The following document summarizes the input received during and immediately following the 2018 Controlled Wood Regional Meetings and provides rationale for the resulting mitigation options for the Klamath-Siskiyou Critical Biodiversity Area (CBA), along with definition of any identified gaps in the final set of options.

**Please note that any of the proposed mitigation options may be done individually or in collaboration with other certificate holders, or other entities that have similar desired outcomes. Collaboration is encouraged to scale up potential mitigation impact, and FSC US will seek to assist with collaboration when feasible.**

**CENTRAL THEME: Education & Outreach**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Original Proposed Options(#1) Support and/or collaborate with University of California Cooperative Extension to provide educational information to landowners, foresters and loggers; ensure that these kinds of individuals understand that the supply chain desires for sustainable forest materials.(#2) Collaborate with organizations like the California Licensed Foresters Association, Forest Stewards Guild, California Licensed Timber Operators and local chambers of the Society of American Foresters on service delivery and information dissemination to share information about best practices that will help to maintain or enhance the biodiversity of the region.(#5) Improve/promote/support/develop/encourage educational outreach materials to increase knowledge about the high-diversity fine scale habitats found in the Klamath-Siskiyou CBA. | Topline Input* Broad support for educational efforts around maintaining and enhancing the biodiversity of the region
* Target audience widely variable and includes general public, landowners, loggers, and forest managers
* Emphasis on the high proportion (~85%) of the Klamath-Siskiyou CBA that is publicly managed
* Many of the proposed options are similar and educational theme should be merged
* Materials should be developed in collaboration with extension services, universities, tribes, and other technical entities and professional associations. Should not be limited to specific groups or organizations.
* Materials should provide information about best practices to maintain and enhance biodiversity.
 |

*Consultation Insights: Stakeholder feedback shows broad support for all mitigation options related to education and outreach. Additionally, given that a number of the proposed options were similar, a number of stakeholders suggested that these should be further developed together with allow flexibility for organizations to decide with who they will collaborate. The type of information provided through the communication should convey that the supply chain desires for sustainable forest materials as well as best practices for maintaining and enhancing the biodiversity of the Klamath-Siskiyou CBA. Therefore, the following mitigation includes a mitigation option that merges a number of those originally proposed, but also introduces some flexibility to ensure companies can decide with whom they will collaborate.*

**Proposed Revised Mitigation Options**

**The following is offered as an option that could be scaled for any impact level:**

**Using materials (as described below), and with a desired outcome of engaging landowners, foresters, and loggers within the specified risk area and the Organization’s supply area in conservation of the Klamath-Siskiyou biodiversity, communicate to audiences (as described below) the social benefits and values of biodiversity in the region, threats from poorly implemented forest management (and related loss of values), and opportunities for conservation (i.e., management that enhances biodiversity, focusing on both within stand and between stand diversity).**

* **Materials: Developed by, or developed in cooperation with, organizations/individuals with expertise in Klamath-Siskiyou biodiversity conservation, tribes, or FSC US, and delivered in a manner that will be the most effective in achieving the desired outcome of engaging landowners, foresters, and loggers in conservation of Klamath-Siskiyou biodiversity, while reflecting the specific context and characteristics of the Organization.**
* **Audiences: Audiences will reflect the specific context and characteristics of the Organization, but communications should be directed toward those audiences where the communications will be most effective in helping to achieve the desired outcome of engaging landowners, foresters, and loggers within the specified risk area and the Organization’s supply area in conservation of Klamath-Siskiyou biodiversity. Depending upon the Organization’s location in the supply chain, communications may be directly with landowners, foresters, or loggers, or through intermediaries such as community members, suppliers, or in collaboration with organizations/individuals already working for conservation of Klamath-Siskiyou biodiversity.**

**The following is offered as an option for Organizations with suppliers that are land managers or that purchase directly from the source forest:**

**Develop/adapt a procurement policy that reflects the above communications themes and clearly states the expectation that suppliers will promote conservation of Klamath-Siskiyou biodiversity and will not provide materials from forests where this HCV was threatened as a result of forest management activities that produced the forest materials. This will require providing a description of the potential threats from forest management activities, and of the kinds of activities that would maintain or enhance the Klamath-Siskiyou biodiversity in the supply area.**

**NOTE: Actions to demonstrate policy enforcement and communicate policies on sourcing to suppliers should be audited under the Due Diligence system requirements within the 40-005V3-1 standard section 1.1.**

