

**Forest Management and Stump-to-Forest Gate Chain-of-Custody  
Certification Evaluation Report for the:**

**Mid-Maine Forestry**

**Conducted under auspices of the SCS Forest Conservation Program  
SCS is an FSC Accredited Certification Body**

**CERTIFICATION REGISTRATION NUMBER  
SCS-FM/COC-00049G**

**Submitted to:**

**Mid-Maine Forestry  
1320 Western Road  
Warren, Maine 04864**

**Lead Author: Daniel Stepanauskas**

**Date of Field Audit: February 4, 2008**

**Date of Report: February 28, 2008  
(Updated November 2009, See section 6.1)**

**Certified: February 28, 2008**

**By:**

**SCIENTIFIC CERTIFICATION SYSTEMS  
2200 Powell St. Suite Number 725  
Emeryville, CA 94608, USA  
[www.scscertified.com](http://www.scscertified.com)**

**SCS Contact: Dave Wager [dwager@scscertified.com](mailto:dwager@scscertified.com)  
Contact: Barrie Brusila 207-273-4046**

## **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 SCS website ([www.scs-certified.com](http://www.scs-certified.com)) no less than 30 days after issue of the certificate. Section B contains more detailed results and information for the use of Mid-Maine Forestry.

## **FOREWORD**

Scientific Certification Systems, a certification body accredited by the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC), was retained by Mid-Maine Forestry to conduct a certification evaluation of its consulting forestry firm. Under the FSC/SCS certification system, forest management operations meeting international standards of forest stewardship can be certified as “well managed”, thereby enabling use of the FSC endorsement and logo in the marketplace.

In February 2008, Daniel Stepanauskas, Forester was empanelled by SCS to conduct the evaluation. The auditor collected and analyzed written materials, conducted interviews and completed a one day field and office audit of the subject property as part of the certification evaluation. Upon completion of the fact-finding phase of the evaluation, the auditor determined conformance to the 56 FSC Criteria in order to determine whether award of certification was warranted.

This report is issued in support of a recommendation to award FSC-endorsed certification to Mid-Maine Forestry for the management of its Maine forest consulting estates. In the event that a certificate is awarded, Scientific Certification Systems will post this public summary of the report on its web site ([www.scscertified.com](http://www.scscertified.com)).

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Foreword.....  | 3  |
| Section A- Public Summary and Background Information .....   | 5  |
| 1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION.....   | 5  |
| 1.1 FSC Data Request.....  | 5  |
| 1.2 Management Context.....  | 7  |
| 1.2.1 Environmental Context.....   | 7  |
| 1.2.2 Socioeconomic Context .....  | 8  |
| 1.3 Forest Management Enterprise .....   | 8  |
| 1.3.1 Land Use .....   | 8  |
| 1.3.2 Land Outside Scope of Certification.....   | 8  |
| 1.4 Management Plan.....   | 9  |
| 1.4.1 Management Objectives.....   | 9  |
| 1.4.2 Forest Composition.....  | 9  |
| 1.4.3 Silvicultural Systems .....  | 9  |
| 1.4.4 Management Systems .....   | 9  |
| 1.4.5 Monitoring System.....   | 9  |
| 1.4.6 Estimate of Maximum Sustainable Yield .....  | 10 |
| 1.4.7 Estimated, Current and Projected Production.....   | 10 |
| 1.4.8 Chemical Pesticide Use.....  | 10 |
| 1.5 SLIMF Qualifications .....   | 10 |
| 2.0 Guidelines/Standards Employed.....   | 10 |
| 3.0 THE CERTIFICATION ASSESSMENT PROCESS.....  | 10 |
| 3.1 Assessment Date .....  | 10 |
| 3.2 Assessment Team.....   | 10 |
| 3.3 Assessment Process .....   | 11 |
| 3.3.1 Itinerary.....   | 11 |
| 3.3.2 Evaluation of Management System .....  | 11 |
| 3.3.3 Selection of FMUs to Evaluate.....   | 11 |
| 3.3.4 Sites Visited .....  | 11 |
| 3.3.5 Stakeholder Consultation .....   | 12 |
| 3.4 Total Time Spent on audit.....   | 12 |
| 3.5 Process of Determining Conformance .....   | 12 |
| 4.0 Results of the Evaluation .....  | 13 |
| Table 4.1 Notable strengths and weaknesses of the forest management enterprise<br>relative to the P&C..... | 13 |
| 4.2 Preconditions.....   | 16 |
| 5.0 Certification Decision .....   | 16 |
| 5.1 Certification Recommendation .....   | 16 |
| 5.2 Initial Corrective Action Requests & Recommendations.....  | 16 |
| 6.0 Surveillance Evaluations.....  | 17 |
| 6.1 2009 Annual Audit.....   | 17 |
| 7.0 Summary of SCS Complaint and appeal Investigation Procedures.....                                      | 20 |

