

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

## *Irving Woodlands, LLC (IWLLC)*

*J.D. Irving Northern Maine Woodlands Forestry Division*

Maine, USA

### **SCS-FM/COC-00121N**

300 Union Street

St. John, New Brunswick

E2L 4M3, Canada

[MacDougall.Scott@jdirving.com](mailto:MacDougall.Scott@jdirving.com)

[www.jdirving.com](http://www.jdirving.com)

CERTIFIED	EXPIRATION
08 December 2014	07 December 2019

DATE OF FIELD AUDIT

19-21 October 2015

DATE OF LAST UPDATE

28 December 2015

*SCS Contact:*

**Brendan Grady** | Director  
Forest Management Certification

+1.510.452.8000

[bgrady@scsglobalservices.com](mailto:bgrady@scsglobalservices.com)

**SCS** global  
SERVICES  
Setting the standard for sustainability™

## Foreword

2000 Powell Street, Ste. 600, Emeryville, CA 94608 USA  
 +1.510.452.8000 main | +1.510.452.8001 fax  
[www.SCSglobalServices.com](http://www.SCSglobalServices.com)

Cycle in annual surveillance audits			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1 <sup>st</sup> annual audit	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <sup>nd</sup> annual audit	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <sup>rd</sup> annual audit	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 <sup>th</sup> annual audit
Name of Forest Management Enterprise (FME) 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 conformance with the requirements and standards of certification. A public summary of the initial evaluation is available on the FSC Certificate Database <http://info.fsc.org/>.

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 this 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.

### 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 90 days after completion of the on-site audit. Section B contains more detailed results and information for the use by the FME.

## Table of Contents

---

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY .....	4
1. GENERAL INFORMATION .....	4
1.1 Annual Audit Team.....	4
1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation .....	4
1.3 Standards Employed .....	4
2 ANNUAL AUDIT DATES AND ACTIVITIES .....	5
2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities .....	5
2.2 Evaluation of Management Systems .....	8
3. CHANGES IN MANAGEMENT PRACTICES .....	8
4. RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION .....	9
4.1 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations .....	9
4.2 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations .....	16
5. STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS .....	18
5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted .....	18
5.2 Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Responses from the Team, Where Applicable .....	19
6. CERTIFICATION DECISION .....	19
7. CHANGES IN CERTIFICATION SCOPE .....	20
8. ANNUAL DATA UPDATE .....	24
8.1 Social Information .....	24
8.2 Annual Summary of Pesticide and Other Chemical Use .....	25

## SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY

### 1. General Information

#### 1.1 Annual Audit Team

<b>Auditor Name:</b>	Robert J. Hrubes, Ph.D.	<b>Auditor role:</b>	Lead Auditor
<b>Qualifications:</b>	<p>Dr. Hrubes is a California registered professional forester (#2228) and forest economist with over 40 years of professional experience in both public and private forest management issues. He is presently Executive Vice-President of Scientific Certification Systems. Dr. Hrubes was fundamental in his work to develop the programmatic protocol that guides all SCS Forest Conservation Program evaluations. Dr. Hrubes has previously led numerous SCS Forest Conservation Program evaluations of North American public forests, industrial forest ownerships and non-industrial forests, as well as operations in Scandinavia, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Australia and New Zealand. Dr. Hrubes holds graduate degrees in forest economics, economics and resource systems management from the University of California-Berkeley and the University of Michigan. His professional forestry degree (B.S.F. with double major in Outdoor Recreation) was awarded from Iowa State University. He was employed for 14 years, in a variety of positions ranging from research forester to operations research analyst to planning team leader, by the USDA Forest Service. Upon leaving federal service, he entered private consulting from 1988 to 2000. He has been Senior V.P. at SCS since February, 2000.</p>		
<b>Auditor Name:</b>	Michael Thompson	<b>Auditor role:</b>	Auditor
<b>Qualifications:</b>	<p>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 20 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. He is currently enrolled as a PhD student in the University of Maine’s School of Forest Resources. Mr. Thompson has over 30 years of experience in ecology, wildlife management, wetland science, and rare species conservation.</p>		

#### 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, including drafting of the certification audit report:	5
<b>D. Total number of person days used in evaluation:</b>	<b>11</b>

#### 1.3 Standards Employed

##### 1.3.1. Applicable FSC-Accredited Standards

Title	Version	Date of Finalization
-------	---------	----------------------

FSC-US Forest Management Standard	1.0	08 July 2010
All standards employed are available on the websites of FSC International ( <a href="http://www.fsc.org">www.fsc.org</a> ), the FSC-US ( <a href="http://www.fscus.org">www.fscus.org</a> ) or the SCS Standards page ( <a href="http://www.scsglobalservices.com/certification-standards-and-program-documents">www.scsglobalservices.com/certification-standards-and-program-documents</a> ). Standards are also available, upon request, from SCS Global Services ( <a href="http://www.SCSglobalServices.com">www.SCSglobalServices.com</a> ).		

### 1.3.2. SCS Interim FSC Standards

Title	Version	Date of Finalization
Not applicable to this audit.		
This SCS Interim Standard was developed by modifying SCS' Generic Interim Standard to reflect forest management in the region and by incorporating relevant components of the Draft Regional / National Standard and comments from stakeholders. More than one month prior to the start of the field evaluation, the SCS Draft Interim Standard for the country / region was sent out for comment to stakeholders identified by FSC International, SCS, the forest managers under evaluation, and the National Initiative. A copy of the standard is available at <a href="http://www.scsglobalservices.com/certification-standards-and-program-documents">www.scsglobalservices.com/certification-standards-and-program-documents</a> or upon request from SCS Global Services ( <a href="http://www.SCSglobalServices.com">www.SCSglobalServices.com</a> ).		

