

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

**State of Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands
Department of Conservation**

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

**CERTIFICATION REGISTRATION NUMBER
SCS-FM/COC-00042N**

Submitted to:

**Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands
Augusta, Maine**

Lead Author: David E. Capen

Date of Field Audit: 13-17 November 2006

Date of Report: Draft: December 2006, Finalized: Feb 28, 2007

Updated: August 2007 (See Section 6.1)

Updated: December 2008 (See Section 6.2)

Updated: November 2009 (See Section 6.3)

Certified: March 15, 2007

By:

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

SCS Contact: Dave Wager dwager@scscertified.com

Bureau of Parks and Lands Contact: Tom Charles (207) 287-4916

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 the Bureau of Parks and Lands.

FOREWORD

Scientific Certification Systems, a certification body accredited by the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC), was retained by the State of Maine, Bureau of Parks and Lands, to conduct a re-certification evaluation of its Public Reserved and Non-reserved forestland estate. 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. The Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands was awarded this distinction in March 2002.

In September 2006, 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 State of Maine, Bureau of Parks and Lands for the management of its Public Reserved and Non-reserved forestland estate. As detailed below, a pre-condition (also known as Major Corrective Action Request) that was stipulated by the audit team upon completion of the field audit was addressed by Bureau of Parks and Lands 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).

Foreword.....	2
Section A- Public Summary and Background Information	4
1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION	4
1.1 FSC Data Request.....	4
1.2 Management Context.....	6
1.2.1 Environmental Context.....	7
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.....	10
1.4 Management Plan.....	10
1.4.1 Management Objectives.....	11
1.4.2 Forest Composition.....	11
1.4.3 Silvicultural Systems	12
1.4.4 Management Systems	12
1.4.5 Monitoring System.....	13
1.4.6 Estimate of Maximum Sustainable Yield	13
1.4.7 Estimated, Current and Projected Production.....	14
1.4.8 Chemical Pesticide Use.....	14
2.0 Guidelines/Standards Employed.....	15
3.0 THE CERTIFICATION ASSESSMENT PROCESS.....	15
3.1 Assessment Dates.....	15
3.2 Assessment Team.....	15
3.3 Assessment Process	17
3.3.1 Itinerary.....	17
3.3.2 Evaluation of Management System	18
3.3.3 Selection of FMU’s to Evaluate.....	18
3.3.4 Sites Visited	18
3.3.5 Stakeholder Consultation.....	19
3.3.6 Other Assessment Techniques	21
3.4 Total Time Spent on audit.....	21
3.5 Process of Determining Conformance	21
4.0 Results of the Evaluation	22
Table 4.1 Notable strengths and weaknesses of the forest management enterprise relative to the P&C.....	22
4.2 Major Correction Action Requests (Pre-conditions)	30
As a result of the assessment, the team has recommended the following actions on outstanding Corrective Action Requests:.....	31
5.0 Certification Decision	37
5.1 Certification Recommendation	37
5.2 Corrective Action Requests	37
6.0 Surveillance Evaluations.....	39
7.0 Summary of SCS Complaint Investigation Procedure.....	56

SECTION A- PUBLIC SUMMARY AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1 FSC Data Request

Applicant entity	<i>State of Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands</i>
Contact person	<i>Tom Charles</i>
Address	<i>22 SHS, Augusta, Maine 04333</i>
Telephone	<i>207-287-7271</i>
Fax	<i>207-287-6170</i>
E-mail	<i>Tom.t.charles@maine.gov</i>
Certificate Number	<i>SCS-FM/COC-00042N</i>
Certificate/Expiration Date	<i>03/15/2007-03/15/2012</i>
Certificate Type	<i>single FMU</i>
Location of certified forest area	
Latitude	<i>E/W 45 degrees 45# minutes</i>
Longitude	<i>N/S 69 degrees 08 minutes</i>
Forest zone	<i>temperate</i>
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is:	
privately managed ¹	<i>0</i>
state managed	<i>573,000 acres</i>
community managed ²	<i>0</i>
Number of forest workers (including contractors) working in forest within scope of certificate	<i>Approximately 100 (varies by season), 35 BPL staff, the remainder contractors/crews.</i>
Area of forest and non-forest land protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for conservation objectives	<i>81,146 acres</i>
Area of forest protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for the production of NTFPs or services	<i>None</i>
Area of forest classified as 'high conservation value forest'	<i>150,000-200,000 acres (to be refined as part of CAR 2006.3)</i>
List of high conservation values present ³	<i>HCV 1-6 1-3 definitely, 4-6 possibly</i>
Chemical pesticides used	<i>Yes, for field mgmt and r-o-w</i>
Total area of production forest (i.e. forest from which timber may be harvested)	<i>385,000 acres</i>
Area of production forest classified as 'plantation' for the purpose of calculating the Annual Accreditation Fee (AAF)	<i>0</i>
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by replanting ⁴	<i>0</i>
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by natural regeneration	<i>385,000 acres</i>
List of main commercial timber and non-timber	<i>red, black, and white spruces</i>

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

³ 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

⁴ 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.

species included in scope of certificate (botanical name and common trade name)	<i>balsam fir, hemlock, northern whitecedar, white and red pines, white and brown ash, American beech, white and yellow birch, red and sugar maples, northern red oak, aspens/poplars</i>
Approximate annual allowable cut (AAC) of commercial timber	<i>m³ or bd ft by species Spruces: 73,000 Fir: 23,000 Pines: 11,000 Hemlock: 10,000 Cedar: 27,000 Tolerant HW: 96,000 Intolerant HW: 28,000 These are based on species share in BPL's 1999 inventory. Preliminary modeling using Woodstock suggests much larger AAC for softwoods other than cedar (which becomes much lower), slightly lower for TH, significantly lower for IH.</i>
Approximate annual commercial production of non-timber forest products included in the scope of the certificate, by product type	<i>Unknown, but relatively minor</i>
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.)	<i>Sawlogs, veneer, roundwood, pulpwood, chips, fir tips</i>

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

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

Volume

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 an entity engaged in public lands management in the State of Maine, management of the forestlands is subject to an array of local, state and federal guidelines and regulations. At the federal level, the principal regulations of greatest relevance to forest managers in the State of Maine include the following statutes:

