



2000 Powell St., Suite 600
Emeryville, CA 94608, USA
www.scscertified.com
Brendan Grady
bgrady@scscertified.com

FOREST MANAGEMENT AND STUMP-TO-FOREST GATE CHAIN-OF-CUSTODY SURVEILLANCE EVALUATION REPORT

J.D. Irving Northern Maine Woodlands Forestry Division
Irving Woodlands, LLC
SCS-FM/COC-00121N
300 Union Street
St. John, NB, CA E2L4M3
Scott MacDougall, MacDougall.Scott@jdirving.com
www.jdirving.com

CERTIFIED	EXPIRATION
12/08/09	12/08/14

DATE OF FIELD AUDIT
10/16-18/12
DATE OF LAST UPDATE
12/07/12

Organization of the Report

This report of the results of our evaluation is divided into two sections. Section A provides the public summary and background information that is required by the Forest Stewardship Council. This section is made available to the general public and is intended to provide an overview of the evaluation process, the management programs and policies applied to the forest, and the results of the evaluation. Section A will be posted on the FSC Certificate Database (<http://info.fsc.org/>) no less than 30 days after issue of the certificate. Section B contains more detailed results and information for the use of by the FME.

FOREWORD

Cycle in annual surveillance audits			
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 st annual audit	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 nd annual audit	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 rd annual audit	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 th annual audit
Name of Forest Management Enterprise and abbreviation used in this report:			

All certificates issued by SCS under the aegis of the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) require annual audits to ascertain ongoing compliance with the requirements and standards of certification. A public summary of the initial evaluation is available on the SCS website www.scscertified.com.

Pursuant to FSC and SCS guidelines, annual / surveillance audits are not intended to comprehensively examine the full scope of the certified forest operations, as the cost of a full-scope audit would be prohibitive and it is not mandated by FSC audit protocols. Rather, annual audits are comprised of three main components:

- A focused assessment of the status of any outstanding conditions or Corrective Action Requests (CARs; see discussion in section 4.0 for those CARs and their disposition as a result of this annual audit);
- Follow-up inquiry into any issues that may have arisen since the award of certification or prior to the audit; and
- As necessary given the breadth of coverage associated with the first two components, an additional focus on selected topics or issues, the selection of which is not known to the certificate holder prior to the audit.

Contents

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY	4
1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION	4
1.3 Standards Employed	4
2.0 ANNUAL AUDIT DATES AND ACTIVITIES	5
3.0 CHANGES IN MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	8
4.0 RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION	8
6.0 CERTIFICATION DECISION	13
8.0 ANNUAL DATA UPDATE	14
8.2 Annual Summary of Pesticide and Other Chemical Use	14

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY

1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1 Annual Audit Team

Auditor Name:	Mike Dann	Auditor role:	Lead Auditor
Qualifications: Mike Dann is a Lead Forest Management and Chain-of-Custody auditor for SCS from Dixmont, Maine. He earned a BS in Forest Management from the University of Maine Orono and is a Licensed Forester in Maine. He has completed a 3-day ISO 19011 training designed & presented in relation to the FSC Standards, a 3 day SCS training for Forest Management auditors and other SCS in-house training courses. He has conducted multiple FSC forest management and COC audits. He worked 36 years, the last 15 as Woodlands Manager, for Seven Islands Land Company, and more recently, 4 years for the Small Woodland Owners Association of Maine.			
Auditor Name:	Mike Thompson	Auditor role:	Team Auditor
Qualifications: Mr. Thompson is the President of Penobscot Environmental Consulting, Inc., and a Certified Wildlife Biologist. He has worked as a subcontractor to SCS for over 15 years, conducting certification evaluations to the Forest Stewardship Council's (FSC) forest management and chain-of-custody standards. Mr. Thompson has also conducted audits to the Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI) forest management standards. He received his B.Sc. degree in wildlife from the University of Idaho and his M.Sc. degree in wildlife from the University of Maine. Mr. Thompson has over 25 years of experience in ecology, wildlife management, wetland science, and rare species conservation.			

