

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

Prentiss & Carlisle Management Company, Inc.

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

**CERTIFICATION REGISTRATION NUMBER
SCS-FM/COC-00103G**

Submitted to:

Prentiss & Carlisle Management Company, Inc.
107 Court Street, PO Box 637
Bangor, Maine 04402

Lead Author: Sterling Griffin

Date of Field Audit: 9/18 – 9/21/2007

**Date of Report: 11/9/2007- Draft; 1/18/08 Final
Updated November, 2009 (See section 6.1)**

Certified: January 18, 2008

By:

**SCIENTIFIC CERTIFICATION SYSTEMS
2200 Powell St. Suite Number 725
Emeryville, CA 94608, USA
www.scs-certified.com**

SCS contact: Dave Wager, dwager@scs-certified.com

Prentiss & Carlisle contact: Bill Miller, whmiller@prentissandcarlisle.com

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.scscertified.com) no less than 30 days after issue of the certificate. Section B contains more detailed results and information for the use of Prentiss & Carlisle Management Company.

FOREWORD

Scientific Certification Systems, a certification body accredited by the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC), was retained by Prentiss & Carlisle Management Company, Inc. (PCMC) to conduct a certification evaluation of its company and managed lands in the State of Maine. 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 September 2007, an interdisciplinary team of natural resource specialists was empanelled by SCS to conduct the evaluation. The team collected and analyzed written materials, conducted interviews and completed a 4 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 team 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 Prentiss & Carlisle Management Company for the management of its company and managed lands in the State of Maine. As detailed below, certain pre-conditions (also known as Major Corrective Action Requests) that were stipulated by the audit team upon completion of the field audit were addressed by PCMC and cleared by SCS prior to finalization of this report. 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).

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	8
1.2.2 Socioeconomic Context	8
1.3 Forest Management Enterprise	9
1.3.1 Land Use	9
1.3.2 Land Outside Scope of Certification.....	9
1.4 Management Plan.....	9
1.4.1 Management Objectives.....	9
1.4.2 Forest Composition.....	10
1.4.3 Silvicultural Systems	10
1.4.4 Management Systems	10
1.4.5 Monitoring System.....	11
1.4.6 Estimate of Maximum Sustainable Yield	11
1.4.7 Estimated, Current and Projected Production	12
1.4.8 Chemical Pesticide Use.....	12
2.0 Guidelines/Standards Employed.....	12
3.0 THE CERTIFICATION ASSESSMENT PROCESS.....	12
3.1 Assessment Dates.....	12
3.2 Assessment Team.....	12
Robert J. Hrubes, Ph.D., Team Leader	13
3.3 Assessment Process	14
3.3.1 Itinerary.....	14
3.3.2 Evaluation of Management System	14
3.3.3 Selection of FMU's to Evaluate.....	14
3.3.4 Sites Visited	15
3.3.5 Stakeholder Consultation	20
3.4 Total Time Spent on audit.....	23
3.5 Process of Determining Conformance	23
4.0 Results of the Evaluation	24
Table 4.1 Notable strengths and weaknesses of the forest management enterprise relative to the P&C.....	25
4.2 Preconditions.....	29
5.0 Certification Decision	33
5.1 Certification Recommendation	33
5.2 Initial Corrective Action Requests.....	33
6.0 Surveillance Evaluations.....	40
7.0 Summary of SCS Complaint and appeal Investigation Procedures.....	48

SECTION A- PUBLIC SUMMARY AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1 FSC Data Request

Applicant entity	Prentiss & Carlisle Management Compnay
Contact person	Bill Miller
Address	107 Court Street, PO Box 637 Bangor, Maine 04402
Telephone	207.942.8295
Fax	207.942.1488
E-mail	whmiller@prentissandcarlisle.com
Certificate Number	SCS-FM/COC-00103G
Certificate/Expiration Date	January 18, 2008 – January 18, 2013
Certificate Type	Group
Group Members	55
Number of FMU's	55
Number of FMUs in scope that are	
less than 100 ac in area	6
100 - 1000 ac in area	7
1000 - 10 000 ac in area	29
more than 10 000 ac in area	13
Location of certified forest area	
Latitude	44.801N
Longitude	-68.778W
Forest zone	Temperate
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is included in FMUs that:	
are less than 100 ha in area	<i>ha or</i>
are between 100 ha and 1000 ha in area	<i>ha or ac</i>
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is:	
privately managed ¹	764,487 acres
Number of forest workers (including contractors) working in forest within scope of certificate	400 - 450
Area of forest and non-forest land protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for conservation objectives	0
Area of forest protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for the production of NTFPs or services	13,904 ac
Area of forest classified as 'high conservation value forest'	26,947 ac +riparian areas of various widths
List of high conservation values present ²	HCV 1-6
Chemical pesticides used	
Total area of production forest (i.e. forest from which timber may be harvested)	764,487 acres
Area of production forest classified as 'plantation' for the purpose of calculating the Annual	0

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

² 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

Accreditation Fee (AAF)	
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by replanting ³	0
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by natural regeneration	100%
List of main commercial timber and non-timber species included in scope of certificate (botanical name and common trade name)	<p><u>Major:</u> Red Spruce – <i>Picea rubens</i> Balsam Fir – <i>Abies balsamea</i> White Pine – <i>Pinus strobus</i> Eastern Hemlock – <i>Tsuga canadensis</i> Black Spruce – <i>Picea mariana</i> Northern White Cedar – <i>Thuja occidentalis</i> Red Pine – <i>Pinus resinosa</i> Tamarack (Larch) – <i>Larix laricina</i> Sugar Maple – <i>Acer saccharum</i> Yellow Birch – <i>Betula alleghaniensis</i> American Beech – <i>Fagus grandifolia</i> Red Maple – <i>Acer rubrum</i> White Ash – <i>Fraxinus americana</i> White (Paper) Birch – <i>Betula papyrifera</i> Quaking Aspen (Poplar) – <i>Populus tremuloides</i> Northern Red Oak – <i>Quercus rubra</i></p> <p><u>Minor:</u> American Basswood – <i>Tilia americana</i> Black Cherry – <i>Prunus serotina</i> White Spruce – <i>Picea glauca</i> Bigtooth Aspen – <i>Populus grandidentata</i> Balm of Gilead – <i>Populus balsamifera</i></p>
Approximate annual allowable cut (AAC) of commercial timber	225,000 cords
Approximate annual commercial production of non-timber forest products included in the scope of the certificate, by product type	
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.)	Round wood Pulp wood Chips

Conversion Table English Units to Metric Units

Length Conversion Factors

To convert from	to	multiply by
mile (US Statute)	kilometer (km)	1.609347
foot (ft)	meter (m)	0.3048
yard (yd)	meter (m)	0.9144

Area Conversion Factors

³ 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.

To convert from	to	multiply by
square foot (sq ft)	square meter (sq m)	0.09290304
acre (ac)	hectare (ha)	0.4047

Volume Conversion Factors

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

As a private forest enterprise located in Maine, USA, management of the PCMC lands are subject to a host of local, state and federal regulations. The principal regulations of greatest relevance to forest managers are associated with the following statutes:

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:

- The Land Use Regulation Act
- DEP, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
- Maine Forest Practices Act
- Erosion and Sediment Control Act
- Fish and Wildlife Management Laws
- Great Ponds Act
- Natural Resource Protection Act
- Protection and Improvement of Waters Act

1.2.1 Environmental Context

PCMC managed forests are located in the northern two-thirds of Maine, USA. Overall, this region can be described as a transition zone between the boreal spruce-fir forest to the north and the deciduous forest to the south. Forests are highly heterogeneous and shaped by climate, elevation, drainage, past management history, and natural disturbances. Glaciers have shaped the distinctive topography of this region and also determined the mosaic of soil and forest types. The mountains and plateaus are underlain by granite and metamorphic rocks and are often thinly covered by glacial till. Many glacially broadened valleys have glacial outwash deposits with poor soils and contain numerous swamps and lakes.

Forest types range from stands containing attributes of the northern hardwood forest type that is dominated by beech, birch, and maple to the boreal forest type that is dominated by black, and white spruce, balsam fir, cedar, white birch and tamarack. This mosaic of forest types and habitats are known to support nearly 225 bird species. Characteristic mammals include moose, white-tailed deer, black bear, red fox, snowshoe hare, porcupine, fisher, beaver, bobcat, marten, muskrat, and raccoon, although some of these species are less common in the southern parts of the region. Coyotes have recently replaced wolves, which were eradicated from this region in historical times.

Once covered in primeval forests, the region was extensively cleared for agriculture during the 19th century. Many farmers soon abandoned these lands and moved west to more fertile areas and the forests were allowed to naturally regenerate. As a result, there remain very few examples of undisturbed old growth forests in the region.

1.2.2 Socioeconomic Context

Lands managed by PCMC are scattered throughout the state of Maine but lie mostly in the northern and central portions of the state. These areas may be characterized as resource dependent, with high levels of direct and indirect employment related to the timber industry. Recent land ownership profiles have shifted significantly in the last few decades and have created great uncertainty within the forest products economy.

Populations within the region have experienced large reductions in recent decades as young people have moved to larger urban centers. This shift in population demographics has created challenges in keeping a labor force needed to perform forestry related operations. However, employment in the forest products industry has remained strong and mechanized operations require fewer personnel and can still attract skilled workers.

The region is also experiencing increased recreational demand particularly in off-road ATV use and hunting activities. Second home development is also in high demand near or adjacent to bodies of water. These development and recreational pressures are beginning to affect the way forested properties are being managed by some landowners across the state. Thus far, PCMC has been able to successfully adapt to the changing socioeconomic conditions experienced across the state.

1.3 Forest Management Enterprise

1.3.1 Land Use

Prentiss & Carlisle Management Company provides a full range of forest management services to clients in Maine and the Upper Peninsula of Michigan. In Maine, PCMC manages approximately 1,060,000 acres of which approximately 240,000 is owned by a timberland investment management organization that is FSC Certified and managed as a separate FMU.

PCMC currently provides comprehensive forest management services to 47 individual entities. These 47 individual entities are condensed along family or corporate lines into 20 separate groups. A large proportion of the PCMC client acres are owned in common and undivided form (tenants in common). There may be as many as twenty or more individual entities owning a particular parcel of timberland. Common and undivided ownership is not only found within a given family group, but is also prevalent amongst family groups, and to a lesser extent with outside owners.

Customarily the majority owner in a common and undivided interest assumes management responsibility for the parcel. Therefore, PCMC provides administrative and management services on most of its clients lands.

PCMC administers approximately 200 recreational leases in northern and eastern Maine. Nearly all of these lease lots have been in existence for many years and are considered “grandfathered” under local or state zoning ordinances.