- Endangered Species Act
- Clean Water Act
- Forest Resources Conservation and Shortage Relief Act
- National Resource Protection Act
- National Environmental Protection Act
- National Wild and Scenic River Act
- Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970
- Archeological and Historic Preservation Act
- National Historic Preservation Act
- Native American Grave Protection and Repatriation Act
- Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965
- Americans with Disabilities Act
- Rehabilitation Act
- Architectural Barriers Act
- U.S. ratified treaties, including CITES and ILO

At the state level, the principal regulations governing public lands forest management include the following:

- Maine Revised Statute Annotated (M.R.S.A.), Title 12
- Maine Forest Practices Act
- Maine Forest Service Rules, Chapters 20, 21
- Maine Land Use Regulation Commission Laws and Statutes, Ch. 10
- Maine Land Use Regulation Commission, Comprehensive Land Use Plan
- Maine Endangered Species Act
- Maine Natural Resources Protection Act
- Shoreland Zoning Act
- Erosion and Sedimentation Control Act
- Protection and Improvement of Water Act
- Maine Human Rights Act
- M.R.S.A. 30, An Act to Implement the Maine Indian Claims Settlement
- M.R.S.A. 26, (Labor, various)
- M.R.S.A. 5, (Administrative Procedures Act)
- M.R.S.A. 27, (History, Culture and Artifacts)

Regulatory Context for State and Local Regulations:

County and local regulations, especially those related to road use and scenic viewsheds, are part of the regulatory landscape and are relevant, but do not typically play a prominent role as compared to state and federal regulations. Notably, a sizable portion of the BPL's forestlands are subject to regulation of the Maine Land Use Regulation Commission (LURC). This Commission was established by the State legislature in 1971 to serve as the planning and zoning authority for the state's townships, plantations, and unorganized areas. The Commission has land use regulatory jurisdiction over these areas because they have no form of local government to administer land use controls, or they have chosen not to administer land use controls at the local level. LURC rules and standards cover a number of areas relevant to the management of the defined land holdings, including policies covering timber harvesting, deer yard management, and erosion control on logging jobs, roads, and water crossings. LURC permits are required for certain activities within certain designated protection zones (i.e., wetlands, fish/wildlife zones, and aquifer protection areas). Other policies/regulations pertinent to BPL are found in LURC's Lake Management Program, amended 1990, and Rivers with Special Protection Plan. LURC standards and regulations for timber harvesting have been separate and distinct from the Maine DEP's regulations, but the Maine Forest Service recently has harmonized statewide standards for timber harvesting in shoreland areas and modification of stream crossings (Maine Forest Service Statutes, Chapter 21).

Maine also has a set of forest practice regulations, promulgated and administered by the Maine Forest Service. These regulations require that the Forest Service be notified of all commercial timber harvests, and that areas and volumes harvested be reported annually. All clearcuts over 5 acres require separation zones; clearcuts over 20 acres must have a silvicultural justification on file; clearcuts over 75 acres require prior review by the Forest Service and more detailed management plans. New rules, Chapter 23, relate to liquidation harvesting, but exempt parties that have undergone third-party certification.

Aside from the state forest practice regulations, the overriding and most influencing body of regulations governing management of the defined lands within BPL is the federal Endangered Species Act. Of particular significance are listings under the federal Endangered Species Act, such as the golden eagle, various species of anadromous salmonids, and, most recently, the Canada Lynx. Under both the state Forest Practices Regulations and the federal Endangered Species Act, there is a focus on long-term management.

1.2.1 Environmental Context

About 90 percent of Maine's total land area is forested (17.7 million acres or 7.2 million ha), and 95 percent of this area (16.9 million acres/6.8 million ha) is considered productive forestland. In addition to being the most heavily forested state, Maine has the highest percentage of forestlands in private ownership at 95 percent. Small, non-industrial private

forest landowners manage 37 percent of the productive land, mostly in the southern and central portions of the state, whereas large private forest landowners manage about 59 percent, mainly in the north and northeast regions of the state. State and county governments own approximately 4 percent of the productive forestland.

1.2.2 Socioeconomic Context

Maine's generally poor soil, short growing season, and remoteness from industrial and commercial centers have long staved off development and population growth, leaving the landscape of the state, and its economy, dominated by agriculture and forestry. Maine's agricultural outputs include poultry, eggs, dairy products, cattle, wild blueberries, apples, and maple sugar. Commercial fishing, once a mainstay of the state's economy, still maintains an important presence. Aquifers and springs in Western Maine are a major source of bottled water, a growing and controversial industry. Maine's industrial outputs consist chiefly of paper, lumber and wood products, electronic equipment, leather products, food products, textiles, and bio-technology. Naval shipbuilding and construction remain key as well. Manufacturing is still the largest sector in the state's economy. Maine is a leading producer of paper and wood products, which are the most valuable of all manufactured commodities in the state.

Tourism and outdoor recreation play a major and increasingly important role in Maine's economy, probably supporting more jobs in the state than any other industry. Picturesque coastal and island resorts and the promise of tranquil outdoor life hold a strong appeal for tourists, recreational and seasonal visitors, and, increasingly, retirees. The state is a popular destination for sport hunting (particularly deer, moose and bear), sport fishing, snowmobiling, skiing, boating, camping and hiking, among other activities.

The population of Maine is just over 1.3 million people. Ninety-seven percent of the population is white; American Indians comprise only 0.6 percent. Nevertheless, there are five Indian Tribes in Maine: Passamaquoddy, Penobscot, Micmac, Maliseet, and Abenaki. In 1980, President Carter signed the Maine Indian Land Claims Settlement Act, which acknowledged that Congress never ratified treaties with Maine Indians. As a result of the Act, Penobscots and Passamaquoddies gave up claims to millions of acres of land in exchange for a \$27 million trust fund and \$51 million to buy 300,000 acres of land. The Act also established the Houlton Band of the Maliseets as a federally recognized tribe, and it received \$900,000 to buy 5,000 acres of land. Micmacs were left out of the Settlement Act, but in 1991, Micmacs received federal recognition and \$900,000 to buy land. The Abenaki Tribe still is not recognized by the federal government. The Passamaquoddy and Penobscot Tribes are a presence in the management of forest lands in the state, and the Bureau of Parks and Lands often engages in cooperative projects involving access roads and bridges, as well as protecting special sites of importance to Tribes and providing specialty items from the forest such as brown ash, used for basket-making.