1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation

A. Number of days spent on-site assessing the applicant:	3
B. Number of auditors participating in on-site evaluation:	2
C. Additional days spent on preparation, stakeholder consultation, and post-site follow-up:	1
D. Total number of person days used in evaluation:	7

1.3 Standards Employed

1.3.1. Applicable FSC-Accredited Standards

Title	Version	Date of Finalization
FSC-US Forest Management Standard	V1.0	July 8, 2010
All standards employed are available on the websites of FSC International (www.fsc.org), the FSC-US (www.fscus.org) or the SCS Forest Conservation Program homepage (www.scscertified.com/forestry). Standards are also available, upon request, from Scientific Certification Systems (www.scscertified.com).		

2.0 ANNUAL AUDIT DATES AND ACTIVITIES

2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities

Date: Tuesday Oct. 16, 2012	
FMU/Location/ sites visited	Activities/ notes
St. John Office (Fort Kent)	<p>Opening Meeting</p> <p>Attending:</p> <p>Scott MacDougall – Certification Manager</p> <p>Ked Coffin – Regional Forester</p> <p>Peter Tabor – Regional Manager</p> <p>Matt Stedman – Operations Forester</p> <p>John Gilbert – Mgr. Fish and Wildlife</p> <p>Toby Pineo – Road Superintendent</p> <p>Steve Mason – Harvest Superintendent</p> <p>Nick Pelletier – Planning Forester</p> <p>Andrew Willet – Mgr. Silviculture</p> <p>Josh Philbrook – Harvest Superintendent</p> <p>Rick Fowler – District Scaler</p> <p>Mike Dann – SCS Lead Auditor</p> <p>Mike Thompson – SCS Team Auditor</p> <p>Document review</p> <p>Review of open CAR/Obs</p>
T 14 R 12 Block#6894	<p>Mixedwood stand with clearcut in front to remove poplar and fir and improvement cut on the remainder of the tract.</p> <p>Small wet run buffered</p> <p>Adequate stand level retention</p> <p>Forwarder is all off-road, leaving clean ditches. One temp crossing placed in ditch to avoid siltation.</p> <p>Cross-drain ditches to Ben Glazier Brook were running clean.</p> <p>Crew had appropriate oil and fuel spill kits on site and explained correct procedures for handling leaks and spills.</p>
T 14 R 12 Block#6892	<p>Late Successional (LS) Hardwood Stand</p> <p>Risk assessment showed potential LS from GIS data</p> <p>Site is entered in Unique Areas Program</p> <p>Site will remain in the Program until a formal cruise determines whether it qualifies as LS</p>
T 15 R 12 Block#6853	<p>Cooperative Deer Wintering Area (DWA)</p> <p>Road activity in 2008 showed deer activity</p> <p>JDI placed the area under the cooperative management agreement with</p>