## 2 Annual Audit Dates and Activities

### 2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities

Date: October 19, 2015	
FMU / Location / Sites Visited	Activities /Notes
Ashland Mill Office	<p><b>Opening Meeting</b>  <b>Attending:</b>                      Robert Hrubes, SCS Lead Auditor                      Michael Thompson, SCS Audit Team Member                      Blake Brunson, JDI<sup>1</sup> Chief Forester                      Scott MacDougall, JDI Certification Manager                      Ked Coffin, JDI Regional Forester                      John Gilbert, JDI Fish and Wildlife Manager                      Roy Bernard, JDI Purchase Wood and Sales                      Josh Philbrook, JDI Northern Superintendent                      Nick Pelletier, JDI Northern Planning Forester                      Kelly Honeyman, JDI Naturalist                      Matt Stedman, JDI Planning Forester                      Lance Cunningham, JDI Operations Superintendent                      Kenneth Cyr, JDI Operations Superintendent</p> <p><b>Agenda:</b>                      Update from JDI                      Document Review                      Review of open CAR/OBS from 2014 audit                      Audit Field Itinerary Planning</p>
Masardis, Block 7577 (Hrubes/Thompson)	Josh Caron, JDI Forester, explained prescription. Prescription is for crown release thinning in a 30-year-old spruce

<sup>1</sup> Note that throughout this report the certificate holder is interchangeably referred to as either "JDI" or "IWLLC."

	planting, focusing on removing poorly-formed and unhealthy trees, leaving the best-formed stems. Logging operation in progress. Interview with Scott Chasse, Logging Contractor (new to JDI).
T14R5, Block 6413 (Hrubes/Thompson)	Summer and Fall 2014 clearcut harvest. Discussion of Outcome Based Forestry (OBF) program and sector planning that results in landscape dispersion of overstory removal prescriptions. Discussion of policy for retaining islands in overstory removal blocks (i.e., how they are designed, minimum sizes, etc.).
T14R5, Old FPA Clearcut (Hrubes/Thompson)	Discussion of harvest planning under the Forest Practices Act (FPA) approach in comparison to the current OBF approach. Continued discussion of sector planning from the previous site.
T15R5, Block 6403 (Hrubes/Thompson)	Discussion of invasive species management (e.g., Phragmites) and priority species to control, including dog-strangling vine, garlic mustard, and buckthorn.
T15R5, Block 6399 (Hrubes/Thompson)	Irregular shelterwood prescription within a larger block that also included overstory removal and riparian prescriptions. Within the irregular shelterwood, trail width was prescribed as 15' and trail spacing as 80'. Stems able to survive 20-30 years were retained, but stems with no merchantable products were also left standing. Residual basal area target ranged from 40-80 square feet.
John Goddard Farm (Hrubes/Thompson)	Historic site encompassing a 180-acre homestead from 1840-1861. Site includes trails, interpretive signs, and several large, late-successional white pine trees.
T16R4, Block 6386 (Hrubes/Thompson)	Recently completed intensive crown release (4-sided release) focusing on removing poorly-formed trees and retaining the best spruce and fir.
<b>Date:</b> October 20, 2015	
<b>FMU / Location / sites visited</b>	<b>Activities /Notes</b>
T18R11, Block 6052 (Thompson)	2015 clearcut that was chained and planted in 2016. White pine stand left as an island. Advance regeneration was identified and conserved. There is a deer wintering area (DWA) nearby and foresters targeted increasing the spruce component in the area to potentially benefit deer. Discussion of how the company is planning for next spruce budworm outbreak. Riparian areas and multiple-entry selection harvests were prescribed for the remaining portions of the block.
T19R11, Block 6017 (Thompson)	Active harvest operation. Clearcut prescription area visited, but block also included riparian areas, overstory removal, irregular shelterwood, multiple entry (selection), and seed tree prescriptions. Block is adjacent to the old growth Yankeetuladi Unique Area (HCVF) and Kelly Honeyman, JDI Naturalist, explained how he visited the site on multiple occasions to determine the best possible way to buffer the site from harvest operations.
T17R17, Block 6091 (Thompson)	Deer wintering area (DWA) management block subject to an agreement with the Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife (MDIFW). Prescription for 2015 harvest was to remove dying fir and promote cedar. Entire operation included overstory