1.3 Forest Management Enterprise

The Bureau of Parks and Lands is an agency within the Department of Conservation. In addition to its responsibilities for the management of State Parks, Historic Sites, the Allagash Wilderness Waterway, the Penobscot River Corridor, Boating Facilities, and the Snowmobile and ATV Programs, the Bureau is responsible for the management of approximately 568,692 acres of Public Reserved Lands, 4,043 acres of Non-reserved Lands, 51,314 acres of conservation easements, 2,300,000 acres of the State's marine and freshwater Submerged Lands, and 1,325 publicly owned coastal islands (Report to State Legislature 2005).

This certification assessment evaluated State of Maine's Public Reserved and Non-reserved forestlands, totaling 573,000 acres, 390,000 of which are "regulated," or managed for a sustainable harvest (T. Charles, BPL, 17 November 2006). These BPL-managed state forestlands occur in relatively small widely scattered parcels distributed into 33 consolidated units, ranging in size from 500 to 43,000 acres, and 136 scattered parcels ranging in size from 100 to 1000 acres. The largest blocks (e.g., Bigelow Preserve, Nahmakanta, Duck Lake), for example, only encompass 1-2 townships (Note: A typical township in Maine is approximately 36 square miles in size).

1.3.1 Land Use

Relative to pre-settlement conditions, the forests of Maine, including the BPL lands, have experienced a systematic reduction of white pine, red spruce, and yellow birch. The entire region was harvested during the 19th century with exploitation focused first on white pine, followed by red spruce and then sawlog quality hardwoods. In contrast to the drier, harsher forest sites of the western U.S., the forests of Maine have remained well stocked despite this extensive harvesting. The species composition, however, has been substantially simplified, and many stands are comprised of pole-sized trees. The smaller diameter stand structures have fostered, and in turn have been perpetuated by the pulp and paper industry, which, beginning in the 1890s, has become the dominant landowner in Maine. Reflecting the long history of extensive timbering, there are very few old-growth stands remaining in the region.

Much of the land managed by BPL has been in public ownership for many decades, however, and managed for products other than pulp, so stands of high quality, large-diameter trees are common. Stocking levels for BPL lands are approximately 30 percent more than the average for all of Maine's timberland as reported by the U.S. Forest Service in 1995. Thus, it was no surprise that the Maine Forest Biodiversity Project looked to state lands for ecological reserves containing representative samples of forested natural communities.

Ecological Reserves are designated areas containing representative native ecosystem types managed as special protection areas. These areas serve as benchmarks to measure changes in both managed and unmanaged ecosystems, to provide habitat unlikely to occur where active management occurs, and to serve as sites for scientific research, monitoring, and education. The Director of BPL is authorized to designate Ecological Reserves on Bureau-managed lands, and to conduct a monitoring program for those reserves. In 2001, 13 areas

comprising 68,944 acres of Public Reserved Land were designated for this purpose, which is within the legislative caps of 6% of timber-operable acres and 15% of the total ownership. In March 2002, the Bureau accepted donations of two parcels deeded as Ecological Reserves, Big Spencer Mountain (4,244 acres) and Mount Abraham (4,033 acres). In December 2003, the Bureau accepted another reserve parcel, the St. John Ponds (3,895 acres) as part of the Seboomook Lake acquisition. Deeded reserve acres do not count toward the legislatively set acreage limit for ecological reserves. The Bureau's Ecological Reserve inventory currently stands at 81,146 acres (Report to State Legislature 2005).

Aside from commercial timber harvesting within the defined forest area, the other principal land uses and management activities include: (1) outdoor recreation, such as motorized vehicle use, hunting, fishing, boating, mountain biking, horseback riding, hiking and camping; (2) small-scale firewood cutting and collection of non-timber forest products, such as boughs and florals; (3) camplot lease program and other lease arrangements; (4) traditional cultural activities by Americans Indians, such as the felling of brown ash trees for basket making; (5) research on various natural resource management issues, such as deer yard habitat management or ecology of furbearers; and (6) leasing stations to commercial guides for baiting bears and hunting.

1.3.2 Land Outside Scope of Certification

The Bureau of Parks and Lands is the steward for State Parks, State Historic Sites, Public Reserved and Non-reserved Land, and Coastal Islands. FSC certification, first awarded in 2002, is directed only at Public Reserved and Non-reserved Lands, which are managed for multiple use and sustained yield of products and services. State Parks are managed primarily for public recreation or conservation purposes, not sustained yield of forest products, and thus have not been part of the certified land base. However, demonstration forest management projects have been initiated on five state parks, sparking discussion about whether these parcels should be added to the land base assessed for certification.

Pursuant to the FSC Policy on Partial Estate Certification, "severe" non-conformances with the FSC Principles and Criteria are not permitted on the non-certified portion of the estate. Per SCS policy, severe non-conformance with the P&C would be triggered by (1) Use of GMO's; (2) Conversion of natural forests to plantation since 1994; or (3) a significant violation of worker or indigenous peoples rights as defined by the Major Failure Indicators for Principles 2,3,4 in the SCS Generic Interim Standard. These severe non-conformances do not occur on State Parks.

1.4 Management Plan

The Bureau has a three-tiered management plan. The umbrella document is the Integrated Resource Policy, which describes the agency's land base, authority for management, goals and objectives, and policies for management. The next tier comprises management plans for Sustainable Harvest Units, which are now defined roughly along the lines of 14

biophysical regions in the state. Unit plans are developed utilizing technical expertise at the State and Bureau level, and involving the general public in the plan development process. For each plan, Public Advisory Committees are established representing local, regional, and statewide interests. These committees serve as forums for discussion of draft plans. Public meetings are also held, providing interested parties an opportunity to comment on draft plans. After consideration of these comments, the Bureau then submits to the Commissioner of the Department of Conservation, upon recommendation by its Director, a final plan for adoption. The third tier of planning produces detailed compartment descriptions and prescriptions for harvesting.

1.4.1 Management Objectives

The BPL's management is guided by their Integrated Resource Policy (IRP), first developed in 1985 and substantially revised in 2000. The 2000 document specifies the following objectives:

- Protect the public investment in the Bureau's natural and cultural resources, facilities, and infrastructure
- Offer opportunities for multiple uses when compatible with the protection and wise use of the resource;
- Manage renewable natural resources to ensure sustainability;
- Acquire and develop new resources that complement current holdings;
- Provide technical and financial assistance to our public and private partners to enhance the public benefits of the Bureau's programs;
- Offer recreational and education opportunities for all people;
- Ensure a high level of safety to minimize risks to people who work at or use lands and facilities managed by the Bureau;
- Achieve high levels of competence and job satisfaction among Bureau employees; and
- Earn and maintain the trust, confidence, and respect of our customers, partners, and fellow citizens of Maine.