	MDIFW voluntarily. Harvests have targeted non-conforming cover and provided browse. A temporary brook crossing was used. Proper water quality BMPs employed.
Michaud Farm – Allagash River	Viewed past harvest within the visual zone of the Allagash Wilderness Waterway (AWW). Harvested under a permit issued by the AWW. Harvest is unobtrusive when viewed from the river.
Date: Wednesday October 17, 2012	
FMU/Location/ sites visited	Activities/ notes
T 19 R 11	Discussion of culvert size and placement on road reconstruction. Satisfactory placement and sizing All water quality BMPs used appropriately
T 19 R 11	New bridge construction Discussion of advantages of bridge vs. culverts for aquatic organism passage
T 20 R 11&12 Block#6006	2012 winter harvest adjacent to a floodplain forest along the St. Francis River designated an HCVF. Discussion of determining boundary of the HCVF on the ground. Visual buffer left around a leased recreational camp
T 17 R 12 Block#6097	Seed Tree harvest in hardwood stand that had a significant component of low quality beech. Discussion of results.
T 17 R 12 Block#6096	Processor cut in hardwood Combination of clearcut and maintenance cut prescriptions Island with stand level retention components left. Discussion of Legacy Tree vs. other trees left for retention Buffers left around wet areas Maintenance harvest removed high risk softwood leaving a well-stocked quality residual.
T 17 R 12 Block #6108	Full tree overstory removal in hardwood. Feller buncher operator discovered a large stick nest, stopped operating in the area, and notified the forester. Nest might be a Great Blue Heron nest. MDIFW consulted and a ¼ mi. buffer has been placed around the nest until it can be positively identified.
T 17 R 12 Block #6108	Overstory removal harvest in a hardwood stand that had a Shelterwood prep cut in 2002. Used the same trails to preserve advance regeneration A 3-4 acre island was left for retention Beech dominated understory with some maple and birch Discussion of whether desired outcome had been achieved.

T 17 R 12 Block #6108	Single tree selection harvest in mature hardwood 70 sq.ft. BA of quality hardwood remaining.
Date: Thursday October 18, 2012	
FMU/Location/ sites visited	Activities/ notes
T 13 R 9	Clearcut, overstory removal, and harvesting in old clearcut buffer zones. Discussion of the Outcome Based Forestry Agreement that JDI has recently signed with the State of Maine that allows deviation from some requirements of the Maine Forest Practices Act if all environmental issues are adequately addressed. Requires 3 rd party forest certification. Allows JDI to practice stand/landscape level without being artificially constrained. Harvests seemed to make sense silviculturally. A 17 acre island had been left uncut to provide some connectivity between and among the clearcut patches. The clearcut areas will be planted.
T 13 R 9 Block #6607	Riparian zone harvest. 40% removal within 250 feet of the brook An LS stand, identified by JDI as potentially Type I old growth, was reserved pending future confirmation of Type I status. Discussion of identification and protection of old growth.
T 13 R 9 Block #6606	Overstory removal on steep slopes with a processor. Well-stocked advance regeneration No water control issues noted, BMPs appropriately used
T 13 R 9 Block #6606	Inspection of log landing Short steep slopes and wet weather led to excess siltation of yard. JDI recognizes the need to take remedial action; waiting for the area to firm up so that more damage will not be done. Discussion of the timeliness of response and appropriate measures to insure that siltation does not reach Fox Brook.
T 14 R 8	Herbicide block Discussion of how environmental concerns are addressed in the planning and execution of the herbicide program.
T 14 R 8	Inspection of new road system New roads are straighter and wider, increasing efficiency and safety The system has reduced the number of stream crossings that have to be constructed and maintained. Sections of the old road system will be cut off and old culverts will be pulled.
JDI Portage Office	Closing meeting

	Summarization of findings
--	---------------------------

3.0 CHANGES IN MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

There were no significant changes in the management and/or harvesting methods that affect the FME’s conformance to the FSC standards and policies. JDI has signed the **Outcome Based Forestry Agreement #2011-1** with the Maine Forest Service. This agreement frees JDI from requirements of the Maine Forest Practices Act concerning clearcut size, buffer zones between clearcuts, and management plan and reporting requirements. In return, JDI commits to maintain 3rd party certification, document efforts to improve the quantity and/or quality of its timber resource, annually report information about its harvests and silvicultural metrics, and report average clearcut size and total acres. A Maine Licensed Forester shall review their management plan. Harvests will be laid out with consideration to visual aesthetics in visually sensitive areas. JDI will accommodate other reasonable requests for information.