	removal, variable retention, and multiple entry prescriptions. Operating 249 acres within a 3,464-acre DWA.
T17R12, Block 6097 (Thompson)	2015 harvest in riparian area (unnamed brook). Discussion of riparian area standard operating procedures. Spruce decline and mortality due to bark beetle coupled with dying fir. Retention of healthy trees and cedar.
Fort Kent Office (Hrubes)	Interview with Jesse Saunders, Silviculture Coordinator; the focus of the interview was herbicide use.
Stop #1: New bridge on main off-highway road south of North Main Woods gate, near Pelletier Brook (Hrubes)	Review of road network planning and main haul road realignment. Discussion of evolving bridge design standards and culvert sizing (now designed for 200-year flood events)  Serendipitous engagement with and interview of Maine Forest Service Ranger, Dave Rochester
Stop # 2: T13R9 Block 608 (Hrubes)	Inspection of large roadside yarding operation. Wet and muddy conditions. Interviewed IWLLC field supervisor, Amos Dean. Separately, interviewed: Harvesting Contractor, Jesse Guimond and Forwarder Contractor, Tim Guimond
Stop #3: T14R8 Block MHO6596 (Hrubes)	Inspection of a multiple-entry harvest unit that also entails additional site-disturbing prescriptions. Management objective is to create uneven-aged structure through various approaches: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Irregular shelterwood</li> <li>• Selection</li> <li>• Overstory removal</li> </ul> Wet ground with noticeable ruts in harvesting machinery tracks were observed; the auditor was informed by company personnel that the length and depth of the ruts did not meet the company's definition of a rut and, as such, no remedial actions were deemed necessary. Ensuing discussion focused on ongoing efforts at techniques for wood slash placement to maintain machine float (and avoid rutting) in wet areas. See the Findings section of this report for an Observation related to rutting.
Stop #4: T16R8 Block 6517	Inspection of a township that has not been actively harvested for several decades; roading began 5-6 years ago and the road network is essentially now complete which meant that no new roads were built for the harvesting of Block 6517. The area is dominated by tolerant hardwoods with very little in the way of softwoods which can be managed through multiple-entry prescriptions. The block that was inspected was logged 2 years ago. Interviewed Bud Soucy and Max Petrashune, both IWLLC planners.
<b>Date:</b> October 21, 2015	
<b>FMU / Location / Sites Visited</b>	<b>Activities / Notes</b>
Ft. Kent Office	Audit Team deliberations and Closing Meeting
	<b>Closing Meeting</b> <b>Attending:</b> Robert Hrubes, SCS Lead Auditor Michael Thompson, SCS Audit Team Member

	<p>Nick Pelletier, JDI Planning Forester  Ked Coffin, JDI Regional Forester  Scott MacDougall, JDI Certification Manager  Matt Stedman, JDI Planning Forester  Josh Philbrook, JDI Northern Superintendent  Peter Tabor, JDI Regional Manager  Lance Cunningham, JDI Operations Superintendent  Donald Mansius, Director, Forest Policy and Management, Maine Forest Service (observer)  Gary Donovan, Outcome Based Forestry Panel Member (observer)</p> <p><b>Agenda:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Verbal presentation of draft Findings</li> <li>• Review of next steps in the annual surveillance audit process</li> </ul>
--	--

## 2.2 Evaluation of Management Systems

SCS deploys interdisciplinary teams with expertise in forestry, social sciences, natural resource economics, and other relevant fields to assess an FME's conformance to FSC standards and policies. Evaluation methods include document and record review, implementing sampling strategies to visit a broad number of forest cover and harvest prescription types, observation of implementation of management plans and policies in the field, and stakeholder analysis. When there is more than one team member, team members may review parts of the standards based on their background and expertise. On the final day of an evaluation, team members convene to deliberate the findings of the assessment jointly. This involves an analysis of all relevant field observations, stakeholder comments, and reviewed documents and records. Where consensus between team members cannot be achieved due to lack of evidence, conflicting evidence or differences of interpretation of the standards, the team is instructed to report these in the certification decision section and/or in observations.

## 3. Changes in Management Practices

There were no significant changes in the management practices including harvesting methods that affect the FME's conformance to the FSC standards and policies. IWLLC 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 3<sup>rd</sup> party certification, to document efforts to improve the quantity and/or quality of its timber resource, to annually report information about its harvests and silvicultural metrics, and to report average clearcut size and total acres. A Maine Licensed Forester must review JDI's management plan. Harvests must be laid out with consideration of visual aesthetics in visually sensitive areas. JDI must accommodate other reasonable requests for information from the Maine Forest Service.

## 4. Results of the Evaluation

### 4.1 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations

<b>Finding Number: 2014.1</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):	
<b>Deadline</b>	<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):
<b>FSC Indicator:</b>	FSC US Forest Management Standard, V1-0, 3.3.a
<b>Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):</b> The Penobscot Nation has no record of being consulted in association with the specific requirements of this indicator and IWLLC did not present evidence to the contrary. While contact has been established with 2 Tribes in conformance with this indicator, and with all Tribes in association to basket weaving interests, interviews confirm that this certificate holder and some of the tribal representatives continue to struggle during these early stages of these relationships. Some important stakeholder feedback indicates that IWLLC could do more to promote a working relationship with tribal representatives through culturally sensitive methods and to ensure that actions are taken so that forest management does not adversely affect tribal resources.	
<b>Corrective Action Request (or Observation):</b> IWLLC shall invite consultation with tribal representatives in identifying sites of current or traditional cultural, archeological, ecological, economic or religious significance.	

