



Salmon-Safe Inc.

Certification Guide for Corporate & University Campuses

October 2007

INTRODUCTION

This document provides general and specific guidance to natural resource experts serving as inspectors under the Salmon-Safe Corporate & University Campus Certification Program. As with any such certification program, Salmon-Safe fundamentally relies upon structured judgments rendered by a team of experts empanelled to ascertain the extent of conformance with established *certification standards*. Accordingly, the overall credibility and value of the campus certification program requires that the inspectors conducting the certification assessments are adequately guided as to procedures and protocols, so as to provide consistency, objectivity, and other necessary program attributes.

This Certification Guide is intended to provide prospective inspectors, and anyone else with an interest in the mechanics of a Salmon-Safe certification, with the basic directions on carrying out an inspection.

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

Salmon-Safe promotes and administers three environmental certification programs in the Pacific Northwest, all oriented towards maintaining and enhancing habitat conditions conducive to the recovery of native Pacific salmonid stocks.

1. Farm Assessment Program
2. Parks & Natural Area Assessment Program
3. Corporate and University Campus Assessment Program

Common to the three programs is that salmon-bearing streams and contributing drainage systems flow through farms, office parks, college campuses, and parklands and that management practices on such lands can have direct and indirect impacts on the health of salmon fisheries.

Salmon-Safe certification is a market-based (i.e., voluntary) mechanism by which landowners and land managers can seek independent endorsement (i.e., certification) of their management practices, provided that such practices are

found to be in conformance with an established set of standards of *best management practices*. Salmon-Safe is a not-for-profit 501(c)3 entity based in Portland, Oregon. Originally a program area developed by the Pacific Rivers Council, Salmon-Safe has successfully defined and promoted ecologically sustainable farming practices that protect water quality and aquatic biodiversity throughout the Pacific Northwest.

HOW THE CAMPUS PROGRAM OPERATES

As a voluntary, market-based mechanism, the Salmon-Safe certification program is comprised of the following key procedural steps:

- Representatives of a corporate landowner or university campus (the “Applicant”) notify Salmon-Safe, via an application form, that it wishes to participate in the certification program and to undergo the evaluation process leading to the possible award of certification. A contract is executed between the Applicant and Salmon-Safe setting forth the terms and conditions of the evaluation process, including an express specification of the land areas to be included in the evaluation and an acknowledgement that certification will be awarded only if the Applicant is found to be in conformance with the Certification Standard.
- Upon execution of a contract with the Applicant, Salmon-Safe empanels an interdisciplinary team of relevant experts to carry out the evaluation. Depending upon the size, complexity and nature of the park system to undergo the evaluation, the inspection team will be comprised of from two to four experts. Collectively, the inspection team members will bring to the process expertise in aquatic ecology, stormwater management, and integrated pest management (IPM). One member will be formally designated by Salmon-Safe as the Team Leader. Ultimately, the Team Leader is responsible for assuring that the inspection team completes its activities in accordance with Salmon-Safe protocols.
- The Applicant is required to provide, or agree to provide as part of a condition for certification, Salmon-Safe with a set of documents and data such as inventories and maps, an IPM plan, summary reports, and chemical use policies. The list of required information that must be supplied by the Applicant is contained in Appendix A of the Certification Standard.
- Salmon-Safe personnel provide the inspection team with the Applicant’s materials plus the Certification Standard and this Certification Guide. Team members are expected to review all provided materials prior to the field component of the evaluation. Typically, one or more teleconferences will take place between the team members and Salmon-Safe personnel prior to the field stages of the process.
- The field component of the evaluation process entails the following sub-components:
 - Interviews with campus personnel, both in an office setting based and in the field
 - Telephone interviews with relevant external parties such as regulatory agency personnel (if necessary)
 - Inspection of areas within the campus undergoing evaluation

- Completion of evaluation forms (“checklists”) for the campus as a whole and, if multiple sites are included in the assessment, for each of the campus units forming the sample. The checklist forms memorialize the inspectors’ judgments as to the extent of conformance to each of the *performance requirements* found in the Certification Standard.
- Through synthesis and deliberation, facilitated by the Team Leader, a single set of consensus judgments is reached as to conformance with the Certification Standard. The Certification Team renders the *certification decision* by employing the *decision rule for certification* (discussed below). As necessary, the inspection team generates a consensus set of *pre-conditions* or *conditions* designed to address observed deficiencies in the parkland & natural area management program, relative to the Certification Standard.
- A certification evaluation report is prepared and provided to the Applicant in which the certification decision is presented and justified. Typically, report writing will be the responsibility of the Team Leader with the assistance of Salmon-Safe personnel.
- Award of certification is contingent upon execution of a written *certification agreement* between Salmon-Safe and the Applicant. The *certification agreement*, once executed, expressly commits the Certificate Holder to meet the terms and requirements of certification, including any conditions stipulated by the Inspection Team and attached to the award of certification. Other requirements pertain to use of the Salmon-Safe trademarks and the obligation to undergo an annual verification process.

AN OVERVIEW OF THE CERTIFICATION STANDARD

The Salmon-Safe Corporate and University Campus Certification Standards constitute a set of best management practices that can be applied across a variety of landscapes from office parks to urban campuses and sport fields. The Standards are intended to define practices that will maintain and restore aquatic and riparian conditions that are conducive to the recovery of salmonid fisheries. The Standards also recognize that longstanding infrastructure in some campuses can impact water quality and habitat. These infrastructure-related impacts, such as existing concrete-lined stream channels, are addressed as restoration elements of the Standards. Campuses must demonstrate long term progress in addressing the impacts of existing infrastructure where feasible, within budgetary constraints and their use mandate.