PCMC is a partner in the North Maine Woods, Inc non-profit corporation that exists for the purpose of managing recreational lands on commercial forestland in northwestern Maine. The other members of North Maine Woods are major landowners with timberlands encompassed by the management area. The overall goal of North Maine Woods is to enhance the recreational experience of the visitors while protecting the owner’s resource.

1.3.2 Land Outside Scope of Certification

The current assessment is an evaluation of PCMC company and managed lands within the state of Maine. One large parcel owned by the Forestland Group and managed by PCMC has already received FSC certification and is not within the scope of this evaluation. PCMC also manages lands in Michigan that are not considered within the scope of this assessment. Those lands are also currently FSC certified under a separate certificate. Consequently, there are no concerns related to the FSC partial certification guidelines.

1.4 Management Plan

1.4.1 Management Objectives

The objectives of the forest management operation are to provide clients with the highest rate of return, including income and maintenance or enhancement of the asset's value while protecting the long-term viability of timber and non-timber resources. Moreover, PCMC strives to provide each client with an annual income, which necessitates annual harvesting on most tracts. PCMC strives to meet those goals through diligent planning guided by the best available science and data, and entrusting foresters with the responsibility to execute the management plans professionally and efficiently.

1.4.2 Forest Composition

PCMC managed lands lie in a transition zone between the boreal spruce-fir forest to the north and the deciduous forest to the south. Forest types range from stands containing attributes of the deciduous northern hardwood forest type dominated by beech, birch, and maple to the boreal forest type dominated by black, and white spruce, balsam fir, cedar, white birch and tamarack. Most stands however contain a heterogeneous mixture of species composition that result in highly complex stand structures.

1.4.3 Silvicultural Systems

The silvicultural systems used by Prentiss and Carlisle Management Company foresters are fully described in the company's Silvicultural Guidelines. These guidelines provide a basic decision matrix based on stand age and species composition. In practice, the predominate silvicultural method used by PCMC is the shelterwood system. Shelterwood cutting is applied in various combinations of stages (harvest entries) and crown cover retention. Where advanced regeneration is lacking, the first stage of a shelterwood cut is utilized to promote desirable regeneration. High quality growing stock trees of preferred species are chosen for retention and upon successful establishment of regeneration, the residual trees are usually removed in subsequent harvests. The overstory removal step is utilized quite frequently in most cases. PCMC will retain larger wildlife trees and individual trees when conducting an overstory removal to promote species diversity and provide a good seed source to fill in small openings where regeneration may be low. Clearcutting is limited in use and highly regulated by the Maine Forest Practice Clearcut Rules. Selection silviculture is utilized to a limited extent in shade tolerate and Northern Hardwood stands. By using the combination of shelterwood and selection systems as the primary silvicultural methods, PCMC matrix of lands maintain a natural forest cover with moderate amounts of structural diversity that often contrast with adjacent large industrial ownerships that rely on more intensive even-age techniques.

1.4.4 Management Systems

Prentiss & Carlisle Company was founded in 1924 and has focused on timberland management and ownership, adding a harvesting/logging capability in 1944. In 1987, PCMC was established as a separate company to concentrate on its core business of timberland management. In 1996, the company converted most of its stumpage sales program to direct marketing of forest products. Today the company provides a full range of forest management services to its clients in Maine and Michigan. The company maintains a central office in Bangor and field offices in Ashland, Enfield, and Newport, Maine to manage the lands being reviewed for this certification assessment.

PCMC's forest management system is based on managing the various regions from the corresponding field offices with the tract being the basic unit of management. The harvest planning process involves conducting inventories and calculating an allowable cut for the tract. A 20-year planning period is utilized along with a rolling 5-year harvest plan. Typically, a new inventory for a specific tract is conducted every 10 years and the plan is adjusted to a new 20-year planning period. A portion of the managed lands are inventoried every year. The company utilizes contract logging and transportation operators and sells wood directly to the mills. Twelve field foresters, along with the company's central office staff, are responsible for implementing the PCMC management system.

1.4.5 Monitoring System

The bulk of PCMC monitoring activities are captured in a recurring timber inventory. Inventories are conducted on an average ten-year cycle for each tract. These inventories are used to define development classes and are used somewhat to define major habitat conditions. Management plans for each tract are updated based on compilation of the inventory data and new annual allowable cuts are calculated if the projected inventory does not match the sampled estimates. Approximately 75,000 – 125,000 acres are inventoried each year.

PCMC has begun working with Maine Natural Areas Program (MNAP) to allow them access to survey PCMC lands for rare plants and natural communities or ecosystems. Survey work was conducted in 2006 and in 2007 PCMC provided MNAP with digital stand type maps and boundary line updates in order to assist with field survey work. MNAP surveyed ten separate sites in 2006, and six have so far been surveyed in 2007, all in the Eastern Lowlands ecoregion of Maine.

1.4.6 Estimate of Maximum Sustainable Yield

PCMC's objective is to regulate harvest on a tract-basis to provide a steady flow of income to its clients. As such, some level of harvesting is typically done annually for each client and larger individual tracts are generally harvested annually while smaller tracts are harvested periodically. The annual allowable cut (AAC) process is based on attempting to achieve a target forest structure based on an average stocking level for hardwood, mixed hardwood, and softwood stands respectively across a tract. Tract stocking levels are a weighted average across many stands at all stages of development. Forests (tracts) may either have a surplus or

deficient stocking level, in which stocking is either above or below the targets. The FIBER growth model is used to calculate growth rates for forest strata, which, when used with timber inventory and historical harvest data PCMC calculates an allowable cut for each property. When stocking differs from the targets, PCMC applies the “Austrian Formula” to determine the AAC that will achieve the target stocking over an acceptable period of time. AAC calculations are verified by the 10-year inventory updates. If actual inventories, as measured in the 10-year re-inventory, differ from projections due to differences in actual growth rates, the AAC is adjusted to move the inventory towards the stocking targets.

1.4.7 Estimated, Current and Projected Production

Total annual harvest on PCMC lands equals approximately 225,000 cords. This figure is based on detailed records maintained by the company and represents a stable harvest volume. Future production is expected to remain relatively constant as the management goal is to provide a stable annual revenue stream to clients.

1.4.8 Chemical Pesticide Use

Chemicals are not currently used and have not been used on PCMC-managed lands in some time. There are no plans to change this practice, although managers recognize that use of chemicals might be necessary to combat pests in the future, so they will remain aware of FSC standards for use of chemicals.

2.0 GUIDELINES/STANDARDS EMPLOYED

As the applicant forest property is located in the Northeastern United States, the certification evaluation that is the subject of this report was conducted against the duly-endorsed FSC Northeast Region Standard (v9.0, 2/10/05). The standard is available at the FSC-US web site (www.fscus.org) or is available, upon request, from Scientific Certification Systems (www.scscertified.com).

3.0 THE CERTIFICATION ASSESSMENT PROCESS

3.1 Assessment Dates

A Preliminary Certification Evaluation of PCMC was conducted February 7-9, 2007 by Robert J. Hrubes, PhD. See Appendix 1 of the full report for the Preliminary Evaluation Report.

The main certification evaluation began with stakeholder notification and consultation beginning August 16, 2007. The field visit portion of the assessment occurred September 18 – 21, 2007.

3.2 Assessment Team

Robert J. Hrubes, Ph.D., Team Leader

Dr. Robert Hrubes is Senior Vice-President of Scientific Certification Systems. In that capacity, Dr. Hrubes is responsible for all natural resource and environmental certification activities of the company. While providing senior leadership of these programs, Dr. Hrubes remains an active certification practitioner. He continues to lead certification evaluation teams throughout the world as well as represent both SCS and FSC and numerous public fora. He is internationally recognized as a leading authority and practitioner of third-party forest management certification. Prior to assuming his present duties at SCS in 2000, Dr. Hrubes owned and managed, for 6 years, a forestry and natural resource economics consultancy based in northern California. During those years, he served on the founding Board of Directors of the Forest Stewardship Council. Additionally, he served as the founding Chair, Board of Directors of the Forest Stewards Guild, a U.S.-based professional society of progressively minded practicing foresters. Previous to the creation of his own consultancy, Dr. Hrubes was for 6 years a managing principal of LSA Associates, Inc., a California-based environmental consulting firm. And prior to that, Dr. Hrubes was employed for 14 years by the USDA Forest Service in a variety of positions from field forester to research economist, operations research analyst and acting Group Leader for Land Management Planning.

Dr. David Capen, Independent Consultant (Wildlife Biology and Ecology):

Dr. Capen is Research Professor, Rubenstein School of Environment and Natural Resources, University of Vermont. His research experiences and expertise are in the areas of wildlife habitat analysis, avian ecology, landscape ecology, biodiversity analysis, GIS and remote sensing, multivariate statistics, and conservation planning and reserve design. He holds the following degrees: B.S.F., University of Tennessee, 1969 (Forestry); M.S., University of Maine, 1972 (Wildlife Management); and Ph.D., Utah State University, 1977 (Wildlife Science). Dr. Capen has participated in a variety of forest certification projects, including SFI and FSC projects on public lands in Massachusetts, Maine, and Minnesota, and private forest lands in Maine and New York.

Sterling Griffin, Senior SCS Forster: Sterling Griffin is a Senior Certification Forester with Scientific Certification Systems. He is a Registered Professional Forester in the State of California with 10 years professional experience in private and public forestland management. He is a graduate of Purdue University with a B.S in Forestry and has conducted Forest Stewardship Council endorsed assessments on over 5 million acres of forestland throughout the United States. Recent FSC assessments have included lands administered by the Fort Lewis, WA Forestry Branch, Michigan DNR, Indiana DOF, New York DEC, Maryland DNR and numerous private operations in Maine, Pennsylvania, Oregon, Washington, and California. Prior to joining SCS, he was a consulting forester in Northern California specializing in sustained yield management, fuel reduction, and forest health management. His professional career also includes silvicultural and ecosystem research for the U.S. Forest Service. Areas of research activities include stand level response to vegetative competition and Long-Term Ecosystem Productivity (LTEP) in the Pacific Northwest.

3.3 Assessment Process

3.3.1 Itinerary

The field visit portion of the evaluation began September 18 with an opening meeting at the PCMC central office in Bangor, MA. The full evaluation team met PCMC management staff and received an opening briefing on PCMC management systems. Following the opening meeting, the team was joined by PCMC field staff. The auditors and PCMC staff then traveled to the first site visit to receive a general overview of timber harvest plan development and implementation along with specific evaluation of harvesting activities that had occurred on-site.

On September 19th and 20th the auditors each formed sub-teams to visit separate tracts in various regions of PCMC managed lands throughout the state (see sites visited in section 3.3.4). Team deliberation began the evening of 20th and continued through the morning of the 21st. A closing meeting was held in the afternoon of September 21st to present the preliminary findings.

