Harvest utilization viewed; insular patches of mixed species (Pl, Po, Sp) Viewed road reclamation and trail free of debris; viewed heavy drags SIP
2	2528	Harvest 2013; plant 2015; SIP 2014; active road reclamation 2015	Harvest utilization viewed; insular patches of mixed species (Pl, Po, Sp) Viewed active road reclamation; checked H&S requirements Viewed 2015 planted tree survival
3	2632	Harvest 2014; stakeholder issue - rutting	Located area of rutting – 2 ruts approx. 10-15' long & 6" deep – isolated – observed frogs in water held by ruts – ruts beginning to close in and settle Viewed 2015 planted tree survival – no trees planted in ruts.
4	2347 & 1499	Stream crossing	Native timber bridge – no issues – use of silt cloth to prevent siltation – no disturbance near stream channel
5	2273 + 2309	Stakeholder concern – 2013 harvest block; 2014 SIP; 2015 plant	Site Preparation, harvest block, Walked edge of cut boundary – evidence of cattle/feral horses – no issue with site degradation or rutting
6	2239B	Stream crossing; stakeholder concern	Very steep approach to creek; both banks exposed silt + clay soils not stabilized; appears to be silt in creek; quad trail runs through creek with no bmp crossing; UHW noted problem and attempted to mitigate runoff but efforts unsuccessful
7		Road construction	Native timber bridge; silt running off road on approach to crossing and down bank to within 1 meter of permanent stream; bridge deck separated in nw corner from abutments allowing road material to fall through (not into creek) Runoff; siltation due to space between bridge deck and bridge cribs/road bed
8	2865A	Harvest 2015	Some isolated rutting/site disturbance; correctly mitigated; piled Po left in back of cutover; small undersize conifer left behind residual on back side of block on wetland
9	114	Road reclamation; SIP rutting	Little change from 2014 pictures; viewed plant survival; area greened up; viewed some willow ingress. No evidence of original issue of rutting
10		2007 plantation and retreat 2015; stakeholder concern	Viewed area of retreat; viewed successful regeneration; will likely have to retreat depending on survival of replant 2015; 2007 trees growing slowly and poor survival; Due to mountain winds and large clearcut has resulted in plantation survival issues; UHW is aware and has replanted in 2015 based on establishment surveys in 2015
11	Bible Camp Road	Road reclamation; stakeholder	Road surface beginning to green up – no issues

12	654	2015 plant; stakeholder issue; PSP	<p>Identified as a wetland concern prior to harvest; UHW worked with stakeholder to leave a buffer along wetland; company left variable buffer during harvest; identified as an issues by another stakeholder in 2013; company investigated and provided paper work; no FSC finding – viewed area of concern but no water evident to call a stream – biologist confirmed likely an ephemeral stream - Cutting too close to wetland – biologist auditor identified area in question not a stream as no defined channel , Road reclamation is quick and effective - roads disappear (2 roads).</p> <p>PSP was well-marked and protected with a buffer.</p> <p>There was no garbage on the cutblock.</p> <p>The gate preventing access to HCVF #14 was closed and locked.</p> <p>No unauthorized access was observed.</p> <p>The complaint about harvesting to the edge of a stream was investigated - the site proved to be shallow ephemeral surface flow on relatively flat ground and did not appear to be negatively affected by the adjacent cutblock; it was not a stream.</p> <p>BH had good knowledge and awareness of SAR, and the procedure for addressing new values discovered during the course of operations. The process for pre-harvest inspections was described.</p>
13	1794 + CTP	Harvest 2015; HCV tree	Viewed piling of slash in CTP cut to address request from AEP Fire – AEP will burn slash piles as part of fire protection for base at bottom of hill, Viewed recent harvest and standing Douglas Fir – abundant residual trees left standing that appear representative of original stand
14	2049	Harvest/block layout	Block boundary pulled back to remove poplar that is not merchantable. No other changes were required
15	2073	Harvest block layout /Stakeholder concern	Trumpeter swan reserve. Walk buffer. Cut planned for winter. Nesting habitat identified by stakeholders, verified by AESD, cut boundary adjusted by SLC. Very wide buffer. Targeted to maintain undisturbed visual habitat for nestinbg swans.
16	2981		
17	3280	Harvest block layout /Stakeholder concern	Adjacent to landowner, Block sboundary was adjusted to minimize oppoteunity for blow down near fence.
18	3489A	Harvest/ reclaimed road /regeneration	reclaimed road almost undetecable , stocking 89 % surviving but slow growing , slash load is very light, no rutting or industrial trash evident.
19	3926	Harvest block layout/stakeholder concern	Block boundary was changed to correct layout error. Change reduced sight lines for hunting. Done with input from nearby landowner. Adjacent to an open hay field
20	312	Harvest	Hidden trails, Block buffer to protect viewscape. See road reclamation 0312, harvest retained island , Road reclamation excellent Slash dispersed on site Very nice site
21	382	Active Harvest	93 ha harvest block Product cruise , horse trail has been protected , No unique habitat or RTE species noted cross drains on site Planned retention in block , operator had RTE and Invasive Species book on hand , no soil movement , excellent utilization
22	3600	Harvest , renewal	There was no garbage on the cutblocks. Gates and barriers were in place. No unauthorized vehicles were encountered. Hiking/biking/equestrian trails were protected and signed for safety.