The Standards focus on the following key areas of habitat vulnerability most critical to salmonid survival:

1. *Water Quality* – Introduction of sediment, energy (temperature), or chemicals and nutrients from surface or sub-surface runoff.
2. *Water Quantity* – Increase in the magnitude and frequency of peak flows from natural soils and vegetation types converted to impervious surfaces; or reduction in instream flows due to surface or sub-surface water withdrawal for irrigation.
3. *Instream habitat* – Direct alteration of in-stream habitat, including stream bed and stream banks through bank armoring, channelization, or removal of instream wood.
4. *Riparian habitat* – Elimination or reduction of riparian vegetation that can provide numerous stream habitat functions including shade, bank stabilization, source of instream cover (large and small wood) and food chain support.
5. *Fish passage* – Poorly designed or inadequately maintained stream crossings that are barriers to passage by adult or juvenile fish.

Part A of the Standards, focusing on general management issues, is elaborated through a set of eight summary standards that address issues such as compliance with legal requirements, integrated pest management (IPM) and landscape planning.

Part B of the Standards, which focuses on specific management activities, is structured in a 3-level hierarchy:

--Habitat Management Categories

--Standards

--Performance Indicators

Part B is elaborated through six habitat management categories:

1. In-stream habitat protection and restoration
2. Riparian and wetland protection and restoration
3. Water use management (irrigation activities)
4. Stormwater management
5. Erosion and sediment control
6. Chemical and nutrient containment

Each *category* addresses a different aspect of habitat management that directly relates to protection of salmonids. Each category is comprised of one to several certification *standards*. Each standard describes the management objective or

desired outcome for habitat conditions. Under each standard are more specific *performance requirements* that must be met, either prior to and subsequent to award of certification (see section, below, on Certification Decision Rule). Collectively, the standards in Part B cover the range of management most directly related to protection of salmonid habitat.

CERTIFICATION DECISION RULE

As is also described in the Standards document, the basic requisite to achieve certification is demonstrated conformance with each of the standards **and performance requirements**, as confirmed by the inspection team. However, and importantly, there are two classes of standards, one class for which conformance is required *prior to* award of certification and the other class for which conformance can be achieved *after* award of certification.

The first class of standards—designate with ® symbol in the Standards document—are referred to as *non-provisional standards*. Because of their centrality to and importance in achieving circumstances conducive to salmonid recovery, conformance with these standards **and each of their respective performance requirements** must be demonstrated before certification can be awarded. If the inspection team concludes that an Applicant is not in conformance with a non-provisional standard/performance requirement, the inspection team must formulate one or more *Pre-conditions*. Upon receipt of the certification report documenting the team's decision not to award certification, the Applicant must take appropriate remedial actions to “clear” the pre-condition(s). Once Salmon-Safe is satisfied that the pre-condition(s) has/have been cleared, certification will then be awarded.

The remaining standards are referred to as *provisional standards*. Non-conformance with one or more provisional standard, or their respective performance requirements, does not preclude the award of certification. But for each standard/performance requirement for which the inspection team has concluded the Applicant is in non-conformance, the inspection team must formulate one or more *Conditions* that the Applicant must formally accept and agree to clear in a stipulated time frame, if certification is to be awarded.

Standards found in Part A of the Certification Standards are evaluated at the corporate management or campus-wide management level, via group consensus. Part B standards are evaluated at both the campus-wide management and the site level. **Both the campus-wide management assessment and site inspections must be found to be in conformance with the standards.** Thus, non-conformance with one non-provisional standard at the site inspection level would preclude award of certification to the campus applying for certification.

In summary, certification will be awarded at the conclusion of the evaluation process if:

- The inspection team confirms conformance with all non-provisional standards and performance indicators, at the system level and at the site inspection; and,
- The Applicant accepts, as part of the certification contract, all Conditions stipulated by the inspection team to assure, over a reasonable time period, conformance with all provisional standards and performance indicators.

Inability to clear the Conditions in the stipulated time frames could result in the revocation of certification, if judged to be warranted by Salmon-Safe personnel. (The inspection team, or a sub-set thereof, will likely be involved in reviewing the adequacy and timeliness of the Applicant's response to the Conditions).

Drafting Effective Pre-Conditions and Conditions

Given the key role they play, Pre-conditions and conditions must be written so that they:

- Appropriately and adequately respond to observed non-conformances; that is, they require actions of the Applicant that are sufficient to bring about conformance with any standard/performance requirement for which there presently exists a gap
- Provide a reasonable but not excessive amount of time for the Applicant to implement the remedial actions that are being requested (note: generally, no time frames are stipulated for Pre-conditions but if more than, say, one year elapses after the Pre-condition has been conveyed to the applicant, it may be necessary to re-conduct all or a part of the initial evaluation)
- Can be clearly understood by the Applicant and any other interested party.

In summary, Pre-conditions and Conditions should: be concise and clearly written, succinctly lay out what is being asked of the Applicant, and have a stipulated time frame for conformance (Conditions, only). Care should be taken with the wording and style of the Pre-conditions/Conditions so as to avoid imperial tones. They should be written as they are intended, as tools designed to help the Applicant achieve a higher overall level of performance relative to the Standards of certification. Remember, certification is a voluntary process that requires the willing participation of the company or university site management.

QUALIFICATION REQUIREMENTS FOR EXPERT TEAM MEMBERS

Recognizing the pivotal role played by the expert inspection team in the overall certification process, Salmon-Safe has enumerated the following qualifications required of all experts serving as inspectors:

- Independence from the landowner that is undergoing the certification evaluation: Expert team members should not be presently or recently engaged in any business relationship with the Applicant nor any other

type of relationship that could call into the question their objectivity and independence.

- Relevant expertise and professional experience: Salmon-Safe inspectors should possess university credentials in relevant academic disciplines such as aquatic ecology, environmental engineering, landscape architecture, urban forestry, and integrated pest management.
- Ability to function in an interdisciplinary setting
- Ability to follow protocols designed to render structured professional judgments in compressed time frames on the basis of available information and where reaching collaborative and consensus group judgments is required.