<p><b>FME Response</b> (submitted after the 2014 audit but prior to issuance of the 2014 audit report)</p>	<p>Excerpted from several email texts with individual names removed:</p> <p>“...I just got your message on 3.3.a and am quite concerned about the transformation of this finding. I have taken this one very seriously and had quite in depth discussions with [representative]... on this one from the onset to the present to insure I was covering the bases (<i>sic</i>). We had discussions about the appropriateness of who we should be in contact with and based on those discussions and discussions with folks within the local tribes we reached out to the Micmacs and Maliseets. We have worked hard to build a relationship and have always been available for any request. For example, I was approached this summer by ... currently a grad student at Orono, about the feasibility of supporting a study of Black Ash in the North Woods. Her hope is that her learning from that study can be a benefit to all of the tribes of Maine as well as the Maine Indian Basketmakers Alliance which includes the Micmacs, Maliseets, Penobscots and Passamaquoddys. We had representatives from both the Maliseets and Micmacs as well as interested folks from the Penobscots present at that meeting. The meeting went very well and everyone was appreciative of our support and its potential to aid the Maine Indian Basketmakers Alliance (also present). .... (Representative) discussed the availability of permits for harvesting Ash, and I let folks know that the permits could be made available to all parties at the meeting. Ash is a hot topic for folks as the resource is under threat by the EABorer and the folks within the Maine Indian Basketmakers Alliance have a hard time finding places to acquire it. There were no other concerns raised at the meeting. Very positive. ....”</p> <p>“.... this shows we have made contact, and invited the Penobscots to access traditional Ash sites that are very important to them... even offered permits for them to acquire ash for their traditional needs from these sites. As (representative) noted, there were no other concerns at the meeting. This interaction should keep this finding as an Observation. To be a nonconformance it would need to be clear that we had no contact or consultation; that is not the case....”</p>
<p><b>SCS Review</b> (at time of issuance of the 2014 audit report)</p>	<p>See text of the original finding above. Basket weaving interests may represent a portion of the requirements of this indicator; however, the Penobscot Nation report that they have no record of being invited to consult in the identification of sites of archeological, ecological, economic or religious significance. Documentation of a formal communication from IWLLC that invites consultation with each of the tribal representatives in identifying sites of current or traditional cultural, archeological, ecological, economic or religious significance is still lacking. (Note: letters of invitation to 2 Tribes have been reviewed and accepted as evidence of partial conformance).</p>
<p><b>Subsequent FME Response</b> (submitted prior to the 2015 audit)</p>	<p>One on one contact has been made with the Micmac, Maliseet, Penobscot, and Passamaquoddy tribes to invite them to our stakeholder committee meetings to give us input to our forest management and inform us of sites of significance. Email records were submitted to the audit team.</p>
<p><b>SCS Review During 2015 Audit</b></p>	<p>On the basis of the additional actions undertaken by IWLLC, the 2015 audit team concludes that efforts to invite the consultative and collaborative involvement of affected tribes have been improved and that closure of this CAR is now warranted.</p>

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

<b>Finding Number: 2014.2</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):	
<b>Deadline</b>	<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):
<b>FSC Indicator:</b>	FSC US Forest Management Standard, V1-0, 6.3.a.1
<b>Issue:</b> IWLLC has not explicitly identified large blocks of un-fragmented forest interior habitat. (i.e., assess the presence and distribution of areas that are large enough to contain blocks of forest that are not materially influenced by edge-effects associated with roads and other fragmenting features.)	
<b>Observation:</b> IWLLC should document more explicitly that it maintains, enhances, and/or restores under-represented successional stages in the FMU that would naturally occur on the types of sites found on the FMU, specifically large block of un-fragmented forest interior habitat.	
<b>FME Response</b> <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	A GIS query of stands that contribute to forest interior habitat has been created to document that there is and will be in the future, ample forest interior habitat on the FMU. Map was produced to review with the audit team.
<b>SCS Review</b>	In addition to the GIS query and resulting maps generated in response to this Observation, the 2015 audit team takes additional positive note of the fact that Irving Woodlands' Manager of Fish and Wildlife, John Gilbert, is engaged in ongoing consultation with external experts regarding forest interior habitat. The 2015 audit team is satisfied that the company has an appropriate working definition of what constitutes interior forest habitat. It is concluded that this Observation should now be closed.
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i>

<b>Finding Number: 2014.3</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):	
<b>Deadline</b>	<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):
<b>FSC Indicator:</b>	FSC US Forest Management Standard, V1-0, 6.3.d

<b>Issue:</b> White pine and red spruce are recognized as species that are under-represented in this landscape and efforts to conserve/enhance these species' distributions were observed. However, IWLLC could explicitly articulate a goal of maintaining these species in naturally established stands across the landscape. IWLLC could attempt to identify other species such as yellow birch that are not well-represented in this landscape.	
<b>Observation:</b> IWLLC should ensure that management practices maintain or enhance plant species composition, distribution and frequency of occurrence similar to those that would naturally occur on the site, particularly for white pine and red spruce.	
<b>FME Response:</b> <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	Red Spruce and white pine have always been enhanced by the following: adding white pine seedlings to the spruce planting trays at the nursery, planting red spruce where appropriate, pre-commercial thinning pecking order that prefers white pine and spruces, commercial thinning pecking order that prefers white pine and spruces, and saving healthy red spruce and white pine trees with 40% live crown in selective harvest prescriptions. New actions included; add protection of healthy red spruce and white pine trees in selective harvest prescriptions to the Work Orders and train all logging planners to do this.
<b>SCS Review:</b>	On the basis of the actions undertaken by IWLLC managers and field personnel in response to this 2014 Observation, the 2015 audit team concludes that IWLLC is demonstrably committed to maintaining and enhancing these two underrepresented species in the working forest such that it is appropriate to close this Observation.
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

<b>Finding Number: 2014.5</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):</b>	
<b>Deadline</b>	<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):
<b>FSC Indicator:</b>	FSC US Forest Management Standard, V1-0, 6.9.b
<b>Issue:</b> IWLLC presented research results that describe the non-invasive character of Norway spruce; however, evidence from a University of Maine project suggests that Norway spruce can naturally regenerate beyond the planted block (capstone undergraduate research paper by one of B. Seymour's students discussed during closing meeting; <i>Thompson, N. Norway Spruce (Picea abies) Regeneration in Central and Northern Maine</i> ). IWLLC should consider repeating this monitoring effort.	
<b>Observation:</b> IWLLC should periodically monitor the establishment and abundance of Norway spruce seedlings outside the planted footprint.	