## SECTION A- PUBLIC SUMMARY AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION

### 1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION

#### 1.1 FSC Data Request

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Applicant entity  | Mid-Maine Forestry   |
| Contact person  | Barrie Brusila or Mitch Kihn   |
| Address   | 1320 Western Road<br>Warren, Maine 04864                             |
| Telephone   | 1-207-273-4046   |
| Fax   | same   |
| E-mail  | mid-maine_forestry@juno.com  |
| Certificate Number  | SCS-FM/COC-00049G  |
| Certificate/Expiration Date   | 2/28/2008-2/28/2013  |
| Certificate Type  | Group  |
| SLIMF   | a SLIMF certificate  |
| Group Members   | 88   |
| Number of FMUs in scope that are  |  |
| less than 100 ha in area  | 83   |
| 100 - 1000 ha in area   | 5  |
| 1000 - 10 000 ha in area  | 0  |
| more than 10 000 ha in area   | 0  |
| Location of certified forest area   | Mostly within 30 miles of the central Maine coast                    |
| Latitude  | 44°07' 13" N   |
| Longitude   | 69°14' 24" W   |
| Forest zone   | temperate  |
| Total forest area in scope of certificate which is included in FMUs that:   | 8,294  |
| are less than 100 ha in area  | 5,905  |
| are between 100 ha and 1000 ha in area  | 2,389  |
| meet the eligibility criteria as <i>low intensity</i> SLIMF FMUs  | 8,294  |
| Total forest area in scope of certificate which is:   |  |
| privately managed <sup>1</sup>  | 8,294  |
| state managed   | ha or ac   |
| community managed <sup>2</sup>  | ha or ac   |
| Number of forest workers (including contractors) working in forest within scope of certificate                                      | Currently five contracted logging crews, consisting of 7 individuals |
| Area of forest and non-forest land protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for conservation objectives |  |
| Area of forest protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for the production of NTFPs or services         | 0  |
| Area of forest classified as 'high conservation value   | 0  |

<sup>1</sup> The category of 'private management' includes state owned forests that are leased to private companies for management, e.g. through a concession system.

<sup>2</sup> A community managed forest management unit is one in which the management and use of the forest and tree resources is controlled by local communities.

|  |   |
|--|---|
| forest'  |   |
| List of high conservation values present <sup>3</sup>  | HCV 1,4,5   |
| Chemical pesticides used   | n/a   |
| Total area of production forest (i.e. forest from which timber may be harvested)   | 7,800+/- ac   |
| Area of production forest classified as 'plantation' for the purpose of calculating the Annual Accreditation Fee (AAF)   | 0   |
| Area of production forest regenerated primarily by replanting <sup>4</sup>   | 0   |
| Area of production forest regenerated primarily by natural regeneration  | all   |
| List of main commercial timber and non-timber species included in scope of certificate (botanical name and common trade name)  | Eastern white pine, hemlock, red maple, red oak, red spruce, balsam fir, white ash, sugar maple, beech, white birch, yellow birch, aspen<br><br><i>Pinus strobes, Tsuga canadensis, Acer rubrum, Quercus rubra, Picea rubens, Abies balsamea, Fraxinus Americana, Acer saccharum, Fagus grandifolia, Betula papyrifera, Betula alleghaniensis, Populus tremuloides.</i> |
| Approximate annual allowable cut (AAC) of commercial timber  | n/a   |
| Approximate annual commercial production of non-timber forest products included in the scope of the certificate, by product type   | n/a   |
| List of product categories included in scope of joint FM/COC certificate and therefore available for sale as FSC-certified products (include basic description of product - e.g. round wood, pulp wood, sawn timber, kiln-dried sawn timber, chips, resin, non-timber forest products, etc.) | Sawlogs, round pulpwood, veneer logs, biomass chips, firewood   |

## Conversion Table English Units to Metric Units

### Length Conversion Factors

| <u>To convert from</u> | <u>to</u>      | <u>multiply by</u> |
|------------------------|----------------|--------------------|
| mile (US Statute)      | kilometer (km) | 1.609347           |
| foot (ft)              | meter (m)      | 0.3048             |
| yard (yd)              | meter (m)      | 0.9144             |

### Area Conversion Factors

| <u>To convert from</u> | <u>to</u>           | <u>multiply by</u> |
|------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| square foot (sq ft)    | square meter (sq m) | 0.09290304         |
| acre (ac)              | hectare (ha)        | 0.4047             |

### Volume Conversion Factors

#### Volume

| <u>To convert from</u> | <u>to</u>          | <u>multiply by</u> |
|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| cubic foot (cu ft)     | cubic meter (cu m) | 0.02831685         |

<sup>3</sup> High conservation values should be classified following the numbering system given in the ProForest High Conservation Value Forest Toolkit (2003) available at [www.ProForest.net](http://www.ProForest.net)