4.0 RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION

4.1 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations

Finding Number: 2011.4	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC US FM STD; 6.5.d
Non-Conformity:	
<p>JDI maintains a plan identifying all areas in the transportation network where road conditions are in disrepair, and prioritizes them for repair based on their potential for ecological impacts and the disruption of traffic. A large mudhole was observed on a road in the Blackstone district, adjacent to a paved county road that was not identified as being in need of repair on JDI’s road maintenance plan. The explanation was given that the road was traveled infrequently, and that the road maintenance issue in question was not close to impacting an area of high ecological value. The audit team agrees with this position, but still finds that JDI could improve its road maintenance practices by identifying road maintenance issues outside of areas that are undergoing active operations.</p>	
Corrective Action Request:	
<p>JDI could improve its system for identifying poor road conditions on areas of the transportation network not used for regular timber operations.</p>	
FME response <i>(including any</i>	

evidence submitted)	
SCS review	JDI has modified its road maintenance policy to include the requirement that any road not used within the past 3 years will be surveyed to determine if any environmental concerns exist. The audit team thinks this new requirement addresses the concern of the Observation.
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2011.5	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC US FM STD; 6.6.d
Non-Conformity: The applicable indicator requires that written prescription describing site-specific hazards, environmental risks, and precautions that workers will employ to avoid or minimize those hazards and risks. JDI does not prepare a standard written pesticide prescription prior to each application of pesticides. Individual areas are selected for pesticide application by based on the level of competing vegetation, as analyzed by aerial observation and field investigation. Individual maps of pesticide application areas are prepared indicating site-specific hazards such as watercourses. These maps are referenced in an herbicide plan, a spreadsheet that lists the individual applications, their locations, sizes, and the species composition of the target stand. Only a single type of pesticide and single application method is used (aerial spraying of glyphosate). Taken in total, this system meets the all the elements of the indicator, and is thus narrowly in conformance, but the system does not produce a single document that includes all elements of the prescription as envisioned by the indicator.	
Corrective Action Request: Conformance to the indicator would be enhanced if JDI prepared comprehensive written prescriptions meeting the requirements of 6.6.d in a single document prior to chemical's being used.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	
SCS review	JDI revised their pesticide application program to include a document that summarizes site-specific hazards and environmental risks, precautions taken to minimize those risks, and a map of the treatment area. Examples of this

	document were reviewed at the audit. The audit team concludes that this meets the requirements of the Observation.
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

4.2 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations

Certificate holder/applicant	J.D. Irving Northern Maine Woodlands Forestry Division, Irving Woodlands, LLC (JDI)
CAR/OBS identified by (SCS representative)	Mike Dann and Mike Thompson
Date of Issuance	October 18, 2012
Audit Year/Type	3 rd Surveillance Audit

Finding Number: 2012.1	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator(s):	FSC-US Forest Management Standard V1-0 6.3.a.3.
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): JDI's protocol for identifying late successional and potential old growth stands was reviewed. Field sites were visited. Forest stands are being appropriately identified and protected. The protocol meets the intent of the Standard. JDI conducted a harvest adjacent to a potential Type 1 Old Growth stand prior to the company's ecologist evaluating whether the stand actually was Type 1 Old Growth and before the ecologist could advise on the potential impact of the harvest on the stand's functional value.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): A clarification of the protocol under which forest operations can take place adjacent to known or potential old growth stands would improve conformance.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	
SCS review	

Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)
----------------	---

Finding Number: 2012.2	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator(s):	FSC-US Forest Management Standard V1-0 6.3.f.
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): JDI's current Legacy Tree definition is broader than the FSC definition, resulting in trees such as snags and nest trees being defined as Legacy Trees in addition to those meeting the FSC definition.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): While all trees currently protected under the JDI policy are valuable stand components that warrant protection under the Indicator, a clarification and/or redefinition of "Legacy Tree" in the JDI policy would help ensure conformance with the Indicator.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2012.3	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator(s):	FSC-US Forest Management Standard V1-0 6.3.h.