Inspection team members should, through their collective expertise and credentials, enhance the overall credibility of the certification process.

EXECUTING AN EXPERT SERVICES (INSPECTOR) CONTRACT WITH SALMON-SAFE

Salmon-Safe will empanel interdisciplinary expert teams on a project-by-project basis. Depending upon a multiplicity of factors such as billing rates, time availability, absence of a conflict of interest, and relevance of expertise and experience, Salmon-Safe will select from two to four experts to serve on an inspection team. An expert's involvement on an inspection team will always be covered by a written agreement between the expert and Salmon-Safe. The agreement will set forth the terms of engagement (e.g., level of compensation, if any) and also include a standard confidentiality agreement as a conflict of interest declaration. At the discretion of Salmon-Safe, the engagement of the services of experts with previous experience on Salmon-Safe projects may be covered by a "standing agreement" kept on file at the Salmon-Safe offices. However, for every new project, each inspection team member must provide an updated conflict of interest declaration that covers the new Salmon-Safe client.

PREPARATION FOR THE INSPECTION

Once the inspection team has been formed, each team member is responsible for preparing for the upcoming certification evaluation. Initially, preparation will typically entail the following activities:

- Develop a working conversancy with the Certification Standards
- Read and become familiar with the contents of this Certification Guide.
- Read any programmatic materials supplied, forwarded by Salmon-Safe, that have supplied by the Applicant
- Participate in any teleconferences arranged by Salmon-Safe and/or the team leader.

Inspection team members are expected to be well prepared for the field components of the certification evaluation process.

CONDUCT OF THE INSPECTION

While there may be slight variations from project to project, the following steps will typically comprise the field component of the evaluation, most of which the team will be physically together:

- **Planning meeting:** typically on the morning of the first day in which the team members are “on site,” the team will get together to plan out the ensuing inspection. Under the direction of the team leader, the team will layout a preliminary logistical plan for the conduct of the inspection. Other logistical details that may be addressed at the planning meeting are whether, in the case of multiple unit campus systems, all team members will visit each of the units forming the sample or, alternatively, if each team member takes on a portion of the sample. Generally, the interdisciplinary paradigm would favor more than one team member visiting each unit, but large campuses or labor budget limitations may preclude that option. One standing direction that the team leader should convey to the team members is: *take careful notes throughout the process.*
- **Opening meeting and interviews:** This is the first point in the process where the inspection team meets face to face with representatives of the Applicant (the campus seeking Salmon-Safe certification). Typically entailing two hours to a half day, the opening interview provides for four things to be accomplished:
 - The inspection team leader can introduce the team members and provide a very brief overview of the evaluation process
 - The Applicant to make a prepared presentation to the inspection team, a presentation geared towards the certification standards. It is the Applicant’s opportunity to “make its case” as to conformance with the Standards. Salmon-Safe representatives should expressly inform the Applicant well in advance that the opening meeting is to be primarily taken up with an informal presentation to the inspection team.
 - The inspection team members can ask specific questions that will better enable them to ascertain the extent of conformance with the Certification Standards, particularly those in Part A. Since time will always be an issue, the inspection team should be careful to not use up the available time with questions and comments. *Generally, the inspection team should refrain from commentaries and debates and instead focus strictly on gathering information.* The inspection team members should take notes on a copy of the Part A Checklist Form (see appendix to this Guide).
 - Finalization of the field inspection protocol.
- **Field inspections** For field inspections, the team member(s) should be accompanied by pertinent campus personnel. The field inspections should be viewed principally as *in situ* interview venues, as the most time efficient manner to ascertain conformance with the Standards is to conduct

- field-based interviews, augmented by unit-specific empirical observations. The Part B Checklist (see appendix) should be filled out by each inspector.
- **Stakeholder interviews:** In the event project-specific issues arise for which due diligence requires consultative contact with other stakeholders, responsibility for that consultation typically will fall upon Salmon-Safe staff.
 - **Synthesis, consensus seeking and decision-making:** Once the allotted field time has been expended (typically a half day or more depending upon the size of the operation being evaluated), the inspection team must then sequester itself for the purpose of reaching a conclusion as to the certifiability of the Applicant. This process is best done when the team is still physically together, as memories and impressions are still fresh and the ability to engage in fruitful dialogue and synthesis is the strongest. In some circumstances, synthesis may need to take place remotely via conference call or email.

Prior to the commencement of the synthesis process, each team member will need to have completed the checklists for Part A and B.

Sufficient time is needed for team members to reach consensus on their group judgment as to the level of conformance with the Certification Standards. For Part A, all team members should have filled out a checklist. With the facilitation and direction of the team leader, the team must strive to arrive at a single set of judgments with respect to each of the standards. Each team member must be willing to “give and take” and to be flexible. A concession made by one team member at one point in the deliberative process should be returned with a concession to that person’s viewpoint later in the deliberations. Alternatively, conditions can be added or revised so as to resolve differences of perspective. Experience shows, however, that discussion and dialogue usually resolves differences of opinion or, more accurately, differences of understanding. While the process must move with all possible alacrity, the team leader should devote the time needed to reveal the reasons for differing viewpoints, in hopes that they can be resolved. For Part B, the consensus seeking must occur campus unit by campus unit, in the case of multiple unit campus systems, and involve those team members that visited each unit.

What if the team is unable to reach consensus? First, it should be understood that consensus is not unanimity. Rather, consensus is a state where there is no active dissent from the majority opinion/judgment. Through the give and take nature of deliberation and synthesis, experience has shown that only in the rarest of circumstances does it prove impossible to achieve consensus, as defined. However, in the unlikely event that there remains an actively dissenting minority opinion, the final resolution rests with the Team Leader. In such an event, the report should clearly document the dissenting opinions and the steps that were taken to accommodate those perspectives.