1.4.2 Forest Composition

The BPL lands are located in the transition zone between the northern hardwood region, which is dominated by beech, birch, and maple, and the boreal spruce-fir forest. This transition zone, called by some the Acadian Forest, is rich in species diversity and micro-site variation. Boreal species, such as balsam fir, white and black spruce, tamarack, and white birch, tend to be at the southern end of their range in this area, while species such as red spruce, hemlock, and white and red pine tend to be at the northern end of their ranges. The area in northern Maine west of the Allagash River and extending to the top of Maine is dominated by purer spruce-fir types with hardwoods and mixed forest types prevalent on better-drained sites. Indicative of the transition zone in which the property lies, however, most all townships will contain stands in the full continuum from softwoods to mixed types and hardwoods.

1.4.3 Silvicultural Systems

In general, the Bureau's silvicultural systems appropriately emphasize multi-age structures, including shelterwood harvests with reserves. Natural regeneration, which is usually dependable and abundant, is used exclusively; no planting or direct seeding is done. Single-aged systems are dominated by the shelterwood method; essentially no seed tree or clearcutting has been conducted in recent harvests, though some older (ca. 1980s) harvests were of this nature. From 2002-2006 inclusive, the Bureau reported only 69 acres of clearcuts, 0.13% of their total area harvested during this period.

The timber management program seeks to manage for diversity within compartments and across the landscape. In doing so, managers attempt to manage stands according to optimum site conditions and follow a six-step policy for diversity: (1) plan for diversity over a wide area; (2) manage for a diversity of stand sizes and distribution; (3) retain den trees and snags; (4) retain primary forest and old-growth; (5) seed herbaceous species where soil has been disturbed, using native species where feasible; and (6) use whole-tree harvesting with caution.

1.4.4 Management Systems

As an agency of the State of Maine, Bureau of Parks and Lands maintains its primary offices in Augusta, the State Capital. Offices of the Director, Deputy Director, Operations Director, Planners, Chief of Silviculture, Wildlife Biologist, GIS Manager, and others may be found here. Likewise, cooperating personnel from other state agencies are housed in the same complex: Maine Forest Service, Maine Natural Areas Program, Land Use Regulatory Commission, and others. Offices of the Inland Fisheries and Wildlife Department are close by.

Lands managed for sustainable harvest by BPL occur in all biophysical regions of the state, but organizationally they are divided among three Regions: North, East, and West. Within each region, land units are grouped into Districts. Usually, foresters and forest technicians work together within Districts, but some regions move forest managers from district to district to encourage familiarity with regional variation in forest conditions. Each region has a Regional Manager, a person with primary responsibility for land management decisions, interactions with the public, budget development, and staff supervision.

Contractors may be hired for a variety of purposes, but the most common use of contracted services is for timber harvest. The majority of timber sales are put out to competitive bid, following rules and procedures governing the sale of state property and purchase of services. Most timber is sold as stumpage. Under this system, the contractor agrees to pay the Bureau a bid price per unit for each type of forest product harvested. A lesser volume of timber is sold using contracts for logging services. Under this system, the Bureau pays the contractor to harvest timber and deliver it to specified mills; these mills then pay the Bureau directly for these products. In 2005 no timber was harvested under contracts for logging services.

Once the timber contracts are awarded, Bureau foresters and forest technicians work closely with contractors to ensure contract compliance and achievement of timber management objectives. Bureau staff closely supervise each harvest by marking individual trees for removal or by providing loggers with strict harvesting criteria. These criteria specify which trees are to be harvested. All harvest operations are inspected by Bureau staff on a weekly basis, or more often when individual situations warrant.

1.4.5 Monitoring System

Compartments are examined on a 15-year cycle to identify timber and wildlife resources and recreational opportunities. Forest inventory data are collected continuously as compartments are evaluated for management, but the frequency of such visits is such that the entire enterprise is examined within a 15-year period. Data from these inventories are used to calculate volume, growth, and age-class distributions, and to identify special features such as wetlands, historic sites, and specialized wildlife habitats.

A Memorandum of Understanding has been developed with the Maine Natural Areas Program to collect baseline data for the Bureau's Ecological Reserve inventory. These surveys are being conducted in accordance with established monitoring guidelines. This ongoing effort will provide information necessary for measuring ecological changes on reserves over time.

Numerous monitoring efforts are employed to assess compliance with various regulations that affect forest harvesting. Foresters and forest technicians monitor harvesting contractors frequently to check conformance with standards such as BMPs for soil and water protection; protecting special features for natural and cultural resources; abiding by marked property boundaries, etc. Some of the large contractors maintain their own monitoring systems as well.

Other monitoring efforts gauge use of roads, campgrounds, hiking trails, boat landings, snowmobile trails, etc., by outdoor recreation participants.

1.4.6 Estimate of Maximum Sustainable Yield

The Bureau has always calculated Sustainable Harvest Level (SHL) based on an area-control model, but the most recent inventory data, 1999-2000, has made possible a more sophisticated application. SHLs now exist for each of 13 sustainable harvest units (SHUs), not just three regions as in the past. If the harvest were exactly at the planned level, the Bureau would be harvesting 16,320 acres per year, equal to 1.9% of the regulated area, or an effective cutting cycle of 51.7 years. At this planned area level, the Bureau would be harvesting 111,745 cords per year (0.32 cords per regulated acre), equal to 1.7% of the estimated standing inventory. Assuming no growth, it would thus take the Bureau 59 years to harvest all current standing inventories, a very conservative figure in comparison to other landowners.

The area-control estimates begin by allocating a certain percentage of each of 8 major forest types to either single- or multi-aged silvicultural systems. This was done by field foresters at the SHU level. Once the silvicultural system is assigned, rotations (for single-aged stands) or cutting cycles (for multi-aged stands) are specified by type; these are then divided into the total type areas to obtain the acreage to treat annually in each type, by SHU. Single-aged stands typically receive two thinnings and two regeneration cuts during the rotation (a shelterwood system); rotations are typically 60 years for aspen and fire types, and range from 100-150 for others. Cutting cycles for multi-aged stands are invariably planned to be 20 years, although much latitude exists in practice to depart from these values.

The Bureau is now moving toward a more sophisticated volume-based system of estimating the SHY that incorporates estimated growth for major forest types. At the time of the certification assessment, a contractor, using the Woodstock Model for growth and harvest projections, had produced some first estimates of the SHL, which provided further confirmation that actual harvest levels are still well below the allowable cut.