3.3.2 Evaluation of Management System

The process by which Scientific Certification Systems evaluated the systems employed by PCMC entailed the following components:

- Empanelment of a team with demonstrated credentials and expertise in forest certification, auditing protocols, forest management, and wildlife management as well as a working knowledge of the forest types found in the northeastern US.
- Review of documents pertinent to PCMC management provided to the audit team members
- Consultations with key stakeholders prior to and during assessment
- Interviews with PCMC personnel
- Field reconnaissance of a broad array of forest conditions and past and present management activities

3.3.3 Selection of FMU's to Evaluate

Forest Management Units (FMUs) selected by the audit team prior to the audit were visited to assess the implementation of the management system applied during previous treatments. Lead Auditors Robert Hrubes reviewed a list of previously harvested sites and randomly selected sites located across the ownership to provide a wide array of exposure to PCMC management techniques used by company foresters.

The selection protocol included some random selections and additions of adjacent field sites based on the initial random samples and the need to assess certain key issues, including:

- Silvicultural systems

- Recent harvesting activities
- Use of Best Management Practices
- Watercourse protections
- In-stand retention (including green tree, snags, and CWD)
- Recreation issues
- Wildlife management

3.3.4 Sites Visited

September 18, 2007

Opening Meeting:

- Bill Miller, VP; Dave Dow, Chief Forester (CF); Dave Maddocks, VP for Procurement and Marketing.
- Discussion of common-undivided ownership, which is still prevalent in Maine.. Some lands with minority ownership are not included in the scope of certification, but all lands with majority interest are included except for lands owned by Forestland Group, already FSC certified, and three smaller parcels belonging to a new client, and not yet properly managed. PCMC manages 1.2 million acres; 350+ different parcels of land; 200,000+ already certified. Each parcel has a tract code; costs and profits, time, etc. are logged by tract code.
- Discussion of wildlife management. PCMC checks with IFW and LURC before harvest. Data from Maine Natural Areas Program and the State Historic Preservation Office have been received for the first time and will be incorporated into the 5-year planning process. ArcInfo is the GIS system; operations foresters use ArcView. The GIS specialist is also trained in forestry and wildlife.
- A routinely inventory is conducted on 100-200,000 acres peryear, such that all or most of the properties are surveyed within 10-year period. Allowable cut is determined for each tract, but overall management goals are established for entire management land base.
- AAH is calculated, then discounted by 8% to account for non-accessible areasA consultant from University of Maine was hired to evaluate the AAH methodology—report on file.

Amherst harvest site, Tract 30305, Block B:

- Current operation harvested 3000 cords hardwood; feller-buncher operation. Very large area of landings and roads has been cleared; stacking of biomass wood is partially responsible for this. Yard is on a steep hillside; operations finished for the year; no plans to close out road until more harvest next year. Discussion of potential for erosion into a PSL-2 brook. Trees were not marked prior to harvest; instead the contractor—PCMC in this case—carries out the prescription. Buffers along stream are well flagged. After harvest, it appeared that only small diameter hardwoods were left on site, but an inspection of the yet-to-be harvested stands revealed that there were very few large trees. Cutting trails were totally free of brush (piled for chipping) and heavily scarified, but not rutted.

Millinocket Annex.: Gene Caron, Operations Forester.

- Harvested in March '07 with feller-buncher. Spruce-fir stand in need of commercial thinning. It was almost dark at the time of the visit, but the one cutting trail inspected had ample brush that had been pulled back onto trail. No biomass chipping occurred here, but the yard was quite well cleaned up. No vernal pools, raptor nests, or any T&E issue was noted. Road was flat, but gated to prevent damage by public.

September 19-20, 2007

Auditors formed 3 separate sub-teams to visit separate FMUs in various regions of PCMC managed lands throughout the state

Dave Capen sub-team (focus on westerly portions of company and managed lands). West Branch Camp, SE of Baxter State Park

Kevin Dow (Operations Forester), Dave Dow, Gene Caron (OF), Chandler Buie, Forest Technician. This is Kevin Dow's district, with help from Buie, but Dave Dow used to manage the district.

T5R12, Forest Park. Moulton Family ownership:

- A 50-acre stand of old White Pine, 300+ years old. Not an old-growth stand per se, however, because harvesting had taken place here about 20 years ago, so the understory was very dense: white pine, red spruce, balsam fir, with a scattered overstory of large pines. When harvested, there was no market for pines, so they were left. Foresters indicated that these pine "likely won't cut."

T5R12, Experimental treatment in '85-'86 by Univ. of Maine:

- Regenerating white pine, red spruce, and balsam fir were sprayed with herbicides in narrow strips from helicopter, a test for aerial PCT. The treatment didn't work—stand is mostly red maple and balsam fir; spruce appeared to be killed by the spray. Discussion here about budworm; foresters indicated that PCMC's outlook for a budworm infestation is that they have plenty of roads and are well prepared to harvest dying trees.

T5R12, Strip cuts:

- First harvest in 70s; second in 90s: 100 feet, then 200 feet, with 400-ft buffer to comply with Forest Practices Act. We discussed PCT, and PCMC doesn't feel, at this time, that it is economical (supported by recent study from Univ. of Maine).

T5R12, Mixed wood stand harvested 5-6 years ago:

- Hardwood left as shelterwood; could be harvested anytime, although no plans to do so in 5-year plan. Otherwise, return for harvest in about 30 years. Plenty of basal area, but a young stand.

T5R12, 1994 PCT block:

- Nice mix of white pine and red spruce, and excellent spacing as a result of PCT. Could be commercially thinned at this time with small processor, but likely will not happen. In late 90s, PCT applied to 200-400 acres per year in this district.

T5R12, Along Cuxabaxis Stream:

- Most of this areas has been clear cut or harvested by feller-buncher; overstory will be removed this winter (mostly white pine and red spruce). Discussion about locating and mapping vernal pools and raptor nests.

T5R12, Late-seral/old-growth red spruce-white pine stand:

- This stand, 30-40 acres, has characteristics of old-growth structure, and has been left intact, but only by choice of the district forester

T6R12, Tract 14105:

- Harvest just being finished; still hauling some hardwood. Leave strips from previous harvest had been cut, using both feller-buncher and a processor. Dense regeneration in trails from previous harvest in '95. White pine overstory is good shape throughout the harvest area. Foresters discussed expectations for landing and road close-out, which including grading, reflecting high standards for closing out harvest operations.

“Carry Trail.”:

- A historical carry from Umbassosic Lake to Mud Pond and from Kennebec to Penobscot watersheds; classified as a PUA by LURC and historical site by State. PCMC has left a 400-foot wide unharvested strip along the 1-mile carry, which also protects an old-aged stand of black spruce and white cedar. The leave strip is wider than required by the State (150 feet).
- T2R12, Hardwood site harvested >3 years ago: Road built in '97; steep slopes but road and drainage are in excellent condition. Many large trees left. Including the best of the sugar maple. Nice age-class diversity in the stand and abundant DWD. The best site quality of the day and by far the nicest forest.

T4R7, Big Seboeis River, New Bridge Construction:

- Built by local contractor, Rafert. Excellent construction, 100-ft span with center supports set on solid rock in river bottom. Precast concrete with locking pieces for abutments; nearly solid planking. Built in cooperation with local snowmobile club such that the adjacent snowmobile bridge is supported by same structure, but free of traffic on bridge. Also two large culverts installed in road to avoid long-standing washouts when river floods in spring. A campsite nearby, built by PCMC to be used by people who float and/or fish on the river. Campsite was quite tidy; Maine Forest Service assists with maintenance of the campsite.

T4R7, Fisk Brook, 3-year-old bridge:

- Again, excellent bridge construction, this one built by one of the harvesting contractors, McAvoy.

T4R7 NW Corner:

- Summer 2007 harvest by McAvoy contractor; last harvest was 20 years ago. All roads and landings were newly constructed and look good, although landings are still littered with piles that await the grinding contractor. Harvest trails are narrow, with an abundance of bumper trees. One of the steep trails looked like water bars might have been justified. Although there was no potential for water pollution here, moderate erosion might be expected. Inspected a harvest trail to the edge of a wetland.
- Harvest was an overstory removal in a red spruce-balsam fir-white pine stand with very dense advanced regeneration, and plenty of residual white pines.

Bridge on Lower Seboeis River:

- Another 2007 construction by a contractor from Ashland. Excellent design and installation. Solid decking.

T4R7, South Half:

- Active harvest being conducted by Rick McAvoy and crew. Interviewed contractor and 2 of his 3 crew members. McAvoy works exclusively for PCMC and has for many years. Everyone is CLP certified and there have been no accidents in years (not remembered by any of the crew). McAvoy still slashes with chainsaw much of the time, and was doing so here with all recommended safety equipment. He seemed to know what vernal pools were. Oil spill kit was obviously on site. Equipment seemed well maintained.
- Harvest was a late shelterwood in hardwood types; trails were dry and care was taken to reduce damage to residual trees. Stand was well-stocked after harvest with FB Staceyville:
- Selection cut in hardwood stand. Harvest was by Dan Queley, another long-time operator. One trail walked had excessive rutting, but the operator left this site for another after concluding that it was too wet. Residual forest is very well stocked with a nice distribution of age classes. Roads and landings were in good shape.

Robert Hrubes sub-team (focus on southern region closer to Bangor office)

Wellington Tract

- Mature forest conditions. 5 years of harvesting planned consisting of selection and OSR. Forester is out on sale site once per week. Interviewed logger.

Kingsbury Tract

- Interviewed Chuck Ames with SDR logging.

TA R11 WELS

- New bridge with concrete abutments. No PCT on company lands.

- Major roadway erosion, forester is working on situation and road will be retired.

Jo-Mary Lake Campground:

- Leased campsite.

Alton

- New gate due to dumping.
- Recreation lease

Greenfield Tract

- Past harvest 2005.
- Viewed planned harvest for 2008

Township 3 ND

- 1st shelterwood cut designed to regenerate spruce
- Biomass operation
- Deeryard next to tract
- Intent was a spacing cut with thinning from below – it didn't happen due perhaps to new operator.
- Rutting problems due to less slash available to cover skid trails due to biomass operation.

Grand Falls Tract

- Same type of cut as Township 3
- Better spacing than previous operation done by same operator.

Sterling Griffin sub-team (focus on northern region around Ashland, MA)

Garfield Plantation:

- Salvage sale done after severe windstorm. All residual pine retained. Lots of advanced regeneration well protected. Mechanically harvested on trails 45-50' wide. Lots of slash placed on trails to avoid rutting. 3 blocks harvested 800-1,000 cords total harvested.