As described elsewhere in this Guide, the team will need to draft pre-conditions and/or conditions for each observed non-conformance with a

certification standard, either at the system level or at one or more of the sampled park units.

- **Report Writing:** From the standpoint of providing added value to a park system that undergoes the Salmon-Safe certification evaluation process, preparation and submittal of a certification report is essential. The report also provides an administrative record of the activities undertaken by the team and the conclusions reached.

To reduce the burden that report writing places on the team and the process, the following guidelines apply:

- The report should be written by the Team Leader, with input and review provided by the other team members.
- The report should be as brief as possible (less than 5 pages) and focus at the more aggregate level of the 8 standards in Part A and six management categories in Part B of the Certification Standard. For each Part A standard and Part B management category, the report should contain a brief paragraph describing the team's judgment as to the extent of conformance observed for the subject park system.
- The report should briefly describe the team, the qualifications of the team members and the evaluation activities that were carried out.
- The report should list all individuals, and their affiliations, that the team members interviewed during the evaluation
- The report should, in a separate section early in the report, list and present the express terms of all pre-conditions or conditions that were stipulated by the inspection team
- The report should contain a section entitled "Certification Recommendation of the Inspection Team" in which the bottom-line judgment is presented as to whether or not certification should be awarded.

ANNUAL VERIFICATION

Per Salmon-Safe protocols, certificate holders are subject to annual verification of campus-wide performance focusing on any significant alterations in management objectives and practices that could affect the continued validity of Salmon-Safe certification. Annual verification also includes verification of satisfactory progress in meeting any outstanding conditions. Annual verification will include advance preparation (review of past certification reports, status reports on responding to and closing out Conditions, etc.), and brief interviews with campus personnel, if necessary.

APPENDICIES

Appendix 1: Part A Checklist

Appendix 2: Part B Checklist

Appendix 3: Data and Documents Required for Assessment

APPENDIX 1:

INSPECTOR CHECKLIST
PART A: GENERAL STANDARDS FOR CERTIFICATION

Project Name: _____

Date of Assessment: _____

Standard	Conformance	Notes/Conditions
<p>A.1: Campus management is not in violation of national, state, or local environmental laws or associated administrative rules or requirements, as determined by a regulatory agency in an enforcement action.</p>	<p>Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___ Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___</p>	<p>Note: Non-conformance requires a pre-condition</p>
<p>A.2: Provisions are made for the identification and protection of rare, threatened, and endangered salmonids and their habitat on the campus.</p>	<p>Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___ Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___</p>	
<p>A.3: Standard management practices used in day-to-day landscape maintenance, such as turf management, do not jeopardize salmon or their habitat, as determined by conformance with Part B of the Certification Standards. These practices are implemented campus-wide.</p>	<p>Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___ Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___</p>	
<p>A.4: All pesticide use, including any applications by landscape contractors, occurs within the context of an integrated pest management (IPM) program as documented in a written plan (Appendix A – see elements required of an acceptable IPM plan.</p>	<p>Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___ Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___</p>	
<p>A.5: Satisfactory progress is being made in addressing landscape design and infrastructure features that degrade salmon habitat, such as parking lots and other pavement areas, road crossings, or concrete lined streams. These restoration efforts may include those required by the evaluation team to address deficiencies, as well as efforts</p>	<p>Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___ Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___</p>	

<p>already being undertaken. This progress may include prioritized project lists for the campus, master plans for specific projects, and other planning documents as determined by the review team.¹ There is demonstrated progress in correcting management deficiencies.</p>		
<p>A.6: Summary reporting is adequate to document compliance with Salmon-Safe standards. See Appendix A for a list of written summary reports, documents, and data required for Salmon-Safe assessment.</p>	<p>Inspector 1: ____ Inspector 2: ____ Inspector 3: ____ Consensus: ____</p>	

<p>A.7: Management allows monitoring by a third party authorized by Salmon-Safe, and fully cooperates with such monitoring in so far as possible given staffing and funding constraints. Under rare circumstances, the evaluation team may request that campus management conduct limited monitoring where such monitoring is critically needed to assess the efficacy of existing management practices in meeting Salmon Safe standards. The evaluation team will carefully weigh the need for the monitoring against campus management's guidance regarding the scientific and economic feasibility of the proposed monitoring. ®</p>	<p>Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___ Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___</p>	<p>Note: Non-conformance requires a pre-condition</p>
<p>A.8: A policy addressing new campus design and development is in place. This policy requires that the design for expansion or re-development of an existing campus, or design of a new campus be consistent with Salmon-Safe standards, including restoration goals, as feasible considering human use mandates and cost considerations. For example, campus plans demonstrate that they implement green and low impact development (LID) designs. To evaluate conformance, the evaluation team will review design policy and a sample of new campus designs.®</p>	<p>Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___ Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___</p>	<p>Note: Non-conformance requires a pre-condition</p>

APPENDIX 2: Part B Checklist:

**INSPECTOR CHECKLIST
CAMPUS-WIDE STANDARDS &
FIELD APPLICABLE STANDARDS FOR CERTIFICATION¹**

Project Name: _____

Date of Assessment: _____

Standard	Conformance	N/A	Notes/Conditions
<p>Standard B.1.1: Stream channels are in good condition for providing salmonid habitat, with naturally protected stream banks, meandering channel, and large and small wood structure.</p> <p>This standard applies to a) known and potential fish-bearing streams and b) non-fish bearing perennial or intermittent streams greater than two feet in bankfull width that are connected to fish bearing streams, c) perennial seeps and springs</p>			
<p>B.1.1.1: Inventory – Campus management has an accurate map of fish species distribution (existing and potential distribution of native salmonid species) and stream channel types on campus property. At a minimum, these stream channel types shall include: a) fish-bearing, b) potential fish-bearing, and c) non-fish bearing, but greater than two feet in bankfull width and connected to a fish-bearing or potential fish-bearing stream. Channel inventory includes a summary of existing habitat impacts by general type (such as concrete lined channels) at each campus.</p>	<p>Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___ Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___</p>		<p>Note: Required only for campuses of 40 acres or larger</p>
<p>B.1.1.2: Channel protection – existing channels are protected from new impacts such as filling and excavation, straightening, unnecessary additional stream crossings, unnecessary removal of wood, or disconnection of off-channel wetlands and ponds. ®</p>	<p>Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___ Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___</p>		<p>Note: Non-conformance requires a pre-condition</p>
<p>B.1.1.3: Restoration effort – A plan is being implemented that shows significant progress toward ensuring that existing stream channel deficiencies are addressed, as feasible within financial constraints and the human use mandates, to meet the following objectives -</p>	<p>Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___ Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___</p>		

¹ In the case of multiple unit campuses, the checklist should be filled out for *each* sampled campus unit that has been selected by Salmon-Safe for the field component of the certification evaluation process.

<p>i) Type of bank protection – Stream banks are well stabilized by native vegetation.</p> <p>ii) Channelization – The stream has an intact natural channel and floodplain.</p> <p>iii) Artificial ponds – Artificial ponds located in stream channels are removed. Ponds that remain are reconstructed if needed to provide adequate fish passage, habitat, and maintain stream temperatures and oxygen levels within applicable state water quality standards.</p> <p>iv) Large wood management – large wood and/or beaver dams provides channel structure and habitat, where feasible.</p>			
<p>Standard B.1.2. Road and trail crossings of streams that are on campus property and under campus jurisdiction are minimized and have a minimal effect on instream habitat, fish passage, and constriction of flood conveyance. This standard applies to known and potential fish-bearing streams.</p>			
<p>1.2.1 An inventory of stream crossings has been conducted to determine priorities for fish passage and flood conveyance.</p>	<p>Inspector 1: ____ Inspector 2: ____ Inspector 3: ____ Consensus: ____</p>		<p>Note: Required only for campuses of 40 acres or larger</p>
<p>1.2.2 Restoration effort – A plan is being implemented that, in the judgment of the evaluation team, shows significant progress, as feasible within budgetary constraints, toward:</p> <p>i) ensuring that the frequency and placement of crossings contributes to the restoration of riparian habitat and reduction of water quality impacts.</p> <p>ii) replacement of culvert crossing with bridges or natural bottom culverts where feasible and where there are clear benefits for fish.</p>	<p>Inspector 1: ____ Inspector 2: ____ Inspector 3: ____ Consensus: ____</p>		

Standard B.2.1: Riparian areas are in good condition, functioning to maintain and restore stream health, and provide shade, wood recruitment, leaf litter supply, stream bank stability and cover, and filtration of sediment.			
2.1.1. Inventory – All riparian areas of these streams are identified, mapped, and classified by width of existing buffer, length of riparian vegetation free from intrusions from roads, utilities, and other clearings (riparian continuity), and general vegetation types, in order to identify riparian areas in need of restoration.	Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___ Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___		Note: Required only for campuses of 40 acres or larger
2.1.2 Riparian zone width – For campus lands managed as natural areas, impacts on riparian functions affecting water quality, water quantity, food web, microclimate, floodplains, and habitat shall be minimized within 200 feet of a stream, or within the riparian protection areas cited in adopted local or state plans, whichever distance is larger. Trails are generally an accepted use within these riparian areas unless they are obvious sources of sediment, chemical pollution, or bank instability. ®	Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___ Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___		Note: Non-conformance requires a pre-condition.
2.1.3 Vegetation – Riparian zones are dominated by native vegetation that provides riparian functions of bank stability and shade, at a minimum.	Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___ Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___		
2.1.4 Restoration effort – A comprehensive program is underway to identify riparian restoration priorities. Implementation is underway to improve riparian functions and conditions, as feasible within budgetary constraints and human use mandates, in terms of: i) restoring riparian continuity by removal of intrusions such as road and trail crossings, where feasible, and re-planting of native riparian vegetation. ii) identifying and removing invasive non-native vegetation. iii) protecting riparian buffers in perpetuity by conservation easement or other means. iv) in developed campus lands,	Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___ Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___		

<p>improving function of riparian buffers, a minimum of 50 feet and optimal distance of 200 feet from the stream channel, depending on site characteristics, with respect to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -providing off-channel habitat, -improving water quality (shade, erosion control), -reducing the impact of invasive species, restoring native vegetation. <p>in campus lands managed as natural area, enhancing native plant communities within the riparian zone.</p>			
<p>Standard B.2.2: Wetlands connected to known or potential fish-bearing streams are in good condition, providing valuable slow water rearing habitats for juvenile salmonids and helping to filter and moderate flow to downstream areas.</p>			
<p>2.2.1 Inventory –Wetlands are identified, classified, and mapped. Classification of existing wetlands includes types of impacts and whether the wetland historically or currently provides fish habitat.</p>	<p>Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___ Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___</p>		<p>Note: Required only for campuses of 40 acres or larger</p>
<p>2.2.2 Wetland protection – Existing wetlands are protected under campus management. Management or public impacts that are detrimental to wetland native vegetation, soils, or water quality are minimized. ®</p>	<p>Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___ Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___</p>		<p>Note: Non-conformance requires a pre-condition.</p>
<p>2.2.3 Restoration effort – Plans are being implemented that show significant progress, where feasible within budgetary constraints and human use mandate, toward restoring naturally occurring wetlands or creating wetlands that improve stream habitat directly or indirectly by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -providing off-channel salmonid habitat, -improving water quality, -providing additional flood storage, -reducing the impacts of invasive species, and restoring native vegetation. 	<p>Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___ Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___</p>		
<p>Standard B.3.1: The selected source of irrigation water results in the least potential impact to instream flows of fish-bearing streams.</p>			
<p>3.1.1. Withdrawals of surface</p>	<p>Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___</p>		