<sup>4</sup> The area is the *total* area being regenerated primarily by planting, *not* the area which is replanted annually. NB this area may be different to the area defined as a 'plantation' for the purpose of calculating the Annual Accreditation Fee (AAF) or for other purposes.

gallon (gal)                      liter                                      4.546

1 acre                                      = 0.404686 hectares  
1,000 acres                                = 404.686 hectares  
1 board foot                                = 0.00348 cubic meters  
1,000 board feet                          = 3.48 cubic meters  
1 cubic foot                                 = 0.028317 cubic meters  
1,000 cubic feet                          = 28.317 cubic meters

Breast height                              = 1.4 meters, or 4 1/2 feet, above ground level

Although 1,000 board feet is theoretically equivalent to 2.36 cubic meters, this is true only when a board foot is actually a piece of wood with a volume 1/12 of cubic foot. The conversion given here, 3.48 cubic meters, is based on the cubic volume of a log 16 feet long and 15 inches in diameter inside bark at the small end.

## **1.2 Management Context**

### **Pertinent Regulations at the Federal Level:**

*Endangered Species Act*  
*Clean Water Act (Section 404 wetland protection)*  
*Occupational Safety and Health Act*  
*National Historic Preservation Act*  
*Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act*  
*Americans with Disabilities Act*  
*U.S. ratified treaties, including CITES*

### **Pertinent Regulations at State and Local Level:**

*Maine Forest Practices Act*  
*DEP, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act*  
*Erosion and Sediment Control Act*  
*Fish and Wildlife Management Laws*  
*Great Ponds Act*  
*Natural Resource Protection Act*  
*Protection and Improvement of Waters Act*  
*Maine Natural Areas Program (MNAP provides info & assistance, but is not regulatory)*  
*Maine Historic Preservation Commission (Provides info & assistance, but is not regulatory)*

### **Regulatory Context for State and Local Regulations:**

As a private forest enterprise located in the Maine, USA, management of Mid-Maine Forestry's client lands are subject to a host of local, state and federal regulations.

#### **1.2.1 Environmental Context**

The mid-coast region of Maine is a region where the ranges of forest types intersect. Coastal

spruce/fir forests, oak/pine, and northern hardwood forests cover the landscape. The major environmental concerns in relation to timber management are watershed related, with habitat concerns for the Endangered Atlantic Salmon, and the Bald Eagle.

Three large game species are found on the region, which include moose, white-tailed deer and black bear. The populations of these species are generally stable, and hunting is permitted for all three.

Most of this landscape is former agricultural land, with stone walls constructed during the 1800's throughout the region. Nearly all the forests in the region are former pasture land, with most of the forest having been harvested to some extent since its return to forest land. Nearly all of the forest land in the area is composed of non-industrial private forest. There is little protected land in the area with few State Parks or Forests in the study area.

### **1.2.2 Socioeconomic Context**

The population within the region has grown in recent history, after having declined early in the past century as farming declined. Resource dependent work is still quite common, with fishing, farming, and forest related work interacting as a portion of the income base for many long-term residents. The seasonal nature of work in Maine has been and remains a reality for that segment of the permanent population that works with their hands for a living. The region continues to undergo an influx of people who are either seasonal summer residents or do not work in traditional Maine jobs. As a result, development pressures have become a constant and a greater portion of the economy continues to shift to a dependency upon recreation, tourist and development jobs. Nevertheless, the wood products industry continues to play a role in the small communities found in this region.

## **1.3 Forest Management Enterprise**

### **1.3.1 Land Use**

Most of the forest land in mid-coast Maine is composed of small to moderate sized tracts (25-200 acres) of private non-industrial forestland. Throughout history these lands have been used as an income/sustenance source for local people. This tradition is gradually declining as people from out of state, who have no tradition with working landscapes, purchase land in the region.

There is also a history of blueberry cultivation, which continues to thrive.

### **1.3.2 Land Outside Scope of Certification**

Mid-Maine Forestry does not include all of their managed lands in their FSC Certified group. This is due to the fact that not all clients are willing to contribute funding toward the effort, and not all management scenarios fit the FSC Principles and Criteria. It is also due to small size of some of the properties, and anticipated short ownership tenure.

## **1.4 Management Plan**

### **1.4.1 Management Objectives**

The objectives of forest management on Mid-Maine Forestry's FSC certified lands are to improve the species composition, productivity, diversity, and stocking levels of the forests under their care. All ecological considerations are carefully honored during the forest management activities prescribed and carried out on Mid-Maine Forestry's client lands.

### **1.4.2 Forest Composition**

The majority of forests managed by Mid-Maine Forestry are mixed hardwood/softwood stands which are developing into mature stands. Pure stands of white pine, and spruce (primarily along the coast) do exist, as do nearly pure stands of hardwoods. Large white pines exist in scattered stands and individual trees. Red oak is likely to be found on south or west aspects, with northern hardwoods mixed with spruce and fir/hemlock more common on northerly or eastern slopes, and in wetter areas. The forest is irregular in both species composition and age class due to a history of agriculture and forest harvesting.