North Woods entrance station:

- Gatehouse used to control public access. Numerous campsites utilized by hunters and other recreational users. No ATVs are allowed within the recreation area.

T12 R7 WELS:

- Spoke with Logging Contractor (See stakeholder comments). Selection prescription, but looks more like shelterwood overstory removal. Intent was to open stand enough to control development of beech dominated understory. Observed protected wet area identified with blue flagging. Nice large white cedar tree with large cavity retained for possible den tree. Good maple retention and many snags throughout unit.

T12 R14 WELS, E ½:

- Cut in winter 2006. Overstory removal of Black Spruce. High amount of advanced regeneration present. Removed 8-10 cords/acre. Precommercial thinning could be desirable to control spacing and species mix. PCMC does not do much PCT. Viewed “winter road” used for hauling, no rutting noted.

T13 R13 WELS:

- 2007 cutting block viewed. Mechanically thinned. Sprouting on trails creating nice new age class and lots of browse. Big snags left in place. Tops pulled back in to unit to prevent rutting and compaction. Adjacent to zoned Deer Yard. Untreated units contained dense stands of “overmature” (~80 years old) Balsam Fir with obvious signs of deterioration. Maibec contractors used to flag watercourses. Potential PSL-2 flagged by logging contract supervisor. Discussed Canadian contractors and their requirements to provide workers compensation. Many roads within North Woods paid for and constructed by Maibec. Observed 5 acre stand with large old trees that may be left unharvested due to challenging access. Many other companies are using hand crews and yarding trees out in those situations.

Ashland Wilson Lot

- Harvested in winter of 2004. Tract contain “unzoned deer yard”. Forester chose to work with Inland Fish and Wildlife service (IFW) to develop prescription to promote deer habitat. Left all cedar and higher levels of fir and spruce to promote habitat cover.

Castle Hill, Tract 76501

- Block cut in 7/07. Overstory removal and crown thinning prescription. Used cut to length processor and forwarder to avoid large landing near town septic field. Left some large trees for spacing within small openings to provide seed source. Processor limbed trees ahead of tracks to avoid compaction. Observed 30’ no cut buffer along brook. Discussed non-timber forest product requests by native American individuals and identification and protection of historic sites.

TD R2 WELS - Griswold Tract

- Harvest in winter 2006. Overstory removal and selection systems used in hardwood stand type. Nice road work done to facilitate snow removal and provide access for adjacent landowners. PLS-2 riparian buffer flagged. Skidder bridge used over small spring outflow. Very nice marking of hardwood stand. Best quality trees retained. Very little residual stand damage. No rutting – Forwarder placed high amounts of slash on trails.

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 the distinct purposes of the consultations:

To solicit input from affected parties as to the strengths and weaknesses of PCMC 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.

Principal stakeholder groups of relevance to this evaluation were identified based upon results from the scoping evaluation, lists of stakeholders from the PCMC, 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:

- PCMC employees, including headquarters and field
- contractors
- lease holders
- adjacent property owners
- Pertinent Tribal members and or representatives
- Members of the Northeast FSC Working Group/National Initiative
- FSC International
- Local and regionally-based environmental organizations and conservationists
- Local and regionally-based social interest organizations
- Forest industry groups and organizations
- Purchasers of logs harvested on PCMC forestlands
- Local, State and Federal regulatory agency personnel
- User groups, such as hikers, ATV users, and others
- Other relevant groups

Prior to, during, and following the site evaluation, a wide range of stakeholders from the regional area were consulted in regard to their relationship with the Sample Company, and their views on the management of the Sample Forest. Stakeholders included FSC contact persons, government and non-government organizations involved in forest management, local citizens and groups, employees, contractors, and others. Stakeholders were contacted with a notification mailing soliciting comment and/or phone contact. Comments were received via meetings and personal interviews “face-to-face”, phone interviews (“Interview”), and through written responses. Individuals or groups not offering feedback are labeled “no response” (“NR”). Additional comments may have been received from individuals not wishing to reveal their identities.

Name	Consultation
PCMC Employees	Interview
PCMC Logging Contractors	Interview
PCMC Client Landowners	Interview
Katahdin Timberlands, VP	NR

Maine TREE Foundation	NR
Lumbra Hardwoods	Interview
Maine Forest Products Council	NR
The Nature Conservancy – Maine Chapter	NR
Maibec Industries	Interview
Farm Credit of Maine ACA	NR
Maine Rivers	NR
Sierra Club – Maine Chapter	Interview
Natural Resource Council	Interview
Maine Audubon Society	Interview
Maine Forest Service	Interview
Land Use Regulation Commission	Interview
Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife	NR
Maine Department of Conservation	NR
Maine Natural Areas Program	NR
Verso Paper	NR

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

A summary of the comments on the standard (where applicable) and major perspectives and concerns expressed by the stakeholders that were consulted during the course of this evaluation include:

Economic Concerns

Comment/Concern	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PCMC is a reliable producer of forest products 	Comment Noted
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> They stick with the contractual agreements they make 	Comment Noted
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PCMC has always practiced selective silviculture and provided yearly revenue stream to client 	Comment Noted
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Client accountant has never had any problems with PCMC reporting procedures 	Comment Noted
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One of the best landowners to buy logs from – they offer fair prices 	Comment Noted
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> They are responsive to supply issues 	Comment Noted

Social Concerns

Comment/Concern	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very cooperative with regulatory review 	This response was confirmed by other agencies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No agency foresters or Rangers have had problems with PCMC 	Comment Noted
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have not received any known LURC violations 	Comment Noted
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns with loggers coming from Canada having 	Auditors confirm that

	Canadian contractors do carry workers compensation
--	--

Environmental Concerns

Comment/Concern	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One instance of clearcut not meeting Maine Forest Practices Act stocking rules. 	Evidence indicates this was one time occurrence with no violation issued. Training sessions were conducted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> They should be conducting landscape scale considerations 	Auditors confirmed the need to do more landscape-level analysis. See CAR 2007.5, 2007.7, and CAR 2007.16
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a need to focus on conserving biodiversity 	PCMC should focus more attention on issues related to biodiversity. See CAR 2007.4, 2007.11, 2007.14, and CAR 2007.16
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is important that they have retention in the overstory removal prescriptions 	The auditors paid close attention to retention elements within harvest units. A request was made to establish retention guidelines for CWD and to focus more on strategies to conserve biodiversity. See CAR 2007.6 and CARs related to biodiversity comment.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns with forestland conversions using “2 in 5 rule” to circumvent the LURC rules 	Evidence indicates that PCMC client landowners are not interested in converting forestlands using this or any other zoning mechanism

3.4 Total Time Spent on audit

For the full certification evaluation, approximately 12 auditor days were expended in field, 3 auditor days were needed for document review prior to the field work, 3 auditor days were required in advanced and follow-up stakeholder consultation, and 5 auditor days required to draft the final report.

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 judgment 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
P1: FSC Commitment and Legal Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consultations with regulatory agencies confirmed no violations have been issued to PCMC ▪ Many properties are gated and other roads and trails are barricaded to prevent unauthorized entrance. Boundaries are well marked. Foresters, contractors, and landowners actively patrol properties for unauthorized or illegal activities. ▪ PCMC has made commitment to the FSC principles a part of their official Policy Manual. They have sent notification to their clients along with a letter of intent to be signed and returned for each client/group member 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PCMC has not conducted an analysis to determine if any international conventions, agreements or treaties may be applicable to its group management operations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ See CAR 2007.1
P2: Tenure & Use Rights & Responsibilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There are no questions related to PCMC clients land ownership and their legal rights to use the forest ▪ PCMC is well integrated in to the communities in which they live and work. They maintain open and productive communication with members of these communities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ While some informal consultation exists, PCMC does not actively seek participation from tribal representatives as a standard practice during planning activities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ See CAR 2007.2
P3: Indigenous Peoples' Rights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PCMC management is designed to protect resources that may of significance to tribal members such as water resources, wildlife and significant plant species. ▪ Known sites with special significance are protected by PCMC foresters during operations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PCMC does not as a matter of standard practice reach out to neighboring tribes for the purpose of inviting representatives to participate in identification of significant sites and their protection. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ See CAR 2007.2

P4: Community Relations & Workers' Rights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PCMC company employees are provided with a very competitive compensation package including profit sharing, retirement plans, and a health insurance benefit package. ▪ PCMC has developed long standing working relationships with loggers and transportation contractors. These contractors are an integral part of the communities that PCMC foresters and managers interact with on a sustained basis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is no formal mechanism for people affected by management operations to provide input into management planning 	<p>See CAR 2007.3</p>
P5: Benefits from the Forest	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PCMC has a proven long-term management record on lands that have mostly been under their management since 1924. ▪ Forest stands are always well stocked and contain high quality fast growing trees. Close attention is paid to protecting advanced regeneration during operations. Soil resources are also well protected to ensure long-term productivity. ▪ Stakeholder interviews revealed high satisfaction among local sawmills regarding fairness in pricing and opportunities to purchase logs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ While some provisions are made for biodiversity, there appears to be an inadequate level of consideration, protection, and enhancement of biodiversity being implemented during management activities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ See CAR 2007.4
P6: Environmental Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PCMC foresters manage for the forest type that is most successful on the site. Herbicides are not used. ▪ PCMC foresters maintain diversity in stands by harvesting a variety of products and encouraging natural regeneration, often with shelterwood harvesting methods. ▪ Many of the elements of habitat diversity are recognized and addressed by PCMC foresters ▪ Road design is excellent; bridges well constructed and maintained, and culverts are installed properly. ▪ PCMC forests are not and have not been converted to plantations. Other types of conversion—leasing of camp lots—has been very limited. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Guidelines are needed for retention of woody debris, especially in light of new markets for biomass utilization. ▪ Although a number of areas may be considered de facto reserves, PCMC has not established criteria or protocols for designating reserved lands. ▪ There is no consistent threshold for unacceptable levels of rutting during skidding operations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ See CAR 2007.6 ▪ See CAR 2007.7 ▪ See CAR 2007.8

P7: Management Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PCMC has a strong management system that includes a company wide management plan, a policy and procedures manual, and 5 year plans for each tract ▪ PCMC silvicultural guidelines indicate how prescriptions are to be matched to the site and species preference with the goal of creating a sustained forest management operation. ▪ PCMC maintains an excellent GIS database that identifies currently inventoried forest resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The management plans contain a thorough description of timber resources and the inventory process. Fish and wildlife, soils, and non-economic resources receive considerably less discussion in the management plan. ▪ While PCMC employees participate in various training activities, it is the sense of the audit team that field staff and contractors need focused training on implementing techniques to protect and enhance biodiversity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ See CAR 2007.11
P8: Monitoring & Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PCMC managers actively pursue information that provides feedback on implementation of the management plan. When it is prudent to update the plans, there is evidence that action has been taken to update plans to address changing conditions. ▪ Monitoring activities are preformed during and after operations. The procedures include monitoring of compliance with BMPs and silvicultural prescriptions. ▪ Management costs and revenues are closely monitored and reported to clients. ▪ There is strong evidence that new information collected by various monitoring activities are incorporated into revised management plans. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ While various monitoring activities are undertaken, there is not yet a comprehensive monitoring plan/protocol that is designed to gather information of changes in non-timber resources. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ See CAR 2007.13 and CAR 2007.14
P9: Maintenance of High Conservation Value Forest	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PCMC has many acres that are protected for various reasons. Those protected designations are synonymous with HCVF and receive strong protection and monitoring focus. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PCMC has yet to accomplish all the tasks associated with HCVF designation, creation of management provisions, and monitoring considerations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ See CAR 2007.16

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.