<p>water sources are managed to avoid impact to salmonids in the source stream during cases of drought.</p>	<p>Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___</p>		
<p>Standard B.3.2: Water conservation measures reduce irrigation water use to the minimum necessary to support maintenance of campus grounds.</p>			
<p>3.2.1 Conservation plan – campus management follows a plan to conserve water by focusing watering in limited areas based on varying plant needs and human use objectives.</p>	<p>Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___ Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___</p>		
<p>B.3.2.2: Water use monitoring is conducted and annual summary reporting is available. Reporting documents a decline in water use per acre for the system over the most recent five-year period or explains how no further efficiencies are feasible.</p>	<p>Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___ Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___</p>		

<p>3.2.3 B.3.2.3: Restoration effort – A plan is being implemented that shows significant progress, where feasible within budgetary constraints and human use mandate, toward increased water conservation, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Low water use native landscaping – landscapes are developed that utilize native vegetation that requires less irrigation. ii) Replacing outdated irrigation equipment with an efficient, modern irrigation system to adjust supply to vegetation requirements, infiltration, evapo-transpiration, and other factors. iii) Water use plan to further limit irrigation areas to high priority sites as determined by campus management. iv) Utilizing rain catchment and recycled stormwater systems. v) Using soil management practices, such as composting and mulching, and thatching and aerating turf, to reduce irrigation requirements. vi) Minimizing total area of turf by converting turf areas to landscaping that requires less irrigation. 	<p>Inspector 1: ____ Inspector 2: ____ Inspector 3: ____ Consensus: ____</p>		
---	---	--	--

Standard B.4.1: Stormwater runoff from campus lands is detained and treated to minimize water pollution and reduce adverse effects on stream flows.			
<p>4.1.1 Inventory – A summary report and mapping provides 1) an estimate of the percent of the campus with impervious surface (pavement and buildings), and 2) primary stormwater drainage routes, areas drained, and location of receiving stormwater drains and streams based on visual inspection of aerial photographs and field knowledge of the campus and surrounding area. The report describes stormwater treatment methods used, if any, in each drainage area, such as infiltration areas, detention ponds, bio-filtration swales, and special projects to mitigate for existing infrastructure, such as reduction in pavement areas, constructed wetlands, and installation of rain catchment systems for buildings.</p>	<p>Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___ Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___</p>		
<p>4.1.2 Water quantity treatment – The campus implements effective measures to slow run-off originating from primary drainage areas on the campus through infiltration, detention, or other means.</p>	<p>Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___ Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___</p>		
<p>4.1.3. Water quality treatment – The campus implements effective measures to reduce contaminants in stormwater coming from all drainage areas on the campus through infiltration, detention, or other means.</p>	<p>Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___ Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___</p>		
<p>4.1.4 Restoration effort – A plan is being implemented that shows significant progress toward increasing pervious cover types within the campus system and increasing the capacity of the non-built area to diffuse, filter, or detain stormwater flow generated within campus, as feasible within financial constraints and management mandates, including:</p> <p>i) reducing impervious surface (concrete, pavement, roof, and other) to less than 5 percent of the campus system land as a whole.</p> <p>ii) Treatment for water quantity and quality - use of various methods to diffuse, store, and filter stormwater runoff, such as</p>	<p>Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___ Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___</p>		

<p>bio-filtration swales, bio-filtration sumps, constructed stormwater treatment wetlands, rain catchment systems, replacement of turf with areas of native landscaping and trees that has higher infiltration, and rain gardens, to meet or exceed the current state requirements and guidelines for stormwater management, as provided in standard state stormwater management manual.</p> <p>i)</p>			
<p>Standard B.5.1: Soils protection is accomplished by vegetative cover, mulch, or other methods to prevent off-site movement of sediment. Erosion control for new construction, stored soils, and potential surface erosion areas are addressed by erosion control standards adopted and used campus-wide.</p>			
<p>5.1.1 Trail systems – Earthen trails are protected by mulch, water bars, closures or other BMPs as necessary to prevent erosion.</p>	<p>Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___ Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___</p>		
<p>5.1.2 Vegetative cover – Bare or disturbed soils are only temporary features on campus and are treated with immediate and long term erosion control measures to prevent sediment transport to streams or off-site in stormwater ®</p>	<p>Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___ Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___</p>		<p>Note: Non-conformance requires a pre-condition.</p>
<p>5.1.3 Construction BMPs—all new plans and construction meet or exceed current state requirements for site pollution control, as described in the standard state erosion control manual.</p>	<p>Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___ Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___</p>		
<p>5.1.4 Restoration effort – Plans and construction of stormwater drainage systems demonstrate progress toward protecting soils from erosion and preventing the transport of sediment into streams or off-site stormwater.</p>	<p>Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___ Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___</p>		