<p>Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): JDI's current strategy to assess the risk of, prioritizing, and implementing a strategy to prevent or control invasive species contains the 4 elements listed in the Indicator. An assessment of the invasive plant Phragmites was reviewed by the audit team. The assessment concluded that control of Phragmites was not feasible, but documentation for how this conclusion was reached was general in nature.</p>	
<p>Corrective Action Request (or Observation): The assessment was found to meet the intent of the Indicator. JDI should, however, develop a report with more explicit information on extent, costs, control alternatives, and consultation with State and regional experts to guide future assessments of invasive species.</p>	
<p>FME response (including any evidence submitted)</p>	
<p>SCS review</p>	
<p>Status of CAR:</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)</p>

5.0 STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS

In accordance with SCS protocols, consultation with key stakeholders is an integral component of the evaluation process. Stakeholder consultation takes place prior to, concurrent with, and following field evaluations. Distinct purposes of such consultation include:

1. To solicit input from affected parties as to the strengths and weaknesses of the FME's management, relative to the standard, and the nature of the interaction between the company and the surrounding communities.
2. To solicit input on whether the forest management operation has consulted with stakeholders regarding identifying any high conservation value forests (HCVFs).

Principal stakeholder groups are identified based upon results from the pre-evaluation (if one was conducted), lists of stakeholders from the FME under evaluation, and additional stakeholder contacts from other sources (e.g., chair of the regional FSC working group). The following types of groups and individuals were determined to be principal stakeholders in this evaluation:

5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted

Maine Forest Service	Wildlife consultant
Logging contractors	

Stakeholder consultation activities are organized to give participants the opportunity to provide comments according to general categories of interest based on the three FSC chambers, as well as the SCS Interim Standard, if one was used. The table below summarizes the major comments received from

stakeholders and the assessment team’s response. Where a stakeholder comment has triggered a subsequent investigation during the evaluation, the corresponding follow-up action and conclusions from SCS are noted below.

5.2 Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Responses from the Team, Where Applicable

FME has not received any stakeholder comments from interested parties as a result of stakeholder outreach activities during this annual audit.		<input type="checkbox"/>
Stakeholder comments	SCS Response	
Economic concerns		
None received		
Social concerns		
None received		
Environmental concerns		
A report was received that excessive sedimentation was seen next to the Rocky Brook road.	The site was visited by JDI staff and the audit team. The site was not visually pleasing. Because Fox Brook was just across the road and downhill from the site, JDI staff had determined that it would be appropriate to wait until the site had stabilized somewhat before attempting to put equipment back on the site to repair the damage. The audit team noted that the ditch in front of the site was acting as a settling pool and that no siltation was moving to Fox Brook.	
The Maine Forest Service reported that there had been no water quality problems with JDI in the past year. Nor were there any Forest Practices Act violations.	Noted.	

6.0 CERTIFICATION DECISION

The certificate holder has demonstrated continued overall conformance to the applicable Forest Stewardship standards. The SCS annual audit team recommends that the certificate be sustained, subject to subsequent annual audits and the FME’s response to any open CARs.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments:	

7.0 CHANGES IN CERTIFICATION SCOPE

There were no changes in the scope of the certification in the previous year.

8.0 ANNUAL DATA UPDATE

8.1 Social Information

Number of forest workers (including contractors) working in forest within scope of certificate (differentiated by gender): 214		
204 male workers	10 female workers	
Number of accidents in forest work since last audit	Serious: 0	Fatal: 0

8.2 Annual Summary of Pesticide and Other Chemical Use

FME does not use pesticides.

Commercial name of pesticide/ herbicide	Active ingredient	Quantity applied annually (kg or lbs)	Size of area treated during previous year	Reason for use
Rodeo	Glyphosate 53%	3640 gal	4790 ac.	Conifer release
Arsenal AC	Imazapyr 53%	1264 oz.	1264 ac.	Conifer release
Oust XP	Sulfometuron Methyl 75%	876 oz.	876 ac.	Conifer release