<b>FME Response</b> <i>(submitted after the 2014 audit but prior to issuance of the 2014 audit report)</i>	A survey was completed to monitor the establishment of Norway Spruce outside the planted footprint on a 100 year old Norway Spruce planted stand in southern New Brunswick. Softwood trees were counted in 120 plots outside the planted stand. There were 638 softwood trees of which 2 were Norway Spruce. We concluded that Norway Spruce is not invasive.
<b>SCS Review</b>	The 2015 audit team takes positive note of the additional study that Irving undertook in southern New Brunswick which provides an additional data point supporting a conclusion that Norway spruce is not invasive. But since this was a one-time study and not conducted in Maine and because Norway spruce remains a topic of discussion in the professional forestry community, the 2015 audit team concludes that it would be beneficial for this Observation to be kept open for another year so as to encourage IWLLC managers and field personnel to continue to monitor natural regeneration of Norway spruce.
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other decision—Keep Open for another year

<b>Finding Number: 2014.6</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):</b>	
<b>Deadline</b>	<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):
<b>FSC Indicator:</b>	FSC US Forest Management Standard, V1-0, 7.1.b and 7.1.c and 7.1.e
<b>Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):</b> The 2013-2037 Forest Management Plan briefly summarizes some aspects of the history of the FMU. However, for example, the management plan text (or associated documents) do not include a description of how spruce budworm and the subsequent salvage operations affected the current forest composition and how that influences IWLLC’s silvicultural decisions. The history does not include a description of the influence of fire, which played a significant role around the town of Allagash and along the western boundary near farms in Quebec and the railroad. There is almost no discussion of how management will react to the next Budworm outbreak. While the management plan mentions who owned the land prior to IWLLC, there is no description of how past management shaped current practices. The areas intended to be RSAs as described by staff during interviews appear as part of the Unique Areas data layer but are not explicitly designated as RSAs.	
<b>Corrective Action Request (or Observation):</b> The management plan must describe the history of land use and past management and natural disturbance regimes that affect the FMU, historical ecological conditions, and Representative Sample Areas.	

<p><b>FME Response</b> (submitted after the 2014 audit but prior to issuance of the 2014 audit report)</p>	<p>Page 1 of the management plan shows evidence of conformance to 7.1.b  <b>“INTRODUCTION</b>                  For all of the industrial forestlands that J.D. Irving, Limited owns and manages, we prepare forest management plans. The purpose of these management plans is to outline the strategies necessary to meet our long-term objectives, and the tactical actions required for implementation over the next ten years. It is these tactical actions that provide the basis for our Annual Operating Plans.                  J.D. Irving, Ltd. made its first Maine land acquisition in 1947 when 91,000 hectares were purchased in the area west of Allagash and north to the border in Escourt. Much of these new lands were held in common and undivided ownership primarily with the Dunn heirs, and Dauteuil Lumber. For the first 30 years, until 1976, the Seven Islands Land Company of Bangor, Maine managed these lands.                  By the late 1970’s, we had established ownership objectives that were often inconsistent with the other common undivided owner’s objectives, principally greater silvicultural investment in forest productivity. The result of this divergence was an aggressive campaign to consolidate our ownership out of the common undivided status. In 1977, the company assumed direct management responsibility for its lands with our own staff.                  In 1983, there was an additional acquisition of 101,000 hectares from International Paper Co. in the northern and eastern Aroostook County area. This area included townships from New Canada east to T16R4 with some additional land in St. Francis and Allagash. In 1985 Irving purchased new lands from Great Northern Paper in the northeastern part of Maine. This area included townships T17R3, T17R4, and T17R5 along with acreage in Cyr Plantation, Grand Isle and Hamlin.                  A more recent land purchase occurred in March of 1999. This land purchase increased IWLLC Northern forestland base by 414,000 hectares. The newly acquired lands were bought from Bowater Incorporated (Great Northern Paper, Inc. Woodlands). With an eye to consolidate land under IWLLC’s management, several towns were sold between 2002-2005 (T5R7, T3R8, T4R8, T4R7, T5R8 to T2R8 and T10R12-T9R11, T9R12). The total lands sold were approximately 218,000 hectares.                  In reviewing the recent land acquisitions and releases the total forestland presently managed by Irving Woodlands LLC in Northern Maine is approximately 524,000 hectares. There have been no significant challenges to this ownership other than occasional boundary line disputes which have been amicably resolved. In the future event that good-faith efforts to resolve a conflict were not possible, then it would be referred to the appropriate courts for legal resolution.”</p> <p>7.1 c Page 59 of the management plan shows evidence of conformance to <b>c) historical ecological conditions</b>  <b>APPENDIX VIII – FOREST MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES</b>                  Historical Perspective                  Two issues beyond the control of land managers have played a critical role in directing harvest activities in Northern Maine. The two issues are:                  1. The Spruce Budworm (SBW) infestation. The SBW outbreak of the 70’s and 80’s (and to a lesser degree the outbreak early in the century) forced decisions to harvest large affected tracts or lose substantial volumes of mature timber. The post outbreak impact of these decisions is that there is a gross imbalance in forest age-class structure.                  2. The historic lack of market outlets for low-grade hardwood had been a substantial management challenge for us at the time of the last plan. Today, a combination of aggressive actions by our marketing department and the establishment of flail to rail chipping operations has allowed us to expand markets to better utilize hardwood                  7.1.e The management plan includes a description of the following resources and outlines activities to conserve and/or protect Representative Sample Areas (see Criterion 6.4)</p>
--	--