Standard B.6.1 Pesticides use on the campus does not result in contamination of stormwater or streams with amounts of pesticides harmful to salmon or aquatic ecosystems.			
<p>B.6.1.1: Type of pesticides – All use of pesticides on the campus, including waterways, waterway buffers, and uplands, is limited in an IPM program by the specific policies on the method of use, including application type, rate, frequency, location, and amount. Campus management uses only those pesticides that are listed on a campus approved list. These pesticides will only be used when there is no undue risk of harm to salmon and aquatic ecosystems. This limited use list is established and reviewed on an annual basis by campus management to ensure that potential harm to salmon and aquatic ecosystems is minimized.</p>	<p>Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___ Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___</p>		
<p>B.6.1.2: Minimizing aquatic impacts from high risk pesticides - The use of any pesticides on the Salmon Safe Cautionary List of High Risk Pesticides requires written explanation for each pesticide used that details the methods of use, including timing and location, that demonstrate that the risk to aquatic systems is negligible (Appendix B – Salmon Safe’s Cautionary List of High Risk Pesticides). ®</p>			Note: Non-conformance requires a pre-condition.
<p>B.6.1.3: Restricted use zones – Pesticide use is specially managed within 1) waterways, and 2) waterway buffers. The buffer zone is defined as a corridor of land that is 60 feet in width on the sides of a stream or other body of water. Measurement of this buffer zone begins at the edge of the water line at the time of application. Anticipated seasonal or weather related changes affecting water level will be included in the decision making process when dealing with buffer zones. ®</p>	<p>Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___ Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___</p>		Note: Non-conformance requires a pre-condition.
<p>B.6.1.4: Pesticide treatment of trees – Pesticides are used only on rare occasion for treating tree pests or diseases for trees within riparian buffer zones. Injection of pesticides within tree tissues, or paintbrush application, are the only application methods for trees allowed in riparian buffer zones.</p>	<p>Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___ Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___</p>		Note: Non-conformance requires a pre-condition.

®			
<p>B.6.1.5: Application equipment – Within riparian buffers, pesticide application for vegetation other than trees is done by hand and using low volume, low pressure, single wand sprayers, wiping, daubing and painting equipment, or injection systems. The methods used minimize fine mists and ensure that the applied materials reach targeted plants or targeted soils surfaces. ®</p>	<p>Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___ Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___</p>		<p>Note: Non-conformance requires a pre-condition.</p>
<p>B.6.1.6: Pesticide drift – Great care is taken to ensure that pesticide drift does not reach non targeted areas by using appropriate equipment and methods. Spray applications are not allowed in the buffer area when wind speed is above 5 mph or wind direction would carry pesticides toward open water. Also, no spraying is done during an inversion. ®</p>	<p>Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___ Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___</p>		<p>Note: Non-conformance requires a pre-condition.</p>
<p>B.6.1.7: Reduction program – An IPM plan or policies are being implemented that promote management practices that reduce the impact of, the unnecessary reliance upon, or eliminate the need for pesticides. These practices generally include careful monitoring and scouting of insects, weeds, and disease, use of non-spray control methods (cultural practices and mechanical controls), use of reduced impact pesticide controls, and/or managing specific sites without the use of pesticides (Appendix A – see required elements of an IPM plan). Pesticide applicators, whether employees or contractors, are trained in the IPM plan and implement it fully.</p>	<p>Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___ Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___</p>		
<p>B.6.1.8: Pesticide applicator licensing – All persons applying pesticides must be currently licensed as pesticide applicators by the state department of agriculture. Licensed personnel must be specifically endorsed for any of the state defined categories of pest control they undertake, such as aquatic endorsement for all aquatic pest control activities. ®</p>	<p>Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___ Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___</p>		<p>Note: Non-conformance requires a pre-condition.</p>

<p>B.6.1.9: Pesticide storage, rinsates, disposal – the campus has rigorous policies in place to ensure that no contamination of stormwater or streams occurs due to storage, cleaning of equipment, or disposal of pesticides and these policies are adhered to by campus personnel. ®</p>	<p>Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___ Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___</p>		<p>Note: Non-conformance requires a pre-condition.</p>
<p>B.6.1.10: Pesticide tracking system – Detailed records are maintained for all pesticide applications, including applications to aquatic areas and buffer zones, consistent with state requirements.</p>	<p>Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___ Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___</p>		
<p>B.6.1.11: Pesticide application timing – pesticides are not applied when it is raining, unless otherwise directed by label instructions, or when there is potential for transport by runoff to stormwater drains or streams. Decisions regarding scheduling of pesticide applications should account for the expected impacts of anticipated storm events.®</p>	<p>Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___ Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___</p>		<p>Note: Non-conformance requires a pre-condition.</p>

<p>Standard B.6.2: Fertilizer and lime use and potential for contamination of stormwater and streams is minimized through adherence to a program that uses alternative cultural and mechanical practices to maintain soil fertility, uses fertilizers with discretion based on soil fertility and plant needs, uses slow reacting fertilizers, and ensures proper application of fertilizer and lime in terms of amounts and timing.</p>			
<p>6.2.1 Types of fertilizers – Fertilizer types are tailored to the existing soil conditions and plant requirements. Slow release, organic fertilizers, or compost are generally used. Fertilizers must be selected through a state-approved screening and approval process to ensure the fertilizer does not contain toxic contaminants. If soluble fertilizers are used the timing and rate of application is carefully considered (see below). ®</p>	<p>Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___ Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___</p>		<p>Note: Non-conformance requires a pre-condition.</p>
<p>B.6.2.2: Fertilizer application amounts – In general campus turf and shrub bed areas soluble fertilizer rates of application are limited to no more than .5 lb N/1000 square feet with restraints on timing to minimize fertilizer in stormwater runoff. ®</p>	<p>Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___ Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___</p>		<p>Note: Non-conformance requires a pre-condition.</p>
<p>B.6.2.3: Low fertilizer landscaping – plants with low fertilizer requirements are used for landscaping where feasible.</p>	<p>Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___ Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___</p>		
<p>B.6.2.4: Focused use – Fertilizer and lime are used only on high and moderate intensity use areas, such as flowerbeds, ball fields, golf courses, some turf areas and planting beds, and some plantings associated with construction and restoration projects.</p>	<p>Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___ Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___</p>		
<p>B.6.2.5: Buffer zone width – Fertilizer and lime use is highly restricted within a waterway buffer zone (see 6.1.2). ®</p>	<p>Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___ Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___</p>		<p>Note: Non-conformance requires a pre-condition.</p>
<p>B.6.2.6: Use within watercourse buffers – fertilizer use in buffer zones of</p>	<p>Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___</p>		<p>Note: Non-conformance requires a pre-condition.</p>