**CENTRAL THEME: Implement Management Activities**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Original Proposed Options(#3) Work with local land conservancies to support establishment of working lands easements. (#4) Support the efforts of The Watershed Research and Training Center, University of California Cooperative Extension and others to build prescribed fire in the region through the Northern California Prescribed Fire Council, or other forums.Participant Proposed OptionAdd more ‘on the ground’ best practices implemented | Topline Input* Mix of support for efforts related to building prescribed fire in the region
* Fire is an important management tool to retain and improve critical habitat and biodiversity
* Confusion regarding prescribed fire and its role as a mitigation option for companies
* Support should not be limited to a list of specific organizations, provide flexibility
* Clarify what is meant by ‘support’ and ensure auditability
* Mixed support specifically for easements: strong support from environmental and social, neutral from CBs, and more mixed from certificate holders and suppliers, but no consistent opposition
* High-proportion of public lands may mean limited applicability of easements in the region
* Concern about excessive costs for organizations to implement and support easements
* No strong, consistent opposition to either option
 |

*Consultation Insights: Comments for both of the original proposed options ultimately focused on the need for implementing management activities that will conserve the Klamath-Siskiyou biodiversity, but without limiting the tools that are available for the mitigation approach. Feedback indicates that management practices for maintaining and enhancing the area’s biodiversity include, but are not limited to, use of prescribed fire. The National Risk Assessment does not identify any threats to the biodiversity from forest management activities related to fire, so implementing prescribed fire on its own would not mitigate the identified risk. In a somewhat similar sense, comments received suggest that simply initiating a conservation easement would not be a valid mitigation option, as that action by itself does not mitigate the identified risk. However, if the easement includes clear intent and requirements for management practices that conserve the biodiversity, this would represent valid mitigation.*

**Proposed Revised Mitigation Option**

**The following is offered as an option that could be scaled for any impact level:**

**Engage with and/or provide monetary or in-kind resources to conservation organizations or similar entities (as described below) that are facilitating active, on the ground implementation of management activities (as described below) to maintain or enhance the Klamath-Siskiyou biodiversity within the specified risk area and the Organization’s supply area.**

* **Conservation Entities: These may include: non-governmental organizations that have active programs/projects to conserve biodiversity; tribes, federal, state and/or local agencies with natural resource conservation responsibilities; and/or organizations that have active programs/projects focused on habitat conservation for species dependent upon habitats within the specified risk area.**
* **Management Activities: These should include efforts to maintain or enhance the within stand species diversity, and between stand diversity of successional stages, for mixed conifer forests at all elevations, and conservation of any other habitats identified as important for biodiversity.**

**CENTRAL THEME: Conservation Planning**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Participant Proposed OptionActive participation in National Resource planning processes to influence protection of ecological values. | Topline Input* Indication of support from other participants in the regional meeting for participation in planning processes
 |

*Consultation Insights: This specific suggestion for a mitigation option was suggested at the meeting and a number of meeting attendees supported this as a potential mitigation option. Engagement with conservation planning processes has also been identified in other specified risk topics as a mitigation option. Therefore, the following mitigation option is being included the set of mitigation options for Klamath-Siskiyou CBA.*

**Proposed Revised Mitigation Option**

**The following is offered as an option that could be scaled for any impact level:**

**Engage in and/or provide monetary or in-kind resources to conservation planning processes and the implementation of plans that include goals, objectives and/or actions that are intended to achieve conservation of Klamath-Siskiyou biodiversity within the specified risk area and the Organization’s supply area. This may include: tribes, federal, state and/or local resource planning and plans; planning and plans for Klamath-Siskiyou mixed conifer stands; regional planning and plans directly for Klamath-Siskiyou biodiversity itself; and/or broad-spectrum regional conservation planning and plans that include Klamath-Siskiyou biodiversity conservation.**

**CENTRAL THEME: Research**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Participant Proposed OptionSupport scientific inquiry and participate in experimental forest management activities that mitigate threat to single species conversion | Topline Input* Stakeholders suggested that more research may be needed on improving management practices for managing for biodiversity in the region
 |

*Consultation Insights: While this mitigation option was not discussed widely at the meeting, and therefore, there wasn’t any clear indication of broad support, it also wasn’t rejected by those in attendance. Additionally, research into improving management practices has been proposed as a mitigation option in other specified risk topics. However, based upon input on other similar mitigation option ideas, there is a concern that research on its own will likely not effectively mitigate the identified risk, therefore it needs to be linked to another action.*

**Proposed Revised Mitigation Option**

**The following is offered as a two-part option for ‘high impact’ organizations:**

1. **Engage with and/or provide monetary or in-kind resources to an entity or alliance that is currently conducting, or has the capacity to initiate, research on improving management practices in order to maintain or enhance the biodiversity of the Klamath-Siskiyou within the specified risk area and the Organization’s supply area; and**
2. **Use the results of the research to improve implementation of another mitigation option.**

**GAPS IN THE SET OF MITIGATON OPTIONS**

FSC US Staff evaluation of this set of mitigation options, through the lens of the shared criteria, did not identify any significant gaps, with the possible exception of the requirement for 'auditability.' We will be looking to your comments for suggestions on how to address this potential gap, as well as for identification of any other gaps and suggestions for their resolution. Additionally, we will be meeting with Certification Bodies during the consultation and expect that they will also provide input on improvements in auditability.