<p><b>SCS Review</b> (at the time of issuance of the 2014 audit report)</p>	<p>7.1.b&amp;c The 2013-2037 Forest Management Plan briefly summarizes some aspects of the history of the FMU. However, for example, the management plan text (or associated documents) does not include a detailed description of the important influence that the last spruce budworm outbreak and the subsequent salvage operations had on forest structure and species composition and how this influences current management practice.</p> <p>The plan does not include a description of the effects fire and wind have had on the landscape. For example 1,000 acres of wind-storm damage occurred during 2013; the recent increased frequency of major wind events is ignored. Entire townships burned around 1900 and the state of Maine is still struggling with the outcome of this disturbance; the history does not include a description of the influence of fire.</p> <p>While the management plan mentions who owned the land prior to IWLLC, there is no description of how past management shaped current practices. The intent of 7.1.b. “past management” includes the description of how past management practices shaped the current forest and influences desired future conditions including (1) the ‘mining’ of softwood out of hardwood stands and (2) the harvesting of only the best hardwood sawlogs due to lack of pulpwood markets.</p> <p>The purpose of establishing historic conditions is to facilitate creating a baseline for assessing environmental impacts of operations, to facilitate establishing desired future conditions, and to determine when restoration may be needed. Natural disturbance regimes include wind, fire, insects, and pathogens. Typical disturbance events in terms of opening size, intensity disturbance, range, and frequency of disturbance must be described to the extent they are known. All management plans regardless of the scale and intensity of operations must address the Indicators of Criterion 7.1; the scale and intensity of IWLLC’s operations call for a more comprehensive summary of the details described in this section. This nonconformance remains open.</p> <p>Note: 7.1.e The areas intended to be RSAs as described by staff during interviews appear as part of the Unique Areas data layer however RSAs were not explicitly designated as RSAs (i.e. they are simply part of the list of unique areas that also includes HCVFs, RTEs, etc.). Staff revised the GIS layer during the 2014 audit and this portion of the nonconformance has been addressed and closed, however, the other sections of this nonconformance remain open.</p> <p>This nonconformance remains open.</p>
<p><b>Subsequent FME Response</b> (submitted prior to the 2015 audit)</p>	<p>A supplement document to the Management Plan was written to address the missing information. Titled “Historical Shaping of Our Forest in Northern Maine”, it is stored on the corporate intranet site until it is added to the next revision of the management plan. The document was submitted to the audit team.</p>
<p><b>SCS Review following 2015 Audit</b></p>	<p>The 2015 audit team concludes that closure of this CAR is now warranted.</p>

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

## 4.2 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations

<b>Finding Number: 2015.1</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <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): N/A	
<b>Deadline</b>	<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):
<b>FSC Indicator:</b>	FSC US Forest Management Standard, V1-0, Indicator 4.1.c
<b>Issue:</b> The FSC-US National Standard, Indicator 4.1.c., requires that forest workers are provided with fair wages. "Forest workers" include both employees and independent contractors who work on Irving's Maine timberlands.	
<b>Observation:</b> IWLLC's conformity to Indicator 4.1.c. will be maintained and enhanced through an ongoing commitment to its Principles for Partnership, particularly within the context of the company's pro forma that is used in establishing contractor rates for forest workers. The effectiveness of the Principles for Partnership process in establishing and maintaining fair wages for contracted forest workers could be made more effective through an annual, documented analysis of actual wage rates in relation to logging industry norms, cost of living, and inflation rates in the region.	
<b>FME Response</b> <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	
<b>SCS Review</b>	
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i>

<b>Finding Number: 2015.2</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <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): N/A	
<b>Deadline</b>	<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):
<b>FSC Indicator:</b>	FSC US Forest Management Standard, V1-0, Indicator 5.4.b

<b>Issue:</b> The FSC-US National Standard, Indicator 5.4.b., requires that the forest owner or manager strives to diversify the economic use of the forest so as to enhance contributions to the local/regional economy.	
<b>Observation:</b> IWLLC should explore the potentials for developing forest carbon offset projects on its Maine timberlands, as an opportunity to diversify the economic use of its land base.	
<b>FME Response</b> <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	
<b>SCS Review</b>	
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i>

<b>Finding Number: 2015.3</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU): N/A	
<b>Deadline</b>	<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):
<b>FSC Indicator:</b>	FSC US Forest Management Standard, V1-0, Indicator 6.5.d
<b>Issue:</b> The FSC-US National Standard, Indicator 6.5.d., requires that temporary haul roads and skid trails (or forwarder trails) are designed, constructed, maintained an/or reconstructed to reduce short and long-term environmental impacts.	
<b>Observation:</b> During the course of the 2015 audit, a few instances of rutting and compaction associated with forwarder and harvester trails, particularly on the margins of wet sites, was observed. While the length of the observed ruts did not meet the company's definition of rutting, IWLLC should continue to be focused on avoiding rutting in the location/layout of haul trails on wet/sensitive sites across which is run heavy equipment.	
<b>FME Response</b> <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	
<b>SCS Review</b>	
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i>

<b>Finding Number: 2015.4</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU): N/A	

<b>Deadline</b>	<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):
<b>FSC Indicator:</b>	FSC US Forest Management Standard, V1-0, Indicator 6.5.d
<b>Issue:</b> The FSC-US National Standard, Indicator 6.5.d., requires that to reduce short and long-term environmental impacts, unneeded roads are closed and rehabilitated.	
<b>Observation:</b> There are opportunities for IWLLC to better demonstrate conformances with this Indicator, as evidenced by the management approach that was taken with respect to the new mainline off-highway haul road entering from the St. Francis Checkpoint of North Maine Woods in which the old, more meandering road segments were blocked off and stream culverts removed but otherwise not obliterated/rehabilitated and returned to forest cover.	
<b>FME Response</b> <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	
<b>SCS Review</b>	
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

## 5. 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:

- 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.
- 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 past evaluations, 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	Harvesting contractors
Outcome Based Forestry Panel members	Members of the public

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 (in this audit, an Interim Standard was not 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