waterways is restricted depending on the intensity of application and type of fertilizers. The allowable use of fertilizer also varies depending on whether they are being used for routine maintenance or for restoration and construction projects. ®	Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___		
B.6.2.7: Soil testing– Periodic soil testing is done to determine the need for fertilizer (Phosphorus and Potassium) and lime relative to appropriate benchmarks established by campus management. Testing is conducted a minimum of twice per year and prior to fertilizer application.	Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___ Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___		
6.2.2 B.6.2.8: Soil fertility - practices, such as on-site mulching of leaf and grass clippings, are used to reduce need for fertilizer.	Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___ Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___		
B.6.2.9: A summary report of annual fertilizer use is provided that shows a stable or declining trend in synthetic fertilizer use campus-wide, taking into account changes in acreage managed, campus uses, and other factors.	Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___ Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___		
Standard B.6.3: Other contaminants² , such as animal and chemical waste, do not contaminate stormwater or streams leaving the campus, recognizing that the campus may have a limited management ability to control the public and actions of other agencies.			
B.6.3.1: Animal waste control – Campus management and education policies regarding dog or other domestic animal waste control are effective in minimizing the contamination of stormwater or streams.	Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___ Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___		
B.6.3.2: Chemical waste spills/dumping – The campus is managed to avoid chemical waste dumping. The campus has a rigorous chemical material spill response policy and personnel are trained in spill response. ®	Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___ Inspector 3: ___ Consensus: ___		Note: Non-conformance requires a pre-condition.
B.6.3.3: Wildlife waste control program (geese, ducks) – If necessary and practical, a management program is	Inspector 1: ___ Inspector 2: ___		

² Stormwater contamination and treatment related to runoff from roads and landscapes are evaluated in the stormwater management category.

implemented to ensure that duck and goose waste does not contaminate stormwater or streams.	Inspector 3: ____ Consensus: ____		
B.6.3.4: All vehicle washing is done at an NPDES permitted car wash.	Inspector 1: ____ Inspector 2: ____ Inspector 3: ____ Consensus: ____		

APPENDIX 3:

DATA AND DOCUMENTS REQUIRED FOR CAMPUS ASSESSMENT

Requirements 1-4 apply only if stream, wetland, or riparian habitat is present on the campus

1. Inventory and mapping of fish species distribution (existing and potential distribution of native salmonid species) and stream channel types for property managed by the campus . At a minimum, these stream channel types shall include: a) fish-bearing, b) potential fish-bearing, and c) non-fish bearing, but greater than two feet in bankfull width and connected to a fish bearing stream. The channel inventory shall include a summary of existing habitat impacts by general type, such as locations of channelized streams, severe eroding banks, and other parameters, for each campus.
Note: Required only for campuses of 40 acres or larger
2. Inventory and mapping of stream crossings within the campus to determine need for fish passage and flood conveyance.
Note: Required only for campuses of 40 acres or larger
3. Inventory, mapping, and description of riparian zones (of all stream types listed in 1, above) to summarize existing protected buffer widths, shade condition, general vegetation types (such as mowed grass or mature native trees) within the protected buffer and outside that area in the riparian zone), and riparian restoration opportunities. Local jurisdiction inventory & mapping of riparian areas overlaid with campus areas is generally sufficient to meet this requirement.
Note: Required only for campuses of 40 acres or larger
4. Inventory, mapping, and classification of wetlands. Inventory and mapping using National Wetland Inventory or local wetland inventory data is the minimum acceptable level of mapping. Classification includes types of impacts and whether the wetland historically or currently provides fish habitat.
Note: Required only for campuses of 40 acres or larger
5. Summary report that provides an estimate of the percent impervious surface (pavement) on campus based on visual inspection of aerial photographs and field knowledge of the campus. The report includes a summary of the total percent impervious estimate for both developed and natural areas of the campus. In addition, the report lists any special stormwater mitigation projects that have been completed in the five years preceeding the initiation of certification evaluation, such as reduction in pavement, detention ponds, or biofiltration swales.
Note: Required only for campuses of 40 acres or larger
6. An Integrated Pest Management Plan, or summary information, that contains the following information –

- i. Pest control strategy to ensure that prevention and physical, mechanical, or biological control methods are evaluated for use before pesticides are used. Pest control strategies will be re-evaluated a minimum of once a year.
 - ii. Criteria for choosing any method of pest control includes any potential negative impacts to aquatic systems.
 - iii. Limited Use List of pesticides approved for use in aquatic buffers with annual review based on available information on impacts to aquatic systems.
 - iv. Training and education in pest management techniques and IPM plan.
 - v. Buffer zone width and restrictions for use of pesticides within buffer zones.
 - vi. List of pesticides used on trees and discussion of methods (including equipment, frequency, timing, location, and formulation and amount used).
 - vii. Precautions taken to prevent pesticide drift.
 - viii. Pesticide applicator licensing requirements.
 - ix. Pesticide storage, rinsate, and disposal policies.
 - x. Pesticide tracking system.
7. Summary reports on monitoring activities and findings for any monitoring conducted on the campus within 5 years prior to the campus' initial application for Salmon-Safe certification. Monitoring reports include campus-wide summary reports on irrigation and water use. Reports are also provided for any water quality and habitat monitoring projects that have been conducted, including stormwater runoff testing to help determine if over-fertilization (Nitrogen) is occurring in high fertilizer use areas.
8. Annual restoration project monitoring reports summarizing the results of monitoring according to the restoration monitoring policy established by campus management.
9. Annual summary report from periodic soil testing conducted to determine the need for fertilizer and lime use and to demonstrate trends in fertilizer and lime use campus-wide. The report should include soil analysis reports, and factors responsible for the reported increase or decrease in fertilizer use and relation to soil testing.

10. Harmful chemical waste spills/dumping prevention and response policies and summary documentation on any chemical waste dumping that has occurred.