### **1.4.3 Silvicultural Systems**

The long-term norm for this region has been heavy overstory removals, or the removal of the more valuable and productive species, with white pine and spruce having been the focus of most historical harvests. Mid-Maine Forestry generally practices individual tree selection, silviculture that results in residual stands having a nearly continuous forest overstory. Harvest prescriptions are normally oriented towards species composition adjustments, stocking level adjustments, the removal of poor quality and mature trees. Mid-Maine Forestry's timber harvests are carried out with a light touch having minimal impact upon the forest ecosystem.

### **1.4.4 Management Systems**

Each client's ownership is managed individually with no interdependence. Mid-Maine Forestry uses contract loggers to conduct their timber harvests. The majority of harvesting operations utilize cable skidders and chain saws.

### **1.4.5 Monitoring System**

Monitoring is done by Mid-Maine Forestry when any forestry activity is undertaken on a parcel. Each FMU that is enrolled in Maine's Tree Growth Tax Program is reviewed every ten years to continue the enrollment of the parcel in this current use tax program. The majority of these parcels are also periodically visited by their owners.

#### **1.4.6 Estimate of Maximum Sustainable Yield**

The auditor's estimate of Mid-Maine Forestry's sustainable yield indicates that they harvest less than 30% of their annual increment.

#### **1.4.7 Estimated, Current and Projected Production**

Last year's volume production was 297 M board feet, and 1,149 cords of pulp. These volumes are likely to remain relatively stable. Production is based solely upon the stand prescriptions written in the management plans, and upon random occurrences such as blow downs.

#### **1.4.8 Chemical Pesticide Use**

No chemical pesticides have been used on the Mid-Maine Forestry group member properties.

#### **1.5 SLIMF Qualifications**

Each of the group member properties within the scope of the Mid-Maine Forestry certificate qualify as small forests, i.e. are less than 1,000 hectares.

### **2.0 GUIDELINES/STANDARDS EMPLOYED**

As the applicant forest property is located in Maine, the certification evaluation that is the subject of this report was conducted against the duly-endorsed FSC Northeast Regional Standard V9 2/10/05. The standard is available at the FSC-US web site ([www.fscus.org](http://www.fscus.org)) or is available, upon request, from Scientific Certification Systems ([www.scscertified.com](http://www.scscertified.com)).

### **3.0 THE CERTIFICATION ASSESSMENT PROCESS**

#### **3.1 Assessment Date**

February 4<sup>th</sup> 2008.

#### **3.2 Assessment Team**

Daniel Stepanauskas was the sole assessor for this re-certification of Mid-Maine Forestry. Mr. Stepanauskas is the Northeast Representative for Scientific Certification Systems Forest Management Program. Mr. Stepanauskas has been a practicing forester for twenty-seven years, and is a consultant with over seven years of extensive experience in forest certification and chain-of-custody auditing in the United States and Canada. He earned his B.S. (Bachelor of Science in Forestry) from the University of New Hampshire in 1978.

### **3.3 Assessment Process**

#### **3.3.1 Itinerary**

The re-certification field audit took place on February 4, 2008. The day began in Warren, Maine with 2 hours of office procedures and document review to go over the FSC Principles and Criteria and to review the changes in Mid-Maine Forestry's client list and acreage managed. The remainder of the day was spent in the field visiting client lands, with a focus upon lands that had been treated since the last field audit. During the day we also reviewed the management plans and treatments applied to the various sites visited.

#### **3.3.2 Evaluation of Management System**

The review of office procedures and documents with both Barrie Brusila and Mitch Kihn was followed by field inspections of client lands.

#### **3.3.3 Selection of FMUs to Evaluate**

The selection of sites to visit was based upon choosing parcels that had been harvested since the last field audit. There was also emphasis placed upon choosing sites where machinery crossed wetlands or flowing waters. The selection of sites was otherwise random and chosen by the auditor.

#### **3.3.4 Sites Visited**

1. Kleene Brothers in Hope, ME is an ownership with 188 acres of forestland on both sides of a town road which has been in the family since 1840. We visited an 8 acre harvest site which was composed of mature white pine and a mixed stand of hardwood/hemlock. The harvest is an individual to group tree selection, still in process but inactive at time of audit.
2. Lisa Douglas in Union, ME has 40 acres of forest. The single tree selection in this hemlock/white pine forest was completed last winter. The residual stand is well stocked and has a continuous overstory designed to allow the continued development and growth of the stand, and to encourage softwood regeneration. We viewed a hemlock log skidder bridge constructed over a large stream using USDA cost-sharing funds. The log stringers were a bit short for proper bank overlap, which was a function of the logs available in relation to the span. The bridge was stable with no significant erosion taking place.
3. John Bunker/John Shaw lot in Palermo, ME comprises 107 acres of forest. The timber sale is in progress on 31 acres. We met the logger Scott Arnold who is a Maine Master Logger and does an exceptional job. The sale was in a closed canopy mixed softwood stand with a single tree/ patch harvest designed to encourage the continued softwood composition of the stand.
4. Kimball Pond Realty Trust in Boothbay, ME is a 70 acre tract of forest on a brackish

waterfront property. This light individual tree selection harvest was conducted in the winter of 05/06. The harvest was nicely executed with little to no residual damage and a well stocked residual stand.