The following pre-conditions were placed on PCMC during their initial evaluation. They have all been closed to the satisfaction of the audit team.

Auditor Observation/Non-Conformity:
<p>At present, PCMC cannot demonstrate that it is expressly incorporating the results of evaluations of social impacts into management planning and operations. This non-conformity does not mean that PCMC managers are insensitive to the social/regional-economic effects of their management activities on group member properties but there is a need to make such sensitivity and consideration a more formal component of the PCMC group management program.</p> <p>Significant archeological sites and sites of cultural, historical, or community significance are not being systematically mapped and recorded so as to assure the establishment of special management zones or other appropriate means of protection.</p>
CAR 2007.3:
<p>(a): PCMC managers must develop written procedures/guidelines for tracking and reporting on the regional socio-economic impacts associated with their management of group member properties in Maine.</p> <p>(b): PCMC managers must develop a procedure for maintaining a file of comments and concerns that may be received from individuals or organizations and the actions taken to mitigate these concerns.</p> <p>(c): PCMC must review its group management procedures for the purpose of identifying and implementing more structured means and opportunities for apprising people and groups potentially subject to direct adverse effects of management activities so that they may provide comment or express concerns, if any.</p> <p>(d): PCMC managers must establish protocols for expanding the GIS database to include additional layers for recording known sites of cultural, historical and community significance (e.g., rock walls, farmsteads). In addition to recording known sites and those discovered over time, PCMC must assure that forest management activities minimize adverse impacts to such sites.</p>
Reference: FSC Criterion 4.4.
Time Frame for Conformance: This CAR must be downgraded to a Minor CAR prior to award of certification, by closure of Parts (a) and (b). Thereafter, the remaining Minor CAR (Part (c) and (d)) must be closed within one year of award of certification.
PCMC Response: PCMC has developed Socio-Economic Assessment Procedures that will be incorporated into the company Policy Manual. The assessments are designed to gather input regarding community goals for forest and natural resource use and to solicit input from those directly affected by management operations. A Public Contact Report template has been developed and input will be maintained in a comment file. Procedures

have also been developed to notify affected persons of management activities as requested in Part C of the CAR. Additionally, PCMC has developed procedures for identifying significant cultural sites and creating a GIS data layer to be used in operations planning.

Status: PCMC has adequately responded to all phases of the CAR. **This CAR is Closed.**

Auditor Observation/Non-Conformity:

Assessment of landscape level and/or cumulative environmental impacts (i.e., impacts at a scale larger than the harvest unit) needs to be designed and implemented in a manner that clearly demonstrates conformity with FSC Criterion 6.1.

CAR 2007.5:

(a): PCMC must outline a process and a timetable for conducting a landscape-level assessment of current resources, to include relevant ecological processes, unique and threatened natural communities, rare and threatened species, water and soil resources. The assessment shall address PCMC-managed lands and the appropriate surrounding landscapes, with emphasis on representation of forest types, age-classes, and natural communities in the landscape.

(b): PCMC must complete the assessment of current resources, as described above, and establish goals, if appropriate, for restoring portions of the forest to the range and distribution of forest structures and species compositions consistent with naturally occurring stand development patterns for the region.

Reference: FSC Criterion 6.1 and Regional Indicators 6.3.a.5. and 7.1.f

Time Frame for Conformance: Part (a): prior to award of certification; part (b): two years after award of certification.

PCMC Response: The company has completed a template for conducting Landscape-Level Assessments of current resources that provides all the elements needed to properly address landscape level and/or cumulative environmental impacts. A timetable to complete the assessment for all “regions” has been provided that will meet the timeframe requirements of part b.

Status: Part A of the CAR is Closed. This remaining portion of this CAR is now considered a minor CAR and shall be assessed in future surveillance audits.

Auditor Observation/Non-Conformity:

PCMC managers have not yet initiated and completed a landscape-scale assessment of representative samples of vegetation cover types that have been reserved from active forest management. Managers of certified forests must determine if there are any gaps in the network of set-asides within their landscape region and, if gaps do exist, then determine if any areas within their certified forest area could be designated as reserves and in doing so, help to eliminate those gaps.

CAR 2007.7:

(a): In concert with CAR 2007.5, PCMC must outline a process and a timetable for

identifying representative samples of existing ecosystems suitable for protection.
(b): PCMC must have recorded on maps those sites known to be suitable for reserved status, and must have implemented a plan to survey the ownerships for additional sites suitable for reserves.
Reference: FSC Criterion 6.4.
Time Frame for Conformance: Part (a): prior to award of certification. Part (b): two years after award of certification.
PCMC Response: PCMC has indicated they will be using the Landscape-Level Assessment process to identify unique ecological features, communities, and ecosystems within their defined landscapes. These assessments shall be conducted within the timeframe identified under CAR 2007.5
Status: Part A of the CAR is Closed. This remaining portion of this CAR is now considered a minor CAR and shall be assessed in future surveillance audits.

Auditor Observation/Non-Conformity:
Further training of PCMC field staff and contractors on matters related to management for maintenance/enhancement of biodiversity is needed.
CAR 2007.11:
a) PCMC must outline a plan and timetable for a program that will enhance the training and education of operations foresters in the relevant subject areas of biodiversity conservation necessary to fully implement the policies and guidelines in the company's management plan.
(b) PCMC must demonstrate the plan for enhancing understanding of biodiversity conservation has been implemented.
Reference: FSC Criterion 7.3
Time Frame for Conformance: Part (A): Prior to award of certification; Part (B): one year from award of certification.
PCMC Response: PCMC has presented a plan and timetable to enhance the training of operational foresters and harvesting contractors. A series of training sessions will occur during 2008 that is expected to lead to greater incorporation of biodiversity conservation efforts during management operations.
Status: Part A is Closed. Part B shall be assessed during the first annual surveillance audit.

Auditor Observation/Non-Conformity:
There is presently not a publicly available summary of the PCMC management plan for its group member operations.
CAR 2007.12:
PCMC managers must develop a publicly available summary of the PCMC group program management plan that covers all of the topics enumerated in FSC Criterion 7.1.
Reference: FSC Criterion 7.4.
Time Frame for Conformance: Prior to award of certification

PCMC response: PCMC has prepared a summary of the group management plan. This summary is now publicly available.
Status: Closed

Auditor Observation/Non-Conformity:
At present, PCMC does not have a publicly available summary of the results of periodic monitoring.
CAR 2007.15:
(a): PCMC must develop a template that provides a publicly available summary of monitoring activities and results on group member properties.
(b): PCMC must utilize the template to create a first periodic public summary of monitoring activities and results and make this summary publicly available upon request.
Reference: FSC Criterion 8.5.
Time Frame for Conformance: Part (a): Prior to award of certification; Part (b): one year from award of certification.
PCMC Response: PCMC has submitted a Public Summary of Monitoring Activities document. This document describes in great detail all the monitoring activities PCMC conducts on the managed properties. The document fully describes the monitoring activities conduct on group members properties and is available upon request.
Status: Parts A and B are satisfied. The CAR is Closed.

Auditor Observation/Non-Conformity:
PCMC managers have not yet completed all key analytical and consultative steps required of all managers of certified forests, as set forth in FSC Principle 9.
CAR 2007.16:
(a) Using a template provided by SCS, PCMC must complete a cross-walk that provides SCS with a summary presentation of the extent to which PCMC managers are or have completed activities that are responsive to the key analytical and consultative steps required of FM certificate holders under FSC Principle 9.
(b): PCMC must develop and convey to SCS a written work plan (e.g., tasks, timelines, responsible individuals) for completing PCMC's HCVF obligations.
(c): PCMC must then complete remaining HCVF tasks in order to bring their group forest management program fully in conformance with FSC Principle 9.
Reference: FSC Principle 9
Time Frame for Conformance: Parts (a) & (b): prior to award of certification. Part (c): two years from award of certification.
PCMC Response: PCMC has completed an HCVF analysis that address each of the key elements found in Principle 9 of the FSC standard. It is expected that the HCVF consideration and designation process will continue as PCMC expands their landscape-level analysis and the efforts to further incorporate biodiversity enhancement into the management structure. Currently, the HCVF analysis is up to date and meets the spirit and intent of Principle 9.

Status: All parts of this CAR have been satisfied. The CAR is now Closed.

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 the Prentiss & Carlisle Management Company be awarded FSC certification as a “Well-Managed Forest” subject to the corrective action requests stated in Section 5.2. PCMC has demonstrated that their system of management is capable of ensuring that all of the requirements of the Northeast Regional Standards are met over the forest area covered by the scope of the evaluation. PCMC 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

Auditor Observation/Non-Conformity:
PCMC forest managers do not, at present, know if any international conventions, agreements and treaties may be applicable to the group member forest management operations. Because we consider the risk to be low that PCMC management policies and practices are in substantive non-compliance with any applicable international agreements, we conclude that specification of a Minor Corrective Action Request is appropriate.
CAR 2007.1:
PCMC staff must complete an assessment to determine if: a) any international agreements such CITES and ILO or conventions such as ITTA and the Convention on Biological Diversity are relevant/applicable to the management of their group member properties and b) for those that are applicable, whether or not PCMC management policies and practices are in compliance. The results of this applicability and gap analysis (if are any conventions are found to be applicable) are to be summarized in a briefing report and conveyed to SCS. PCMC is encouraged to refer to the appendix of the Northeast Regional Standard for a list of possibly applicable conventions/agreements.
Reference: FSC Criterion 1, Regional Indicator 1.3.a.
PCMC Response: PCMC submitted an assessment to SCS of the treaties, conventions, and agreements that it believes are applicable and a statement regarding its compliance with each of the treaties and agreements.
Status: Closed

Auditor Observation/Non-Conformity:
PCMC does not as a matter of standard practice engage in affirmative outreach to neighboring tribes for the purpose of inviting tribal representatives to participate in the identification of sites of tribal cultural significance and the review of management practices to assure that such sites are being protected during forestry operations.