1.4.7 Estimated, Current and Projected Production

For 2005, the Bureau reported to the State Legislature that harvest prescriptions resulted in a total of 80,776 cords harvested from 7,437 acres. In concert with the Bureau's contractors, wood was marketed to more than 50 mills in the state. The 2005 harvest was 10,593 cords less than reported the previous year, which had the Bureau's largest annual harvest ever. This harvest represents 72% of the estimated allowable cut of 112,000 cords. Much of the decrease in volume was because Maine had one of its rainiest years on record, causing many harvest operations to be delayed to avoid excessive impact to the land.

The average value per cord harvested in 2005 increased 10% from 2004, however. This increase was due to somewhat higher prices for most sawlog products, with hardwood pulp and aspen prices remaining strong. The harvest volume was 61.5% hardwoods, well above the 47% predicted by the allowable cut model and slightly higher than 2004, as the Bureau continued to remove low quality wood to favor the better trees for the future.

As part of its multiple-use management, the Bureau will continue to emphasize maintaining the harvest volume at a level near the allowable cut, while continuing to practice the highest quality silviculture. In future years the hardwood-to-softwood ratio is likely to be more balanced, which will increase the average revenue per cord. Larger volume, multi-year sales have been initiated recently in an effort to provide stability for contractors, which in turn should increase annual harvest volumes. These contracts have attracted contractors with desired harvesting equipment. In addition, this approach should foster better working relationships and improve efficiency.

1.4.8 Chemical Pesticide Use

Chemical pesticides are not used by the Bureau in silvicultural operations. Small volumes of herbicides may be used for roadside brush control and control of invasive species. No chemicals have been used in recent years that are in violation of the FSC pesticide policy.

2.0 GUIDELINES/STANDARDS EMPLOYED

As the applicant forest property is located in Maine, the certification evaluation that is the subject of this report was conducted against the duly-endorsed Northeast Region of the USA Regional Standard (Version NE Final 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

The field and office assessment was conducted from 13 November through 17 November 2006. Stakeholder consultations continued through 20 December 2006.

3.2 Assessment Team

A five-person team conducted the assessment, which combined aspects of both FSC and SFI audits. For FSC, the assessment served as both the fourth surveillance audit and a re-certification assessment. For SFI, the exercise was conducted as a surveillance audit. Some team members participated in the assessments for both FSC and SFI, while others had more focused roles.

David Capen was the team leader for the FSC reviews, and contributed also to the SFI audit. Mike Ferrucci was the team leader for SFI, but participated also in a portion of the FSC re-certification assessment and annual audit. Mike was present for two days of field and office audits, and participated by telephone in scoring for FSC. Robert Seymour was a member of the initial team that conducted an FSC assessment for Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands; he also has conducted the first three annual FSC audits. His participation on the Assessment Team was only to follow through on conditions and recommendations associated with the initial FSC assessment in 2001 and surveillance audits in 2003, 2004, and 2005. He did not participate in any of the field visits during the 2006 assessment.

Jessica Leahy, a social scientist, was a member of the FSC re-certification team, and also contributed to the SFI audit. She conducted most of the stakeholder interviews. Dan Stepanauskas, a forest management specialist, participated in two days of field audits for FSC re-certification and communicated by telephone for scoring.

David E. Capen is a Research Professor 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, having recently retired from teaching. David is a Certified Wildlife Biologist and a Certified Forester, and has led numerous research projects investigating effects of forest management on wildlife and their habitats.

His recent interests center upon geospatial technologies and their applications for conservation planning. He is Director of the Spatial Analysis Laboratory at the University of Vermont and is an appointed Board Member of Vermont Center for Geographic Information. David has conducted FSC and SFI audits in Massachusetts, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Indiana, and Connecticut.

Robert Seymour is the Curtis Hutchins Professor of Silviculture, in the Department of Forest Ecosystem Science at the University of Maine, where he teaches courses in silviculture, the spruce-fir industrial ecosystem, and forest stand dynamics. His research interests include production silvicultural practices, forest canopy structure, and ecologically based silvicultural systems. He has 25 years of experience in research and management of forests in the Acadian region of northeastern North America. He has authored or coauthored over 50 refereed publications and four book chapters. Prior to assuming the Hutchins Professorship in 1987, Robert worked as the timber management program leader for the Cooperative Forestry Research Unit from 1981-1987. In 1995, along with Mac Hunter, he was named a Conservation Scholar by the Pew Foundation and was awarded a three-year grant to study and write about managing forest biodiversity in the Northeast. He has served on FSC certification evaluation teams for six landowners in North America totaling over 8 million acres. Robert holds a B. S. in forestry from Ohio State University, and a Master of Forestry and Ph. D. in silviculture from the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies.

Michael Ferrucci is the SFI Program Manager for NSF – International Strategic Registrations and is responsible for all aspects of the firm’s SFI Certification programs. Mike has led Sustainable Forest Initiative (SFI) certification and precertification reviews throughout the United States. He has also led joint SFI and Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) certification projects in Wisconsin, Michigan, Maryland, Maine, and Connecticut and a joint scoping or precertification gap-analysis project on tribal lands throughout the United States. He is qualified as a RAB EMS Lead Auditor (ISO 14001 Environmental Management Systems), as an SFI Lead Auditor, as an FSC Team Leader, and as a Tree Farm Group Certification Lead Auditor. Mike has 26 years of forest management experience. His expertise is in sustainable forest management planning; in certification of forests as sustainably managed, in the application of easements for large-scale working forests, and in the ecology, silviculture, and management of mixed species forests, with an emphasis on regeneration and management of native hardwood species. He has also developed expertise in the conservation of forest biodiversity at multiple spatial scales through his involvement in the founding and administration of The Conservation Forestry Network and through his work with the Northern Forest Protection Fund.

Mike has conducted or participated in assessments of forest management operations throughout the United States, with field experience in Maine, New Hampshire, New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, West Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, Georgia, Alabama, Minnesota, Michigan, Wisconsin, Arizona, California, Oregon, and Washington. Mike is a 26-year member of the Society of American Foresters and is active in the Association of Consulting Foresters and the Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island State Implementation Committee (SIC) for the Sustainable Forestry Initiative.