### **3.3.5 Stakeholder Consultation**

Pursuant to SCS protocols, consultations with key stakeholders were an integral component of the evaluation process. Consultation took place prior to, concurrent with, and following the field evaluation. The following were distinct purposes to the consultations:

To solicit input from affected parties as to the strengths and weaknesses of Sample Company'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.

Over the 10 years that Mid-Maine Forestry has been certified, SCS has received very little comment from stakeholders about their operations. The comments that have been received have all been positive. Thus, SCS conducted a very narrow stakeholder consultation for this audit. The following types of groups and individuals were determined to be principal stakeholders:

- Members of the FSC Northeast Working Group
- Contractors working with Mid-Maine Forestry
- Local and regionally based environmental organizations and conservationists
- Local, State and Federal regulatory agency personnel

#### **3.3.5.1 Summary of Stakeholder Concerns and Perspectives and Responses from the Team Where Applicable**

Stakeholder comments were positive and did not suggest any areas of possible non-conformance that would require further investigation.

### **3.4 Total Time Spent on audit**

The auditor spent 1.6 days on the evaluation.

### **3.5 Process of Determining Conformance**

FSC accredited forest stewardship standards consist of a three-level hierarchy, principle, then the criteria that make up that principle, then the indicators that make up each criteria. Consistent with SCS Forest Conservation Program evaluation protocols, the team collectively determines whether or not the subject forest management operation is in conformance with every applicable indicator of the relevant forest stewardship standard.

Each non-conformance must be evaluated to determine whether it constitutes a major or minor non-conformance at the level of the associated criterion or sub-criterion. Not all indicators are equally important, and there is no simple numerical formula to determine whether an operation is in non-conformance. The team must use their collective judgement to assess each criterion and determine if it is in conformance. If the forest management operation is determined to be in non-conformance at the criterion level, then at least one of the indicators must be in major non-conformance.

Corrective action requests (CAR's) are issued for every instance of non-conformance. Major non-conformances trigger major CAR's and minor non-conformances trigger minor CAR's

### ***Interpretations of Major CAR's (Preconditions), Minor CARs and Recommendations***

*Major CARs/Preconditions:* Major non-conformances, either alone or in combination with non-conformances of other indicators, result (or are likely to result) in a fundamental failure to achieve the objectives of the relevant FSC Criterion given the uniqueness and fragility of each forest resource. These are corrective actions that must be resolved or closed out prior to award of the certificate. If major CAR's arise after an operation is certified, the timeframe for correcting these non-conformances is typically shorter than for minor CAR's. Certification is contingent on the certified operations response to the CAR within the stipulated time frame.

*Minor CARs:* These are corrective action requests in response to minor non-conformances, which are typically limited in scale or can be characterized as an unusual lapse in the system. Corrective actions must be closed out within a specified time period of award of the certificate.

*Recommendations:* These are suggestions that the audit team concludes would help the company move even further towards exemplary status. Action on the recommendations is voluntary and does not affect the maintenance of the certificate. Recommendations can be changed to CARs if performance with respect to the criterion triggering the recommendation falls into non-conformance.

## **4.0 RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION**

Table 4.1 below, contains the evaluation team's findings as to the strengths and weaknesses of the subject forest management operation relative to the FSC Principles of forest stewardship. The table also presents the corrective action request (car) numbers related to each principle.

**Table 4.1 Notable strengths and weaknesses of the forest management enterprise relative to the P&C**

| Principle/Subject Area                                    | Strengths Relative to the Standard   | Weaknesses Relative to the Standard   | CAR/REC #s   |
|---|--|---|--|
| <b>P1: FSC Commitment and Legal Compliance</b>            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Mid-Maine Forestry's gentle harvests pose no legal threat to Maine's Forest Practices Act.</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ None</li> </ul>  |  |
| <b>P2: Tenure &amp; Use Rights &amp; Responsibilities</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Client lands are privately owned and unrestricted regarding sustainable forest management carried out by Mid-Maine Forestry.</li> </ul>                                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ None</li> </ul>  |  |
| <b>P3: Indigenous Peoples' Rights</b>                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Principle 3 is largely irrelevant to the small non-industrial private lands within the Mid-Maine Forestry group.</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ None</li> </ul>  |  |
| <b>P4: Community Relations &amp; Workers' Rights</b>      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Barrie and Mitch are deeply involved with the community, both in their children's activities and in forestry education. Barrie spoke to the UMaine forestry class.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ None</li> </ul>  |  |
| <b>P5: Benefits from the Forest</b>                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Harvested forest products are marketed throughout the region for a variety of uses. Log marketing is done by the logging contractors.</li> </ul>                              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Mid-Maine Forestry is minimally involved in marketing wood products to ensure that they indeed reach the best markets and that they are used locally whenever possible. Mitch recently made an effort to sell FSC red oak from one of his sales to a certified buyer.</li> </ul> | REC 2008.1 Mid-Maine Forestry could take a greater effort in marketing certified products. |