<input type="checkbox"/> <i>FME has not received any stakeholder comments from interested parties as a result of stakeholder outreach activities during this annual audit.</i>	
Stakeholder comments	SCS Response
<b>Economic Concerns</b>	
Harvesting Contractor interviews revealed general satisfaction with the contracting process, but some noted that rates often required them to make difficult economic choices.	The effectiveness of the Principles for Partnership process in establishing and maintaining fair wages for contracted forest workers could be made more effective through an annual, documented analysis of actual wage rates in relation to logging industry norms, cost of living, and inflation rates in the region. <b>See OBS 2015.1.</b>
<b>Social Concerns</b>	
Harvesting Contractor interviews revealed that, despite economic challenges, there is a generally positive working relationship between JDI and its contractors.	Duly noted.
Some Harvesting Contractors reported not being able to afford health insurance.	Without delving deeply into contractor business practices, it was not clear whether the failure to purchase health insurance was a personal choice or a financial necessity. <b>See OBS 2015.1.</b>
<b>Environmental Concerns</b>	
Some members of the public question whether or not JDI’s planting program results in the creation of “plantations”, as defined by the FSC.	The Audit Team reviewed JDI’s planting program and compared it to the FSC’s definition of a “plantation” and found that JDI continues to maintain a sufficient degree of natural forest conditions over the life of planted stands and, as such, does not create plantations, as defined by the FSC. The Audit Team also notes that most stakeholders do not have a good understanding of just what constitutes a “plantations” per the FSC lexicon.

## 6. Certification Decision

The certificate holder has demonstrated continued overall conformance to the	
--	--

applicable Forest Stewardship Council 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"/>
<b>Comments:</b>	

## 7. Changes in Certification Scope

Any changes in the scope of the certification since the previous audit are highlighted in **yellow** in the tables below.

### Name and Contact Information

<b>Organization name</b>	Irving Woodlands, LLC (IWLLC)		
<b>Contact person</b>	Scott MacDougall		
<b>Address</b>	300 Union Street	<b>Telephone</b>	506-632-6085
	St. John, New Brunswick	<b>Fax</b>	506-432-0518
	E2L 4M3, Canada	<b>e-mail</b>	<a href="mailto:MacDougall.Scott@jdirving.com">MacDougall.Scott@jdirving.com</a>
		<b>Website</b>	<a href="http://www.jdirving.com">www.jdirving.com</a>

### FSC Sales Information

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FSC Sales contact information same as above.			
<b>FSC salesperson</b>			
<b>Address</b>	<b>Telephone</b>		
	<b>Fax</b>		
	<b>e-mail</b>		
	<b>Website</b>		

### Scope of Certificate

<b>Certificate Type</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Single FMU	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple FMU
	<input type="checkbox"/> Group	
<b>SLIMF (if applicable)</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Small SLIMF certificate	<input type="checkbox"/> Low intensity SLIMF certificate
	<input type="checkbox"/> Group SLIMF certificate	
<b># Group Members (if applicable)</b>		
<b>Number of FMUs in scope of certificate</b>	1	
<b>Geographic location of non-SLIMF FMU(s)</b>	Latitude & Longitude: 47.221541°, -68.755697°	
<b>Forest zone</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Boreal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Temperate
	<input type="checkbox"/> Subtropical	<input type="checkbox"/> Tropical
<b>Total forest area in scope of certificate which is:</b>	Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac	
privately managed	1,255,000	
state managed		

community managed			
<b>Number of FMUs in scope that are:</b>			
less than 100 ha in area		100 - 1000 ha in area	
1000 - 10 000 ha in area		more than 10 000 ha in area	1
<b>Total forest area in scope of certificate which is included in FMUs that:</b>			Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac
are less than 100 ha in area		0	
are between 100 ha and 1000 ha in area		0	
meet the eligibility criteria as <i>low intensity</i> SLIMF FMUs		0	
<b>Division of FMUs into manageable units:</b>			
The forestlands have also been grouped geographically into five economic zones that are used to guide transportation and potential silvicultural investments decisions; the zones include Allagash, Blackstone, Estcourt, Oakfield and Rocky Brook.			

**Non-SLIMF Group Members**

Name	Contact information	Latitude / longitude of Non-SLIMF FMUs

**Production Forests**

<b>Timber Forest Products</b>	Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac
Total area of production forest (i.e. forest from which timber may be harvested)	1,185,000
Area of production forest classified as 'plantation'	0
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by replanting or by a combination of replanting and coppicing of the planted stems	70,545 acres 6%
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by natural regeneration, or by a combination of natural regeneration and coppicing of the naturally regenerated stems	1,114,455 acres 94%
<b>Silvicultural system(s)</b>	<b>Area under type of management</b>
Even-aged management	
Clearcut (clearcut size range 5-249 acres)	16%
Shelterwood	46%
Other:	
Uneven-aged management	
Individual tree selection	38%
Group selection	
Other:	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (e.g. nursery, recreation area, windbreak, bamboo, silvo-pastoral system, agro-forestry system, etc.)	
The sustainable rate of harvest (usually Annual Allowable Harvest or AAH where available) of commercial timber (m <sup>3</sup> of round wood)	m <sup>3</sup> by species/mix: Spruce/Fir: 547,000 Hardwood: 558,000 Cedar: 53,000