Jessica Leahy is an Assistant Professor in the School of Forest Resources at the University of Maine. She is also a Tourism Fellow at the Maine Center for Tourism Research and Outreach. She has an Honors B.S. degree in Forest Recreation Resources from Oregon State University with a concentration in environmental interpretation, an M.S. degree in Forest Resources from Oregon State University with a minor in environmental and resource economics, and a Ph.D. in Natural Resources Science and Management from the University of Minnesota in the economics, policy, society and management track. Jessica teaches in the Parks, Recreation and Tourism program offering courses in outdoor recreation management, environmental interpretation, and issues and ethics of parks, recreation & tourism. Her research is broadly in the human dimensions of natural resources field and includes studies in: social psychological aspects of family forest landowners (including forest certification), trust in natural resource organizations, social capital and civic engagement in public involvement processes, media effects, and land use change impacts on parks, recreation and tourism.

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

3.3 Assessment Process

3.3.1 Itinerary

The following activities comprised the field and office phase of the joint FSC/SFI assessment:

- 13 November: Audit team convened in Old Town; conducted opening meeting with managers from Augusta, Farmington, Ashland, and Old Town; then individual interviews with field staff and office staff from Eastern Region. Team members present: Capen, Ferrucci, Leahy, Seymour.
- 14 November: Convened at Old Town office for field visits to Namakanta and Seboeis Districts; traveled to Farmington. Team members present: Capen, Ferrucci, Leahy, Stepanauskas.
- 15 November: Convened at Farmington for interviews with field and office staff from Western Region; field visits to Bigelow Preserve, Bald Mountain, and Sandy River Plantation; traveled to Augusta. Team members present: Capen, Leahy, Ferrucci, Stepanauskas.

16 November: Convened at State Office Complex in Augusta for interviews with Deputy Commissioner, Department of Conservation; Director of BPL; planners, and representatives of other agencies. Scoring and report preparation for FSC re-certification. Team members present: Capen, Leahy (Ferrucci, Stepanauskas, and Seymour by telephone).

17 November: Closing meeting in Augusta. Team member present: Capen.

20 November-20 December: Stakeholder contacts and interviews. Team member: Leahy.

3.3.2 Evaluation of Management System

The process by which Scientific Certification Systems evaluated the system employed by Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands in managing Public Reserved and Non-reserved Lands entailed the following components:

- Empanelment of an interdisciplinary team with demonstrated credentials and expertise in forest certification, auditing protocols, forest management, wildlife ecology, and social science, as well as a working knowledge of forest types found in Maine and a general knowledge of Maine state government and the Department of Conservation.
- Review of reports and publications pertinent to state forest lands, the web site for BPL, and many file documents provided by BPL personnel.
- Extensive interviews with a broad cross-section of BPL employees at two of the three regional offices (Old Town and Farmington) and at the Director's Office in Augusta, the state capital.
- Field reconnaissance of a broad array of forest conditions and past and present management activities.

3.3.3 Selection of FMU's to Evaluate

In the FSC context, the Public Reserved and Non-reserved forestlands managed by BPL constitutes the FMU. In the context of BPL management, however, Units refer to Sustainable Harvest Units (SHU), which are large parcels of state forest lands, usually grouped with smaller parcels nearby. Such parcels are grouped roughly along the lines of 14 biophysical regions in the state and considered together for the purpose of management planning.

BPL forest managers are distributed among three Regions, each of which is divided into Districts. Foresters and forest technicians usually work together in a single District. The audit team conducted field visits in two districts of the Eastern Region, Namakanta and Seboeis, and two districts of the Western Region, Flagstaff and Rangeley.

3.3.4 Sites Visited

The following field sites were visited:

14 November:

- Namakanta, Compartment 43; 1859 acres, with 586-acre harvest in progress as part of 5-year contract; numerous resource values, including developed and backcountry recreation, wetlands, visual concerns. Visits to three harvest sites, hiking trails, road construction, campsite construction and management. Also Compartment 31 to inspect new road construction.
- Seboeis, Compartment 6; 414 acres, with 329-acre salvage harvest completed in 2006; special wildlife concerns for deer wintering habitat and raptor nests. One site visit to inspect road close-out and revegetation, residual stand condition, log landings, skid trails, distribution of woody debris, road access across other ownership.
- Seboeis, Compartment 12; 390-acre harvest area completed in 2005; special concerns for nesting bald eagles, scenic values along shoreline of Seboeis Lake. One site visit to inspect roads, trails, regeneration, stocking, buffers along streams and vernal pool protection.

15 November

- Bigelow Preserve, Compartment 210A; 1062 acres with 5-year harvest contract; important balance of recreational, scenic, and ecological values. One site visit to recent harvest site, closed-out until winter; road and trail construction, log landings, controversial harvest of late successional/old growth stands adjacent to ecoreserve; silvicultural prescription designed to maintain late successional characteristics; interviews with New Page logging contractors.
- Bald Mountain, Rangely District; 1932-acre parcel, where a select-bid contract led to winter harvests in 2000-2005 to improve stands that were heavily harvested in mid-1980's before BPL acquired the lands. One site visit to observe leased recreational site, hiking and snowmobile trails, lookout platform on top of mountain, and low-impact management to protect visual and recreational values and deer wintering habitat.
- Sandy River Plantation, Compartment 107, 1000-acre compartment, with 800-acre harvest and 5-year contract.

3.3.5 Stakeholder Consultation

Pursuant to SCS protocols, consultations with key stakeholders were an integral component of the evaluation process. Consultation took place prior to, concurrent with, and following the field evaluation. The following were distinct purposes to the consultations: (1) to solicit input from affected parties as to the strengths and weaknesses of BPL's management, relative to the standard, and the nature of the interaction between the company and the surrounding communities; and (2) 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 previous evaluations, lists of stakeholders provided by BPL, and additional stakeholder contacts from other sources. The list of stakeholders contacted is maintained in the SCS Forest Conservation Program offices. The following types of groups and individuals were determined to be principal stakeholders:

- BPL employees, including headquarters and field
- contractors
- lease holders
- adjacent property owners
- Pertinent Tribal members and or representatives
- Members of the Northeast U.S. FSC Working Group
- 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 BPL forestlands
- Local, State and Federal regulatory agency personnel
- User groups, such as hikers, ATV users, and others

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

A majority of comments from stakeholder interviews were supportive of BPL’s forest management, environmental protection, and efforts to involve the public in planning. There were a number of concerns, however, which are summarized in the tables below.