|  |   |  |                   |
|--|---|--|-------------------|
| <b>P6: Environmental Impact</b>                          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Mid-Maine Forestry has a very low impact on the health and diversity of the local environment. The species composition of the forest is adjusted slightly to better serve their clients with the capital appreciation of their forest resource. All species considerations are maintained and often enhanced. Timber sales do not sanitize the forest, but leave a diverse mixture of species, size classes, and tree decay processes in place.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ None</li> </ul>   | <p>none</p>       |
| <b>P7: Management Plan</b>                               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The management plans prepared by Mid-Maine Forestry cover all applicable aspects of the FSC Principles &amp; Criteria with the preservation of the forest and its environmental integrity being at the forefront of each plan's priorities. The harvest prescriptions in the plans are very conservative and lend themselves to the maintenance of low impact forestry.</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ HCVF's must be addressed in each management plan.</li> </ul>  | <p>CAR 2008.1</p> |
| <b>P8: Monitoring &amp; Assessment</b>                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Monitoring is conducted on a ten year rotation in conjunction with Maine's Tree Growth tax requirements. Landowners tend to walk their own lands in this region and are generally unwilling to pay for further monitoring.</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ none</li> </ul>   | <p>none</p>       |
| <b>P9: Maintenance of High Conservation Value Forest</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Barrie and Mitch are cognizant of unusual forest stands and types which may occur in their region, and will proceed with due caution in planning any disturbance in such a site.</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There is nothing in writing which identifies or delineates HCVF's in the lands that they manage.</li> </ul> | <p>CAR 2008.2</p> |

## 4.2 Preconditions

Preconditions are major corrective action requests that are placed on a forest management operation after the initial evaluation and before the operation is certified. Certification cannot be awarded if open preconditions exist.

No preconditions were placed on Mid-Maine Forestry during the initial evaluation.

## 5.0 CERTIFICATION DECISION

### 5.1 Certification Recommendation

As determined by the full and proper execution of the SCS *Forest Conservation Program* evaluation protocols, the evaluation team hereby recommends that Mid-Maine Forestry be awarded FSC certification as a “Well-Managed Forest” subject to the corrective action requests stated in Section 5.2. Mid-Maine Forestry has demonstrated that their system of management is capable of ensuring that all of the requirements of the FSC Northeast Regional Standards are met over the forest area covered by the scope of the evaluation. Mid-Maine Forestry has also demonstrated that the described system of management is being implemented consistently over the forest area covered by the scope of the certificate.

### 5.2 Initial Corrective Action Requests & Recommendations

#### Corrective Action Requests (CARs):

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Background/Justification:</b> High Conservation Value Forests are not addressed in the management plans prepared by Mid-Maine Forestry. |  |
| <b>CAR 2008.1</b>  | HCVF considerations shall be included in each forest management plan prepared from the date upon which this audit is finalized.<br>HCVF’s shall be mapped on forest type maps and will have specific prescriptions for each HCVF written into the management plans |
| <b>Deadline</b>  | 2009 Annual Audit  |
| <b>Reference</b>   | FSC Criteria 9.1.a, 9.1.b and FSC Principal # 9  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Background/Justification:</b> There is a need for an express commitment to the P&C in management plans |  |
| <b>CAR 2008.2</b>   | Management plans for parcels to be enrolled in the FSC acreage must state an allegiance to the Principles and Criteria of the FSC.<br>This is a minor non conformance. |
| <b>Deadline</b>   | 2009 Annual Audit  |
| <b>Reference</b>  | FSC Criteria 1.6   |

## Recommendations:

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Background/Justification:</b> Efforts to further the availability of FSC products in the Maine wood market are needed, and nearly all of Mid-Maine Forestry's timber production is FSC Pure and rarely reaches FSC certified markets. |   |
| <b>REC 2008.1</b>  | Mid-Maine Forestry could take a greater effort in marketing certified products. |
| <b>Reference</b>   | FSC Criteria 5.2a & 5.4b  |

## 6.0 SURVEILLANCE EVALUATIONS

If certification is awarded, surveillance evaluations will take place at least annually to monitor the status of any open corrective action requests and review the continued conformance of Mid-Maine Forestry to the Northeast Regional Standard. Public summaries of surveillance evaluations will be posted separately on the SCS website ([www.scscertified.com](http://www.scscertified.com)).