CAR 2007.2:
PCMC must develop and implement a strategy for making contact with Native American tribes located within the general regions in which the PCMC group member properties are located. The purpose of this contact is to invite tribal input and cooperation in the identification and protective management of sites of tribal significance.
Reference: FSC Criterion 3.3, Regional Indicators 3.3.a. and 8.2.d.3
PCMC response: PCMC has sent a letter to each of the four tribes in Maine asking for information related to significant sites that may be affected by management activities. PCMC has made it clear they would not disclose the location of any known sites to the general public.
Status: Closed

Auditor Observation/Non-Conformity:
At present, PCMC cannot demonstrate that it is expressly incorporating the results of evaluations of social impacts into management planning and operations. This non-conformity does not mean that PCMC managers are insensitive to the social/regional-economic effects of their management activities on group member properties but there is a need to make such sensitivity and consideration a more formal component of the PCMC group management program.
Significant archeological sites and sites of cultural, historical, or community significance are not being systematically mapped and recorded so as to assure the establishment of special management zones or other appropriate means of protection.

CAR 2007.3:
(a): PCMC managers must develop written procedures/guidelines for tracking and reporting on the regional socio-economic impacts associated with their management of group member properties in Maine.
(b): PCMC managers must develop a procedure for maintaining a file of comments and concerns that may be received from individuals or organizations and the actions taken to mitigate these concerns.
(c): PCMC must review its group management procedures for the purpose of identifying and implementing more structured means and opportunities for apprising people and groups potentially subject to direct adverse effects of management activities so that they may provide comment or express concerns, if any.
(d): PCMC managers must establish protocols for expanding the GIS database to include additional layers for recording known sites of cultural, historical and community significance (e.g., rock walls, farmsteads). In addition to recording known sites and those discovered over time, PCMC must assure that forest management activities minimize adverse impacts to such sites.
Reference: FSC Criterion 4.4.
Time Frame for Conformance: This CAR must be downgraded to a Minor CAR prior to award of certification, by closure of Parts (a) and (b). Thereafter, the remaining Minor CAR (Part (c) and (d)) must be closed within one year of award of certification.
PCMC Response: PCMC has developed Socio-Economic Assessment Procedures that will be incorporated into the company Policy Manual. The assessments are designed to gather input regarding community goals for forest and natural resource use and to solicit

input from those directly affected by management operations. A Public Contact Report template has been developed and input will be maintained in a comment file. Procedures have also been developed to notify affected persons of management activities as requested in Part C of the CAR. Additionally, PCMC has developed procedures for identifying significant cultural sites and creating a GIS data layer to be used in operations planning.

Status: PCMC has adequately responded to all phases of the CAR. This CAR is Closed.

Auditor Observation/Non-Conformity:

The consideration, protection and enhancement of biological diversity is not, at present, sufficiently incorporated as a distinct element of PCMC group member forest management, particularly with regard to day-to-day decisions by field personnel.

CAR 2007.4:

Building upon the beginning efforts to incorporate consideration of biological diversity into management operations (i.e., the June 2005 *Guidelines for Conserving Biodiversity in PCMC Managed Forests*), PCMC managers must identify and implement additional measures and field guidance for assuring that field personnel are more clearly and substantively incorporating consideration of biodiversity into day-to-day forest management decisions.

Reference: FSC Criterion 5.5, Regional Indicator 5.5.a.

Time Frame for Conformance: One year after award of certification.

PCMC Response: PCMC has presented a plan and timetable to enhance the training of operational foresters and harvesting contractors. A series of training sessions will occur during 2008 that is expected to lead to greater incorporation of biodiversity conservation efforts during management operations.

Status: Implementation of the training session materials will be assessed during the first surveillance audit along with part B of CAR 2007.11

Auditor Observation/Non-Conformity:

Assessment of landscape level and/or cumulative environmental impacts (i.e., impacts at a scale larger than the harvest unit) needs to be designed and implemented in a manner that clearly demonstrates conformity with FSC Criterion 6.1.

CAR 2007.5:

(a): PCMC must outline a process and a timetable for conducting a landscape-level assessment of current resources, to include relevant ecological processes, unique and threatened natural communities, rare and threatened species, water and soil resources. The assessment shall address PCMC-managed lands and the appropriate surrounding landscapes, with emphasis on representation of forest types, age-classes, and natural communities in the landscape.

(b): PCMC must complete the assessment of current resources, as described above, and

establish goals, if appropriate, for restoring portions of the forest to the range and distribution of forest structures and species compositions consistent with naturally occurring stand development patterns for the region.
Reference: FSC Criterion 6.1 and Regional Indicators 6.3.a.5. and 7.1.f
Time Frame for Conformance: Part (a): prior to award of certification; part (b): two years after award of certification.
PCMC Response: The company has completed a template for conducting Landscape-Level Assessments of current resources that provides all the elements needed to properly address landscape level and/or cumulative environmental impacts. A timetable to complete the assessment for all “regions” has been provided that will meet the timeframe requirements of part b.
Status: Part A of the CAR is Closed. Part B shall be assessed in future surveillance audits.

Auditor Observation/Non-Conformity:
Especially in light of the strengthening market for “bio-mass harvests,” there is a need for more explicit field-level guidance for the post-harvest retention of coarse woody debris and standing dead trees so as to assure adequate nutrient recycling as well as physical protection of soil from excessive rutting and compaction.
CAR 2007.6:
PCMC must develop a policy and guidelines for the retention of biomass in the form of coarse woody debris and standing dead trees.
Reference: FSC Criterion 6.3, Regional Indicators 6.3.b.2 and 6.3.c.1.
Time Frame for Conformance:
One year from award of certification.

Auditor Observation/Non-Conformity:
PCMC managers have not yet initiated and completed a landscape-scale assessment of representative samples of vegetation cover types that have been reserved from active forest management. Managers of certified forests must determine if there are any gaps in the network of set-asides within their landscape region and, if gaps do exist, then determine if any areas within their certified forest area could be designated as reserves and in doing so, help to eliminate those gaps.
CAR 2007.7:
(a): In concert with CAR 2007.5, PCMC must outline a process and a timetable for identifying representative samples of existing ecosystems suitable for protection.
(b): PCMC must have recorded on maps those sites known to be suitable for reserved status, and must have implemented a plan to survey the ownerships for additional sites suitable for reserves.
Reference: FSC Criterion 6.4.
Time Frame for Conformance: Part (a): prior to award of certification. Part (b): two

years after award of certification.
PCMC Response: PCMC has indicated they will be using the Landscape-Level Assessment process to identify unique ecological features, communities, and ecosystems within their defined landscapes. These assessments shall be conducted within the timeframe identified under CAR 2007.5
Status: Part A of the CAR is Closed. Part B shall be assessed in future surveillance audits.

Auditor Observation/Non-Conformity:
While PCMC foresters are sensitive to rutting and compaction, isolated areas on several harvest sites visited during the audit exhibited excessive rutting. In discussing rutting with PCMC foresters, it was revealed that each forester employs his own standards as to what constitutes acceptable depth and extent of rutting and that these standards are not articulated in writing. In light of the observed instances of rutting, the auditors conclude that more guidance to field foresters is needed.
CAR 2007.8:
PCMC must develop a policy and guidelines to define the extent of rutting in harvest operations that is unacceptable.
Reference: FSC Criterion 6.5, Regional Indicator 6.5.b.
PCMC response: PCMC has updated their policies and procedures manual to include actions to be taken to reduce impacts associated with excessive rutting.
Status: Closed.

Auditor Observation/Non-Conformity:
At present, PCMC managers do not have an explicit strategy for protecting vernal pools, seeps and springs. Such a strategy first requires a process for systematically identifying and recording/mapping such areas and then developing appropriate guidance for assuring their protection.
CAR 2007.9:
PCMC must institute a practice of locating vernal pools and forested seeps, delineating such sites before harvest, mapping boundaries and adding this information to the GIS system. Within two years of certification, a sufficient number of vernal pools and seeps should be inventoried in this manner such that randomly selected harvest sites visited in annual audits will reveal suitable protection of such sites.
Reference: FSC Criterion 6.5, Regional Indicator 6.5.c & d.
Time Frame for Conformance:
One year after award of certification.

Auditor Observation/Non-Conformity:
The compendium of planning documents that constitute the PCMC “forest plan” for the group member operations does not, at present, address all of the subject areas enumerated in FSC Criterion 7.1. It is the SCS auditor’s sense that the current treatment (e.g.,

description and analysis) of non-timber resources needs to be strengthened in the PCMC planning documents. Likewise, it is our sense that the presentation of “environmental safeguards based on environmental assessments” (FSC 7.1.f.) needs to be strengthened.
CAR 2007.10:
PCMC managers must complete a review of the current set of documents comprising the PCMC group management plan against the subject matters enumerated in FSC Criterion 7.1.a) through i). Any subjects enumerated in 7.1.a) through i) that are not presently addressed explicitly in a PCMC planning document must be identified and a current planning document must be expanded or a new planning document created to incorporate an explicit treatment of the missing subject matters.
Reference: FSC Criterion 7.1
Time Frame for Conformance:
One year after award of certification.

Auditor Observation/Non-Conformity:
Further training of PCMC field staff and contractors on matters related to management for maintenance/enhancement of biodiversity is needed.
CAR 2007.11:
a) PCMC must outline a plan and timetable for a program that will enhance the training and education of operations foresters in the relevant subject areas of biodiversity conservation necessary to fully implement the policies and guidelines in the company’s management plan. (b) PCMC must demonstrate the plan for enhancing understanding of biodiversity conservation has been implemented.
Reference: FSC Criterion 7.3
Time Frame for Conformance: Part (A): Prior to award of certification; Part (B): one year from award of certification.
PCMC Response: PCMC has presented a plan and timetable to enhance the training of operational foresters and harvesting contractors. A series of training sessions will occur during 2008 that is expected to lead to greater incorporation of biodiversity conservation efforts during management operations.
Status: Part A is Closed. Part B shall be assessed during the first annual surveillance audit.

Auditor Observation/Non-Conformity:
While PCMC managers engage in an array of activities that are responsive to the monitoring requirements of FSC Principle 8, there is at present not a comprehensive monitoring plan/protocol that provides overall guidance and structure to monitoring activities on group member properties.
CAR 2007.13:
PCMC must develop a comprehensive, written monitoring plan that brings together in a more readily accessible manner the multiplicity of activities undertaken on group member properties as well as more generally that, in fact, constitute monitoring.