Economic Concerns

Comment/Concern	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	

Social Concerns

Comment/Concern	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Takes too long to develop and approve plans; BPL needs to learn better methods of polling the public and then distilling comments into planning documents. Plans seem to be a one-time event, with little revision or follow-up. 	Addressed in Major CAR.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that reviews for historic sites are not conducted regularly before harvest prescriptions. 	Comment noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that too much land is being set aside for non-motorized uses. 	Comment noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Downeast Plan has been going nowhere. 	Addressed in Major CAR.

Environmental Concerns

Comment/Concern	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wildlife guidelines are out of date. 	Addressed in Recommendation.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BPL should initiate a specific planning exercise for deer wintering areas, rather than continue with a piecemeal approach driven by compartment prescriptions. 	Comment noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More attention needed for identification and management of LSOG stands. 	Addressed in existing CAR.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BPL did not listen to some concerns about harvest in LSOG stands in Bigelow Preserve. 	Comment noted.

3.3.6 Other Assessment Techniques

No other assessment techniques were deemed necessary. Most of the audit team members are quite familiar with forest practices in Maine, as well as the social and political pressures effecting management of BPL lands. Also, three team members had participated in past certification assessments of BPL’s forest management.

3.4 Total Time Spent on audit

In total, the five members of the audit team and SCS staff spent 27 person days on the assessment.

3.5 Process of Determining Conformance

Consistent with SCS Forest Conservation Program evaluation protocols, for scoring purposes the team collectively assigned weights of relative importance to the Criteria within each of the ten Principles. Scores were assigned to each Criterion at the completion of the field phase and importance-weighted means (average scores) were calculated for each Principle. Scoring takes place on a 100-point scale, using a consensus process amongst all members of the evaluation team. Scores less than 80 points connote performance in which there is discernible non-conformance to the breadth of a Criterion. For any Criterion for which the team assigns a score below 80 points, the team is required to specify one or more Corrective Action Requests (CARs), also known as “conditions.” If the weighted average score of any Principle is less than 80, certification cannot be awarded and, instead, the evaluation team must stipulate one or more Major Corrective Action Requests (Major CARs), also known as “pre-conditions.” The evaluation team also retains the option to specify “discretionary CARs” even when the score for the pertinent Criterion is above 80 points. This may occur when, overall, the Criterion was highly scored but there are issues within the scope of an Criterion where important improvements are, in the judgment of the team, necessary even though these deficiencies are not severe enough to move the score below 80 for the totality of the Criterion. For certification to be awarded, the importance-weighted average score for each of the 10 FSC Principles must be 80 points or higher.

Interpretations of Preconditions (Major CARs), CARs and Recommendations

Preconditions/Major CARs: These are corrective actions that must be resolved or closed out

prior to award of the certificate. These arise when the importance-weighted average score for a Principle is less than 80 points or where there is observed non-compliance with a “pre-emptive” indicator (e.g., use of GMOs is a “fatal flaw” that precludes award of certification regardless of the strength of the overall management program).

CARs: Corrective actions must be closed out within a specified time period of award of the certificate. Certification is contingent on the certified operations response to the CAR within the stipulated time frame.

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-compliance.

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 & Observations Relative to the Standard	CAR/REC #s
P1: FSC Commitment and Legal Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BPL maintains positive working relationships with outside regulatory agencies, and has an excellent record for compliance with laws and regulations governing timber management. • Property boundaries are well marked; illegal harvesting on BPL lands appears to be negligible. • BPL has an excellent payment record regarding its revenue sharing responsibilities with unorganized town, plantations and other municipal groups. • BPL's operations appear to be in compliance with all binding international treaties and conventions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managers are indecisive about rationale for withholding State Park lands where demonstration forest management is being established from certification assessment. One argument is that these are one-time harvests, but there also was acknowledgement that the harvests are designed to illustrate sustainable forest management and that future harvests will follow. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
P2: Tenure & Use Rights & Responsibilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State-owned forestland managed by BPL is clearly held and managed for the citizens of Maine. Ownership and management authorities are well established by statutes and case law. • The state and federal legal framework provides effective mechanisms for resolving disputes over tenure rights. • The Bureau, through its Integrated Resource Policies, has a thorough process for making land-use allocations that involves substantial public input. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As an agency of state government, land-use allocations are too often influenced by political pressure exerted by individual lawmakers and numerous NGOs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None

<p>P3: Indigenous Peoples' Rights</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Bureau has a policy to identify and assess all historical and cultural resources on its lands, and a Historic Sites Specialist, who coordinates this work. • It is Bureau policy to safeguard resources of cultural importance to American Indians. • BPL cooperates with Tribes via projects such as road maintenance and bridge building, and regularly invites tribal representatives to participate on Advisory Committees. • BPL issues permits for brown ash and conducts regular conversations with the Maine Indian Basketmakers Alliance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Despite efforts to identify resources important to members of Maine's Indian Tribes and to involve tribal representatives on Advisory Committees, there is little active involvement of tribal members. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
<p>P4: Community Relations & Workers' Rights</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Salaries and benefits, subject to state guidelines, are in line with regional norms. Office facilities and working environments are better than average. • Health and safety of workers is a high priority. • Employee rights to organize are assured by State Employees Union. • The professional staff reflects favorable age-class diversity in light of anticipated retirements. • BPL, though subject to state procurement policies, has an excellent record of providing opportunities for a variety of local contractors, large and small. • In 2005, more than 50 mills in Maine received products harvested on BPL lands. • BPL is staffed by Maine residents who are active members of their local communities. • The Bureau and its staff participate in the Cooperative Forestry Research Unit at the University of Maine. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workers in BPL do not reflect a desirable component of gender or cultural diversity. • Well qualified and experienced foresters often work for years as forest technicians. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendation 2006.1

<p>P5: Benefits from the Forest</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a state agency, BPL obviously has a long-term perspective for forest management. Silvicultural practices employed by BPL are widely regarded as exemplary, encourage natural diversity at different scales, and have produced forests that are highly productive. • BPL reinvests regularly in roads, bridges, office facilities, vehicles, and other equipment, all of which affect the local economy. • BPL uses very little chemical herbicides or pesticides and has a stated goal of being a leader in minimizing reliance on pesticides. • BPL harvests principally during the winter with snow cover and frozen soil, greatly minimizing site and soil impacts. Harvesting contracts specify standards for minimizing damage to soils and the residual stands, and foresters closely monitor and evaluate contractors. • Biomass harvesting is rare, and woody debris is abundant and usually well distributed on site. • Growth and yield modeling is sufficient to confirm that annual harvest levels are considerably below what is available for harvest. Better models are needed, however, and are under development. • Field foresters have been trained in how to recognize vernal pools and other sensitive wildlife features. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The agency is funded almost entirely from timber sale revenues, but not encouraged to accumulate large surplus revenues to buffer periods of poor market conditions. This forces management to be weighted toward short-term cash management. • There are many demands for services that are independent of timber sales and often conflict with forest management. The forest operation would benefit from more rigorous assessment of the full range of benefits, and additional funding mechanisms should be considered to support such services. • BPL lacks a sophisticated modeling methodology to calculate allowable harvest, although the agency has been working with contractors and in-house personnel to improve this capacity. • Likewise, the Bureau cannot yet model the diversity of forest types and ages across Sustainable Harvest Units, but progress is being made toward this goal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CAR 2006.2
--	---	---	---