### 6.1 2009 ANNUAL AUDIT

#### 6.1.0 2009 SURVEILLANCE DECISION AND PUBLIC RECORD

##### 6.1.1 Assessment Dates

*Since the 2008 re-certification, there were audit activities undertaken on the following dates:*

- *On September 23-24th, an SCS auditor (Daniel Stepanauskas) conducted the annual audit of Mid-Maine Forestry, including on-site inspections of field operations as well as an office interview with Mitch Kihn and Barrie Brusila. The auditor spent two hours on the evening of the 23<sup>rd</sup> reviewing management procedures, and company statistics. The day of the 24<sup>th</sup> was spent on field visits to forest management sites.*

##### 6.1.2 Assessment Personnel

*For this annual audit, the team was comprised of Daniel Stepanauskas, Forester. Mr. Stepanauskas conducted the 2008 re-certification evaluation.*

Daniel Stepanauskas is a northeast representative for the Scientific Certification Systems forest management and chain-of-custody programs. Mr. Stepanauskas has been the principal of his consulting forestry firm for twenty-seven years, and is a consultant with over ten years of experience in FSC forest certification and chain-of-custody auditing for SCS in the United States and Canada. He earned his B.S. in Forestry from the University of New Hampshire in 1978.

### 6.1.3 Assessment Process

*The scope of the 2009 annual audit, as with all annual audits, included: document review, the auditor spending time in the field and office, interviewing both of the firm's foresters and, as appropriate, interacting with outside stakeholders*

*The site visits of the 2009 surveillance audit were conducted on September 24, 2009. Both of the firm's foresters, Mitch Kihn and Barrie Brusila, were present for the entire audit.*

*The locations chosen by the auditor for field visits focused upon sites that were visited in prior audits as marked timber lots and now had been harvested, along with other properties that had been harvested or marked for harvest since the 2008 re-certification evaluation.*

#### Sept. 24, 2009

1. Katherine Bird, in Union Me owns 261 acres of forestland, managed by Mitch Kihn. We toured a 30 acre harvest, which was completed this year, by Jim Burke one of Mid-Maine's regular logging contractors. The cutting was a single tree/group selection harvest was carried out in hemlock, white pine, red spruce and mixed hardwood. We viewed a wetland exclusion, along with steep slopes which were left unmanaged, as requested by the landowner. The harvest resulted in timber stands which remained well-stocked.

2. The William and Barbara Bentley property in Hope, Me is an ownership with 37 acres of forestland, for whom Mitch Kihn is the forester. We visited a 13 acre harvest site which was harvested during the winter of 2008. This initial harvest removed 25% of the forest inventory, with a strong emphasis on pulp quality tree removal. This was made clear both by the auditors walk on the site, and by the harvest volumes which show 5m bd. ft. along with 80 cords of pulp harvested. The land was a northern hardwood, red oak and red spruce forest. The spruce thinning was wonderfully carried out with virtually no trees barked, and an ample residual spruce sawlog stocking which will prevent blowdown on the site. The harvest was performed by the Pease cousins, whom Mid-Maine uses regularly for cable skidder harvesting.

3. The Austin Carey Lot (Baxter State Park) in Harpswell, Me has 179 acres of forestland. This ownership is managed by Barrie Brusila. The single tree selection harvest in this white pine forest was completed during the winter of 2006. The auditor had viewed this lot when it was marked for harvest in 2006. The harvest totals were 62m bd. ft. and 125 cords of pulpwood. The residual stand is well stocked and has a continuous overstory designed to allow the continued development and growth of the stand, and to encourage softwood regeneration. The harvest was carried out by Joel Kinney, who regularly conducts cable skidder harvests for Mid-Maine. The harvest also involved some small patch harvests which were the result of pine blowdown, a regular occurrence in softwood stands along the Maine coast. Mid-Maine has conducted invasive plant removal (Japanese barberry) on this parcel, every year for the past four years.

4. The Ann Thompson/Grace Gillett lot in Phippsburg, Me, comprising 240 acres of forestland, was harvested during the winter of 2007. This property is managed by Mitch Kihn. The timber sale took place on 39 acres,

and removed 65m bd. ft. along with 130 cords of pulpwood. The logger Mark Hawks did an exceptional job. The sale was in a mature mixed softwood stand with a significant inclusion of red oak. This cutting was a single tree harvest designed to maintain the softwood composition of the forest. Large mature trees were harvested in this stand. Mitch's experience on this parcel has shown that beyond a certain age the stands on this site are susceptible to advancing decay.