Opportunities for incorporating more structure and record keeping of monitoring activities and results should be explored.
Reference: FSC Criterion 8.1, Regional Indicator 8.1.b.
Time Frame for Conformance:
One year from award of certification.

Auditor Observation/Non-Conformity:
PCMC managers are, at present, not periodically monitoring group member forest properties for changes in major habitat elements and for changes in the occurrence of sensitive, rare, threatened, or endangered species.
CAR 2007.14:
Coincident with CAR 2007.5(b), PCMC must recognize the importance of different forest structure and species compositions as elements of habitat for wildlife, and incorporate such habitat elements into a monitoring program.
Reference: FSC Criterion 8.2, Regional Indicator 8.2.c.1.
Time Frame for Conformance:
Two years after award of certification.

Auditor Observation/Non-Conformity:
At present, PCMC does not have a publicly available summary of the results of periodic monitoring.
CAR 2007.15:
(a): PCMC must develop a template that provides a publicly available summary of monitoring activities and results on group member properties.
(b): PCMC must utilize the template to create a first periodic public summary of monitoring activities and results and make this summary publicly available upon request.
Reference: FSC Criterion 8.5.
Time Frame for Conformance: Part (a): Prior to award of certification; Part (b): one year from award of certification.
PCMC Response: PCMC has submitted a Public Summary of Monitoring Activities document. This document describes in great detail all the monitoring activities PCMC conducts on the managed properties. The document fully describes the monitoring activities conduct on group members properties and is available upon request.
Status: Parts A and B are satisfied. The CAR is Closed.

Auditor Observation/Non-Conformity:
PCMC managers have not yet completed all key analytical and consultative steps required of all managers of certified forests, as set forth in FSC Principle 9.
CAR 2007.16:
(a) Using a template provided by SCS, PCMC must complete a cross-walk that provides SCS with a summary presentation of the extent to which PCMC managers are or have completed activities that are responsive to the key analytical and consultative steps

required of FM certificate holders under FSC Principle 9.
(b): PCMC must develop and convey to SCS a written work plan (e.g., tasks, timelines, responsible individuals) for completing PCMC’s HCVF obligations.
(c): PCMC must then complete remaining HCVF tasks in order to bring their group forest management program fully in conformance with FSC Principle 9.
Reference: FSC Principle 9
Time Frame for Conformance: Parts (a) & (b): prior to award of certification. Part (c): two years from award of certification.
PCMC Response: PCMC has completed an HCVF analysis that address each of the key elements found in Principle 9 of the FSC standard. It is expected that the HCVF consideration and designation process will continue as PCMC expands their landscape-level analysis and the efforts to further incorporate biodiversity enhancement into the management structure. Currently, the HCVF analysis is up to date and meets the spirit and intent of Principle 9.
Status: All parts of this CAR have been satisfied. The CAR is now Closed.

Auditor Observation/Non-Conformity:
There is not presently a written document that contains key information about the PCMC group certification program, as set forth in the SCS/FSC supplemental group certification criteria, C.1-C.4.
CAR 2007.17:
PCMC must develop and convey to SCS a “group administration document” that includes the information requirements set forth in SCS/FSC group administration certification criteria/indicators: C.1.b, C.2.a, C.2.b, C.2.c, C.3.a (i)-(vi), C.3.b, and C.4.a (i)-(viii).
Reference: SCS/FSC Group Certification Criterion A.1.
PCMC response: PCMC submitted a group administration document to SCS. The guidelines clearly address all the necessary elements of the group management requirements.
Status: Closed

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 Prentiss & Carlisle to the Northeast Regional Standard (v9.0 2/10/05). Public summaries of surveillance evaluations will be posted separately on the SCS website (www.scscertified.com).

6.1 2009 Annual Audit

6.1.1 Assessment Dates

The second annual audit was conducted from 23-25 September 2009.

Between the September 2007 assessment and the second annual audit, the following accomplishments and activities occurred:

- In October 2007, PCMC submitted an assessment to SCS of the treaties, conventions, and agreements that it believes are applicable and a statement regarding its compliance with each of the treaties and agreements. This allowed CAR 2007.1 to be closed
- In October 2007, PCMC has sent a letter to each of the four tribes in Maine asking for information related to significant sites that may be affected by management activities, allowing CAR 2007.2 to be closed.
- In October 2007, PCMC submitted a group administration document and a public summary of that document to SCS, allowing CARs 2007.12 and 2007.17 to be closed.
- In November 2007, PCMC submitted a document outlining Socio-Economic Assessment Procedures that will be incorporated into the company Policy Manual. This document and associated procedures for notifying affected persons of planned management activities and incorporating new information about significant cultural sites into a GIS system allowed CAR 2007.3 to be closed.
- In November 2007, PCMC submitted to SCS a Public Summary of Monitoring Activities document, allowing CAR 2007.15 to be closed.
- In December 2007, PCMC completed an HCVF analysis that addressed each of the key elements found in Principle 9 of the FSC standard. CAR 2007.16 was closed and the company was certified on 18 January 2008, by SCS, as a well-managed forest.
- In July 2009, PCMC submitted a revised draft copy of the Landscape Management Report, which addressed CARs 2007.5(b), 2007.7(b), and 2007.14.
- On 7 September 2009, email correspondence was sent to PCMC indicating that a review of the Landscape Management Report allowed CARs 2007.5(b) and 2007.14 to be closed. Details are provided in Section 2.4 of this report.

David Capen spent two days interviewing employees of PCMC and conducting site visits. Another day was spent preparing for the audit, and reviewing documents and records, and conducting a closing meeting. Thus, a total of three days was allocated to the audit, not including travel to and from the audit site or writing the report.

6.1.2 Assessment Personnel

Dr. David E. Capen is a Professor Emeritus in the Rubenstein School of Environment and Natural Resources at the University of Vermont. He has a B.S.F. degree in Forestry from the University of Tennessee, an M.S. degree in Wildlife Management from the University of Maine, and a Ph.D. in Wildlife Science from Utah State University. He has been a faculty member at the University of Vermont since 1976, maintaining a part-time research appointment since retiring from teaching in 2002. Dr. Capen is a Certified Wildlife Biologist. He has conducted numerous FSC audits in Massachusetts, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, and Indiana.

6.1.2 Assessment Process

The scope of the 2009 annual audit included document review, interviews with management and field personnel, and visits to selected sites in the following townships managed by personnel from the Ashland office of the company: TDR2 GNP, Chapman, Ashland, T12 R7, T13 R8, T13 R7. Other than outstanding CARs, the focus of the assessment was in the field and addressed mostly Principles 4, 5, and 6.

Documents reviewed before, during, and after the field audit:

- Timber harvesting plans for all harvest sites selected for field visits
- Draft report on landscape analysis
- Pre-harvest conference checklist for field sites
- Biodiversity contractor conference checklist
- Appendix A, Guidelines for Conserving Biodiversity in PCMC Managed Forests
- Draft and final procedures for vernal pool management
- Vernal pool locations in GIS databases
- Revised (December 2008) Forest Management Plan, Prentiss & Carlisle Management Company, Inc.

23 September 2008

Bangor Office, Prentiss and Carlisle, (Bill Miller, Dave Dow)

- *Discussions of personnel changes, land ownership, FSC standards, and remaining corrective action requests.*
- *Inspection of GIS data that show locations of vernal pools.*
- *Review of correspondence with MNAP regarding 2009 survey sites.*
- *Audit schedule and travel itinerary for field sites.*

Travel to Houghton and TDR2 GNP Field Site (Dave Dow, Carl Sjogren)

- *Tract No. 73502, Mature hardwood stand; excellent site with full stocking; contract was for 2000 cords, mostly hardwood logs and pulp; contractor was Syl-Ver Logging, using feller-buncher; tops and limbs were chipped on site; harvest was in June and July 2009, an usually wet season; harvest was shut down on three occasions, both by the forester and the logger; the harvest was relatively light, removing most of the largest hardwoods, as well as most beech and fir; many appropriate trees were left for wildlife, and plenty of downed wood was left in the stand; considerable rutting is present on this site, although most instances were for short distances; waterbars were established in appropriate places, but some had been breached by flowing water; no cases of erosion near water; a PSL-2 formed one boundary of the harvest, and the 75-foot buffer was not penetrated by machine tracts, but some softwood trees were removed. Log yards are large. Carl Sjogren was the forester.*
- *Chapman Twp, Browning/Merrill Tract, goal was to remove over-mature aspen, spruce, and fit to open the stand, stimulate exiting regeneration and encourage new regeneration; prescription includes leaving most hardwood trees to provide support and cover for regeneration; many aspens left in the stand, some pockets of advanced fir generation; should result in excellent habitat for grouse, with a mix*

- **Ashland, Morris/Rafford Tract**, active harvest site; goal was to remove the overstory to release existing regeneration while thinning existing regeneration; Aroostook Lumber Co. is the operator, using feller-buncher; harvest has been going on for about 4 weeks on a mostly flat, dry site; very little evidence of rutting; residual stand is a nice mix of species and spacing, with some large white pines left for cover and wildlife; large yarding area, but mostly full of materials at the time of audit; hardwood limbs and tops piled for chipping, but most softwood slash carried back onto trails. Carl Sjogren was the forester.