	White Pine: 4,000
<b>Non-timber Forest Products (NTFPs)</b>	
Area of forest protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for the production of NTFPs or services	0
Other areas managed for NTFPs or services	0
Approximate annual commercial production of non-timber forest products included in the scope of the certificate, by product type	Unknown, but relatively minor
<b>Explanation of the assumptions and reference to the data source upon which AAH and NTFP harvest rates estimates are based:</b>	
<p>There are three major sources of data which are employed to generate yield curves (volume forecast over time). The first one, a digital forest inventory, is compiled from the interpretation of digital aerial photographs taken in 2010. The second source of data comes from the company's Forest Development Survey (FDS) program. These are ground plots used to ground-truth the photo interpretation. FDS plots are established in a large number of stands which serve as a snapshot of the forest structure at a distinct point in time. With the new 2010 digital photography, a major FDS program was undertaken through 2011 and 2012. The third data source is the PSP network that is used to validate and calibrate the growth model. It also provides detailed data on the stand dynamics (growth and mortality) for different components of the forest. Currently, there are 326 Permanent Sample Plots established in the Maine district.</p> <p>The footprint of harvest and silviculture operations occurring throughout each year are collected digitally in the field and their attributes and spatial configurations are used to continually update the photo-interpreted forest inventory. A continuously up-to-date inventory is the fundamental base for establishing accurate estimates of the forest structure that will provide, among other things, timber volume and wildlife habitat predictions. All growth and yield forecasting activities have been linked back to the forest stands within the digital (GIS) forest inventory.</p>	
<b>Species in scope of joint FM/COC certificate: (Scientific / Latin Name and Common / Trade Name)</b>	
<p>Red spruce, <i>Picea rubens</i>                  Black spruce, <i>Picea mariana</i>                  White spruce, <i>Picea glauca</i>                  Norway spruce, <i>Picea abies</i>                  Balsam fir, <i>Abies balsamea</i>                  Hemlock, <i>Tsuga canadensis</i>                  Northern white cedar, <i>Thuja occidentalis</i>                  Eastern white pine, <i>Pinus strobus</i>                  Red pine, <i>Pinus resinosa</i>                  White ash, <i>Fraxinus americana</i>                  Black ash, <i>Fraxinus nigra</i>                  American beech, <i>Fagus grandifolia</i>                  White birch, <i>Betula papyrifera</i>                  Yellow birch, <i>Betula alleghaniensis</i>                  Red maple, <i>Acer rubrum</i>                  Sugar maples, <i>Acer saccharum</i>                  Northern red oak, <i>Quercus rubra</i>                  Big leaf aspen, <i>Populus grandidentata</i>                  Trembling aspen, <i>Populus tremuloides</i></p>	

### FSC Product Classification

Timber products		
Product Level 1	Product Level 2	Species
W1 Rough Wood	W1.1 Roundwood (logs)	All
W3 Wood in chips or particles	W3.1 Wood Chips	All
Non-Timber Forest Products		
Product Level 1	Product Level 2	Product Level 3 and Species

### Conservation Areas

<b>Total area of forest and non-forest land protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for conservation objectives:</b>		19,726 acres		
High Conservation Value Forest / Areas				
<b>High Conservation Values present and respective areas:</b>		Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac		
	Code	HCV Type	Description & Location	Area
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV1	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g. endemism, endangered species, refugia).		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV2	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant large landscape level forests, contained within, or containing the management unit, where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance.		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV3	Forests or areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems.	Yanketuladi St Francis Floodplain Orchard Bog Cross Lake Fen	153 699 534 618
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV4	Forests or areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g. watershed protection, erosion control).	Long Lake Smelt Fishery Long Lake Slopes Chase Lakes	500 431 1283
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV5	Forests or areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g. subsistence, health).		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV6	Forests or areas critical to local communities' traditional cultural identity (areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in cooperation with such local communities).		

<b>Total Area of forest classified as 'High Conservation Value Forest / Area'</b>	4218
---	------

**Areas Outside of the Scope of Certification (Partial Certification and Excision)**

<input type="checkbox"/> N/A – All forestland owned or managed by the applicant is included in the scope.		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Applicant owns and/or manages other FMUs not under evaluation.		
<input type="checkbox"/> Applicant wishes to excise portions of the FMU(s) under evaluation from the scope of certification.		
<b>Explanation for exclusion of FMUs and/or excision:</b>	The parent company of Irving Woodlands LLC (IWLLC) is J.D. Irving Limited, corporately located in New Brunswick, Canada. J.D. Irving Limited owns 3.4 million acres of forestland in Canada and Maine. In total, these lands are divided into five operating districts, four of which are located in Canada. Only those lands under the control of the JD Irving Maine operating district within the State of Maine are within the scope of this certification evaluation; Canadian lands are outside the scope of this certificate. The rationale for partial certification is due largely to differing regional standards between the Maritime and Northeast regions. The company does not at this time believe that the Maritime standard, which encompasses the balance of its ownership, is an appropriate normative standard for industrial/commercial forest management. J.D. Irving has been actively engaged in the Maritime standards development process and remains committed to re-engaging FSC certification in Canada if the Maritime standard undergoes revision through a multi-stakeholder and transparent process. The balance of the ownership is Canadian lands which are managed under the same system as the Maine Woodlands. Because of this common management system, there are no concerns about the forest management of these non-certified lands in Canada.	
<b>Control measures to prevent mixing of certified and non-certified product (C8.3):</b>	The other areas that are not within the scope of this Certificate are located in Canada and are geographically separate from these areas located in Maine.	
<b>Description of FMUs excluded from, or forested area excised from, the scope of certification:</b>		
<b>Name of FMU or Stand</b>	<b>Location (city, state, country)</b>	<b>Size (<input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac)</b>
JD Irving Canada	New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Canada	1.922 million

**8. Annual Data Update**

**8.1 Social Information**

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

## 8.2 Annual Summary of Pesticide and Other Chemical Use

<input type="checkbox"/> 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	3067 gallons	6226 acres total program	Conifer release
Arsenal	Imazapyr	10 gallons	1176 acres inclusive of total program acres	Conifer release
Oust	Sulfometuronmethyl	18 pounds	266 acres inclusive of total program acres	Conifer release