#### 6.1.4 Status of Corrective Action Requests

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>CAR 2009.1 (minor)</b>   | <b>Reference:</b> FSC Criterion 9.1.a, 9.1.b and FSC Principal # 9 |
| HCVF considerations will be included in each forest management plan prepared from the date upon which this audit is finalized. HCVF's will be mapped on forest type maps and will have specific prescriptions for each HCVF written into the management plans |  |
| <b>Action Taken By Company/Auditor Comments: Mid-Maine Forestry now references the value of, and if appropriate, the location, description, and prescriptions for High Conservation Value Forests in their forest management plans</b>                        |  |
| <b>Position in the end of this audit: This CAR has been satisfied and closed.</b>   |  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>REC 2009.1</b>  | <b>Reference:</b> FSC Criteria 5.2a & 5.4b |
| <i>Text of REC. here</i> Mid-Maine could take a greater effort in marketing certified products.  |  |
| <b>Action Taken By Company/Auditor Comments: Mitch Kihn arranged to have a load of red oak logs sold to a FSC chain-of-custody certified mill in western Maine this past winter. In December of 2008 the northeastern hardwood markets collapsed and the mill order was cancelled.</b> |  |
| <b>Position in the end of this audit: The recommendation has been satisfied, although continued efforts to sell to FSC chain of custody certified log markets will be monitored in future audits.</b>  |  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>REC 2009.2</b>  | <b>Reference:</b> FSC Criteria 6.2b & 9.3a |
| <i>Text of REC. here</i> Mid-Maine clients could be encouraged to place conservation easements upon their lands. Tax benefits are significant to landowners with assets. |  |
| <b>Action Taken By Company/Auditor Comments: Mid-Maine's foresters now hold this discussion regularly held with selected clients.</b>                                    |  |
| <b>Position in the end of this audit: The recommendation has been satisfied.</b>   |  |

#### 6.1.5 General Observations

Mid-Maine strictly adheres to, and often exceeds, the standards in the FSC Forest Management Principles and Criteria. Management of their clients forests continues to show a conservative harvesting methodology which allows for well stocked multi-aged forests to exist on all of the lands which they manage for their clients.

### **6.1.6 New Corrective Action Requests and Recommendations**

**None were issued during the 2009 audit.**

#### **Recommendations:**

**None were issued during the 2009 audit.**

### **6.1.7 General Conclusions of the Annual Audit**

The auditor's review and assessment of the documentation, management planning, and on-the-ground forest management conducted by Mid-Maine Forestry, leads to the conclusion that the firm remains in strong compliance with FSC Principle and Criteria detailed in the Northeastern Regional Guidelines. Mid-Maine was assessed using Principles one through nine, as plantations (P10) are not managed by the firm. Last year's one minor CAR, and two Recommendations are now closed, with no new CAR's or Recommendations added in 2009. Continuation of the firm's FSC certification is warranted.

## **7.0 SUMMARY OF SCS COMPLAINT AND APPEAL INVESTIGATION PROCEDURES**

The following is a summary of the SCS Complaint and Appeal Investigation Procedures, the full versions of the procedures are available from SCS upon request. The SCS Complaint and Appeal Investigation Procedures are designed for and available to any individual or organization that perceives a stake in the affairs of the SCS Forest Conservation Program and that/who has reason to question either the actions of SCS itself or the actions of a SCS certificate holder.

A **complaint** is a written expression of dissatisfaction, other than **appeal**, by any person or organization, to a certification body, relating to the activities of staff of the SCS Forest Conservation Program and/or representatives of a company or entity holding either a forest management (FM) or chain-of-custody (CoC) certificate issued by SCS and duly endorsed by FSC, where a response is expected (ISO/IEC 17011:2004 (E)). The SCS Complaint Investigation Procedure functions as a first-stage mechanism for resolving complaints and avoiding the need to involve FSC.

An "**appeal**" is a request by a certificate holder or a certification applicant for formal reconsideration of any adverse decision made by the certification body related to its desired certification status. A certificate holder or applicant may formally lodge an appeal with SCS against any adverse certification decision taken by SCS, within thirty (30) days after notification of the decision.

The written Complaint or Appeal must:

- Identify and provide contact information for the complainant or appellant
- Clearly identify the basis of the aggrieved action (date, place, nature of action) and which parties or individuals are associated with the action
- Explain how the action is alleged to violate an SCS or FSC requirement, being as specific as possible with respect to the applicable SCS or FSC requirement
- In the case of complaints against the actions of a certificate holder, rather than SCS itself, the complainant must also describe efforts taken to resolve the matter directly with the certificate holder
- Propose what actions would, in the opinion of the complainant or appellant, rectify the matter.

Written complaints and appeals should be submitted to:

Dr. Robert J. Hrubes  
Senior Vice-President  
Scientific Certification Systems  
2200 Powell Street, Suite 725  
Emeryville, California, USA94608  
Email: [rhrubes@scscertified.com](mailto:rhrubes@scscertified.com)

As detailed in the *SCS-FCP Certification Manual*, investigation of the complaint or appeal will be confidentially conducted in a timely manner. As appropriate, corrective and preventive action and resolution of any deficiencies found in products or services shall be taken and documented.