24 September 2009

Field Site Visits (Dave Dow, Carl Sjogren, Lonnie Jandreau, Bart Plourde)

- **T12 R7**, Visit to a vernal pool found by forester Lonnie Jandreau; the site is scheduled for harvest and a 100-foot buffer has been marked to protect the pool. This pool is a large one and still holds some water, although water levels have dropped. Plenty of overhanging canopy and numerous cedar trees tipped into the water—a classic example of a vernal pool.
- **T12R7, Tract 77805**, Mature hardwood stand, whole-tree harvest during winter 2009, and shelterwood harvest in summer 2009; the two harvest blocks were side by side. Both winter and summer harvests were done without significant soil disturbance; plenty of limbs and other residual debris on ground; landings were quite small and clean; residual stand is hardwood, on an excellent site. Lonnie Jandreau was the forester.
- **T13 R8 SW, Tract 71505**, Carr Pond winter deer yard, a LURC-zoned yard, but with no recent deer use; also a camping site near Carr Pond, a popular site for camping, fishing, and snowmobiling. Overstory softwood cover has declined; objective of harvest was to remove some mature softwoods and release the fir and spruce regeneration; many very large white pines left standing; harvest prescription was developed in cooperation with Maine IFW; cutting trails for the processor/forwarder harvest were laid out to avoid the camping sites; wood was piled along the road in winter, leaving no indication of yarding. Lonnie Jondreau was the forester.
- **T13 R8 PL, Tract 71503**, A mixed wood site on the banks of Carr Pond; harvested by Dale Plourde in winter 2009 with feller-buncher; wood skidded uphill away from the pond and yarded along a newly constructed (restored) road; within the 250-foot PGP zone, no more than 40% of high-risk softwoods were removed; a careful harvest that is not visible from the pond. Lonnie Jondreau was the forester.
- **T13 R7, Lincoln Association Tract**, an upland block that was selected for a 2000-cord harvest by processor; D. Plourde was the contractor; a mixed wood stand where the prescription was to cut merchantable fir, diseased beech, and spruce with poor crowns; the residual stand is mostly sugar maple, birch, and spruce; plenty of woody debris left on the site and numerous standing trees for wildlife; little to no soil damage from the harvest; several small wet sites marked for avoidance; one

25 September 2009

Bangor Office, Prentiss and Carlisle, (Bill Miller, Dave Dow)

- *Closing meeting: review of newly submitted documents; discussion of CARs.*

6.1.4 Status of Corrective Action Requests

CAR 2007.5(b) Reference Criterion 6.1 and Indicators 6.3.a.5 and 7.1.f
Background Information/Justification: Assessment of landscape level and/or cumulative environmental impacts (i.e., impacts at a scale larger than the harvest unit) needs to be designed and implemented in a manner that clearly demonstrates conformity with FSC Criterion 6.1.
CAR 2007.5(b)
PCMC must complete the assessment of current resources, as described above, and establish goals, if appropriate, for restoring portions of the forest to the range and distribution of forest structures and species compositions consistent with naturally occurring stand development patterns for the region. Results of the assessment will be examined in future surveillance audits.
PCMC 2008:
Lands were divided into 10 regions, consistent with management regions used by PCMC. These regions were used as the basis for a substantial compilation of data: Significant Features (landscape, ownership, economic, etc.); Reserved Lands; Biophysical Regions; Soils; Natural Communities; Rare Species; Historic and Cultural Features; Recreation and Forest Resources. For each region there is a table for PCMC's lands that shows acreage by forest type and age class.
Auditor Assessment 2008:
The goal here should be to assess PCMC resources in comparison to the region as a whole, i.e., do PCMC lands represent the regional landscape? This information should provide the basis for establishing desired future conditions for PCMC lands in these regions. This has not yet been done. In essence, the necessary data have been gathered and compiled, but no analysis of this information has been submitted for review.
Status December 2008: Condition continued until 2009 annual audit.
Auditor Assessment 2009:
PCMC has revised the Landscape Analysis report to include a comparison of forest size classes on PCMC-managed lands within each region to the comparable data for the region as a whole, as measured by USFS FIA inventories. The report lacks only a definitive conclusion about desired future conditions, which is expected to be presented in the next revision of the management plan.
Status September 2009: Closed.

CAR 2007.7(b) Reference Criterion 6.4
Background Information/Justification: PCMC managers have not yet initiated and completed a landscape-scale assessment of representative samples of vegetation cover types that have been reserved from active forest management. Managers of certified forests must determine if there are any gaps in the network of set-asides within their landscape region and, if gaps do exist, then determine if any areas within their certified forest area could be designated as reserves and in doing so, help to eliminate those gaps.
CAR 2007.7(b)
PCMC must have recorded on maps those sites known to be suitable for reserved status, and must have implemented a plan to survey the ownerships for additional sites suitable for reserves; to be completed within two years of certification.
PCMC Actions 2008:
PCMC outlined a process and timetable for identifying representative samples of existing ecosystems suitable for protection, reducing the initial CAR to a minor. Work is progressing on implementing the plan and mapping reserved sites.
Auditor Assessment 2008:
This CAR—2007.7(b)—should remain open for additional work, closely related to that expected for 2007.5(b).
Status December 2008: Continued until the 2009 annual audit.
Auditor Assessment 2009:
The landscape analysis described in CAR 2007.5(b) was a necessary step in addressing gaps in the network of representative reserves in the relevant biophysical regions. The Maine Forest Biodiversity Project has established reserves, mostly on public lands, that fill most gaps in protected examples of forested lands. PCMC, however, still needs additional consultation to determine if targets for reserves have been met in regions and for forest types where their lands might contribute.
Status September 2009: Closed, but see Major CAR 2009.1

CAR 2007.9. Reference Criterion 6.5 and Indicators 6.5.c and 6.5.d
Background Information/Justification: At present, PCMC managers do not have an explicit strategy for protecting vernal pools, seeps and springs. Such a strategy first requires a process for systematically identifying and recording/mapping such areas and then developing appropriate guidance for assuring their protection.
CAR 2007.9
PCMC must institute a practice of locating vernal pools and forested seeps, delineating such sites before harvest, mapping boundaries and adding this information to the GIS system. Within two years of certification, a sufficient number of vernal pools and seeps should be inventoried in this manner such that randomly selected harvest sites visited in annual audits will reveal suitable protection of such sites.
PCMC Actions 2008:
A policy has been developed that outlines procedures for identifying, mapping, and protecting vernal pools during management operations. Furthermore, a map has been prepared that illustrated approximate location of know vernal pools on lands managed by PCMC.
Auditor Assessment 2008:

Procedures have been established and field foresters appear to be inventorying such sites and adding these data to the GIS system. However, only seven vernal pools have been mapped and incorporated into the GIS database. Procedures are adequate, but interviews with foresters in the field have not yet yielded an example where a vernal pool has been located and mapped. Thus, the two-year timeline for the second part of this CAR is still appropriate. The 2009 annual audit will include a review of this layer of GIS data and perhaps some focused inspections of field sites.
Status August 2008: Continued (in part) until the 2009 annual audit.
Auditor Assessment 2009:
An inspection of point locations in the PCMC GIS database shows only eight known locations for vernal pools. One of these locations was inspected in the field, a classic vernal pool environment. All or nearly all company foresters have taken training in the identification and protection of vernal pools in recent years, however, and a suitable effort is now being made to record the location of such pools on maps and GPS units in the field, rather than simply protecting these sites during harvest operations without mapping their locations. The intent of this CAR has been adequately satisfied.
Status September 2009: Closed.

CAR 2007.14. Reference Criterion
Background Information/Justification: PCMC managers are, at present, not periodically monitoring group member forest properties for changes in major habitat elements and for changes in the occurrence of sensitive, rare, threatened, or endangered species.
CAR 2007.14
Coincident with CAR 2007.5(b), PCMC must recognize the importance of different forest structure and species compositions as elements of habitat for wildlife, and incorporate such habitat elements into a monitoring program.
PCMC Actions 2008:
Lands were divided into 10 regions, consistent with management regions used by PCMC. These regions were used as the basis for a substantial compilation of data: Significant Features (landscape, ownership, economic, etc.); Reserved Lands; Biophysical Regions; Soils; Natural Communities; Rare Species; Historic and Cultural Features; Recreation and Forest Resources. For each region there is a table for PCMC's lands that shows acreage by forest type and age class.
Auditor Assessment 2008:
This should be closely tied with CAR 2007.5(b) and will remain open as more work is done on 2007.5. The CAR was issued with a timeline of two years after award of certification.
Status December 2008: Continued until the 2009 annual audit.
Auditor Assessment 2009:
The revised Landscape Management report presents a template for monitoring habitat types for wildlife. Annual updated materials from the Maine Natural Areas Program provides sufficient information for monitoring of sensitive, rare, threatened, or endangered species.
Status September 2009: Closed.

6.1.5 General Observations

Eight field sites, seven with 2009 harvest operations and one marked for harvest, were visited during the audit. All demonstrated an array of sustainable forestry indicators. Contract logging services provide experienced operators who have a history of working for PCMC and demonstrate compliance with expectations concerning BMPs, biodiversity concerns, residual woody debris, and protection of aquatic resources. All stands visited were well stocked, and all had excellent regeneration. In most cases, harvest trails were well brushed or otherwise protected from damage; one site had several instances of deep rutting on main harvest trails, where compaction, not erosion, might be a concern. Despite expanding opportunities for biomass harvesting, plenty of residual wood had been left on trails, and in the understory. Several examples were noted where large woody debris was purposely left on the ground. Snags were numerous on most harvest sites. Wet areas and watercourses were flagged by foresters and well protected, usually in excess of minimal requirements. New roads and bridges are well constructed and built to avoid or minimize erosion, although one instance was noted where maintenance operations had scattered road gravel onto a bridge with open planking.

Substantial progress has been made during the second year of certification, leading to the closure of four CARs.

6.1.6 New Corrective Action Requests and Recommendations

Two new Corrective Action Requests and one Recommendation were issued during the 2009 annual audit.

Non-conformance: PCMC personnel have completed an assessment of forest types and size classes on lands managed by the company, and have compared results with a regional analysis of the same measures. Additional consultation to determine if reserve targets have been met by other landowners in the region still is needed, however.	
Major CAR 2009.1	PCMC must have documented that adequate reserved lands exist, for relevant forest types, in each of the regions where the company manages forests. If gaps are found, then the company must begin to identify suitable sites for protection and/or initiate a search for such sites.
Deadline	15 March 2010 or 3 months after receipt of final report.
Reference	Indicator 6.4.b

Non-conformance: In general, PCMC constructs excellent permanent bridges on forest haul roads. However, many, if not most, are built with partially open decking, i.e., space between running planks where road material, if carried onto the bridge, can fall between cross ties into water courses. Two instances were noted during the field audit where road materials had been deposited on the bridge and into streams below (one bridge was built by PCMC but maintained by another management entity).	
CAR 2009.2	PCMC shall conduct a survey of bridges built or maintained by the company to determine the percentage of those with open decking that have allowed road material to fall through the decking and into brooks, rivers, or ponds below (a violation of BMPs). The survey should be designed without bias and conducted during spring, summer, or fall. Corrective actions

	should be pursued if appropriate.
Deadline	2010 Annual Audit
Reference	Indicator 6.5.d

Background: PCMC has established standards for the degree of rutting and soil damage that can be tolerated during harvest operations in wet weather and/or on wet soils. The primary objectives of these standards are to prevent soil movement and water pollution. In addition, a discussion of the spatial extent of soil disturbances on forest productivity is warranted.	
Recommendation 2009.1	The PCMC forest management staff should schedule a meeting, or a series of meetings, to address the issue of soil compaction and impacts on future forest productivity. The focus should be on the aerial extent of soil disruption and the cumulative effects of such disturbances.
Desired completion	2010 Annual Audit
Reference	Criterion 6.5

6.1.7 General Conclusions of the Annual Audit

Based upon information gathered through site visits, interviews, and document reviews, the SCS audit team concludes that Prentiss and Carlisle Management Company continues to be in overall compliance with the FSC Principles and Criteria, as elaborated by the Northeast Regional Stewardship Standards. As such, continuation of the 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

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.