			Stream crossings were well-constructed (permanent and ephemeral flow). Buffers were appropriate. Roads were well constructed with no visible erosion problems. Cross drains were functioning well. Corduroy and geotextile were used under roads in wet areas to protect them from compaction and rutting, and over grazing land on private property to enable the road bed to return to grazing land quickly after road reclamation. Cutblock boundaries were respected and followed natural contours. Cuts were not excessive in size. Residual retention was as per requirements in the cut blocks. Coarse woody material was abundant throughout the cutblocks and consisted of a variety of species (pine, poplar, spruce). Cut blocks blended into the landscape which was marked with many natural meadows.
23	3554	Harvest	There was no garbage on the cutblocks. Stream crossings were well done. Stream buffers were in place and appropriate. Cutblock boundaries were respected and followed natural contours. Cuts were not excessive in size. Residual retention was as per requirements in the cut blocks. Coarse woody material was abundant throughout the cutblocks and consisted of a variety of species (pine, poplar, spruce).
24	0283	Harvest	No unauthorized vehicles or garbage were observed in the area. Roads were well constructed. Cross drains were installed and working well. A trail constructed under an agreement for other users was observed. An existing bike trail was well protected and signed for safety. A red-tailed hawk, numerous songbirds, and a mule deer were observed using the cut block.
25	2514		The equestrian trail was well protected and extra gravel applied by UHW at the junction with the forest access road. A native timber box crib over a stream was well done. A fence built by UHW for a farmer under a GTA was observed and functioning, but the gate was open at the road. UHW will report this to the farmer to determine whether the gate was intended to be open at that time. No unauthorized use of roads was observed. Roads were well constructed. Residual retention in the cutblock was good. Cutblock boundaries were respected.
26		Active harvest	4 staff of the ESC Group contracting company were interviewed (processor operator, excavator operator, foreman, processor operator) at a road construction site. All men had safety gear (vest, hard hat, spill kit, first aid kit), knew where the emergency evacuation site was, and all had attended the contractor training session put on by UHW in the spring. All demonstrated awareness of SAR and the procedure to be followed if new values were discovered during the course of operations (e.g., dens, SAR, Douglas fir occurrences, nests). Operators all stated that they wash machinery before it is moved to a new site to help to prevent the spread of invasive species. Road building was good and crossings were well done. Excellent efforts had been made by UHW to remove an old railcar bridge across Cataract Creek at this site
27	0654	Harvest/ stakeholder concern /HCV Protection	Road reclamation is quick and effective - roads disappear (2 roads). PSP was well-marked and protected with a buffer. There was no garbage on the cutblock. The gate preventing access to HCVF #14 was closed and locked. No unauthorized access was observed. The complaint about harvesting to the edge of a stream was investigated - the site proved to be shallow ephemeral surface flow on relatively flat ground and did not appear to be negatively affected by the adjacent cutblock; it was not a stream. BH had good knowledge and awareness of SAR, and the procedure for addressing new values discovered during the course of

			operations. The process for pre-harvest inspections was described.
28	1794	Harvest/ Access management	The gate preventing access to the block was closed and locked. No unauthorized access was observed. There was no garbage on the site. Douglas fir had been retained unharvested. Residual retention was excellent.