<p>P6: Environmental Impact</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Integrated Resource Plan sets policy for assessment of environmental impacts. Such assessments begin at the level of SHU planning and carry into harvest prescriptions for compartments. Soil, water, rare species, wildlife habitat, and special cultural sites are routinely addressed in pre-harvest evaluations. • BPL convenes a Silvicultural Advisory Committee annually to review past, current, and future conditions of the forest and harvest prescriptions. The committee includes representatives of conservation organizations, as well as professional foresters. • BPL participates in the Cooperative Forest Research Unit (CFRU) and with Manomet research ecologists, all of which adds to their understanding of historical and current conditions of the forest. • BPL foresters regularly consult with the MNAP to determine the location of rare communities, plants, and animals before harvesting. On-site review by IFWD biologist in residence with BPL is standard. Deer wintering areas are identified and managed in cooperation with IFWD. • Field inspections found a general awareness of the importance of CWD, den trees, and snags, as well as routine conformance to guidelines for retention of these elements. • Maine BPL participated in the Maine Forest Biodiversity Project, a process for identifying and protecting a system of representative reserves, which led to a system of ecological reserves on BPL lands, most of which are more than 1000 acres in size. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Bureau cannot yet model the diversity of forest types and ages across Sustainable Harvest Units, but progress is being made toward this goal. • Guidelines for wildlife habitat management are out of date. BPL relies heavily on reviews by the IFWD wildlife biologist in residence, but should invest in more in-house capability as well. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
--	--	--	---

<p>P7: Management Plan</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Written management plans are presented at three levels: (1) The IRP, which presents goals, objectives, mandates, and policies for Public Reserved and Non-reserved Lands, State Parks, and State Historic Sites; (2) Sustainable Harvest Unit plans, which are general aligned with 14 biophysical regions in the state and present specific allocations of lands for different uses and general management objectives; and (3) compartment prescriptions, which are prepared in advance of planned harvest operations. In total, these plans are quite comprehensive. • Compartment prescriptions examined by the audit team illustrate consistency in addressing areas of special concern. Such areas are delineated on maps attached to the plans and usually marked in the field when excluded from harvest operations. Cultural sites are often described in HSU Plans and in more detail in Compartment prescriptions, when their locations are known. Data describing many of these sites are maintained in a confidential database and released only when management focuses on a specific site. • The Bureau has a web page where plans can be found as well as minutes of public meetings and other useful information. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a significant backlog in planning for Sustainable Harvest Units. The goal for SHU plans is to revise at 10-year intervals, but the agency has fallen far behind schedule in completing plan revisions. To allow more manageable conformance, BPL plans to extend the period for plan revision to 15 years, with reviews at 5-year intervals. • Plans do not adequately present data on growth, yield, stocking, and regeneration. Progress is being made, but results are not yet sufficient 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendation 2006.1 • Major CAR 2006.1 Closed- March 14, 2007 • CAR 2006.3
-----------------------------------	---	--	---

<p>P8: Monitoring & Assessment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Seboomook Unit Management Plan is the newest of the revised HSU plans and a model for other plans in progress. This plan includes an outline for “implementing, accomplishing, and tracking the management recommendations put forth in the Plan.” This process is to be developed within 2 years of the plan adoptions and shall include monitoring of Recreation, Wildlife, Ecological Reserves, and Timber Management. • BPL maintains a thorough stand inventory system that is updated on 10-year intervals. Habitat conditions for wildlife are assessed as part of the inventory (e.g., vernal pools, seeps, deer wintering habitat, locations of raptor nests). MNAP assists in inventory of natural communities. • Two pilot assessments for timber sale cost analysis are in progress and one has been completed. • Members of the Silvicultural Advisory Committee meet annually and address ecological and social aspects of management. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The IRP and Seboomook Plan set goals for monitoring that will require a ramped-up effort to achieve. It is not clear that funding or personnel are available to reach these goals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
---	---	--	---

<p>P9: Maintenance of High Conservation Value Forest</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a participant in the Maine Forest Biodiversity Project, the Bureau conducted a thorough assessment of state lands to delineate exemplary examples of forest communities, with emphasis on late successional and old-growth forests. The resulting system of Ecological Reserves is a significant component of a comprehensive review of HCVF. • Important habitat areas for selected wildlife species were mapped and continue to be mapped, independent of an HCVF assessment. • MNAP continues to survey BPL lands for significant natural communities and rare species. • The IRP, SHU plans, and compartment prescriptions all prescribe appropriate protection measures for HCVF. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial FSC certification for BPL was conducted under interim standards. Final standards for Northeast U.S. include more definitive requirements for identification and assessment of HCVF. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CAR 2006.4
---	--	---	---

4.2 Major Correction Action Requests (Pre-conditions)

Pre-conditions are Major Corrective Action Requests (CARs) 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-condition was placed on Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands as a follow-up to the 2004 annual audit (CAR 2004.1), which has not been satisfactorily closed (See 4.3, below).

<p>Background/Justification: As a result of earlier annual audits, CAR 2004.1 was still open at the time of this re-certification assessment. The CAR read as follows: “For the remaining term of this certificate, the BPL is bound by their strategy (detailed in the 2004 audit report and reproduced below) to complete management plans, with emphasis on lands which have no plan in place. The Bureau agrees that no timber management activities will occur on newly acquired lands requiring “Full Plans” (viz., Kennebec Highlands, Seboomook) until those plans have been approved. Progress will be closely scrutinized at future annual audits.”</p> <p>Progress on the new and revised Unit plans mentioned above has not conformed to the schedule proposed in 2004. Abundant evidence was submitted to demonstrate that planners have been reassigned to high priority projects that were not anticipated in 2004, but that completion of these plans will once again become the highest priority, and that additional planning staff will be placed on contract to assist with the efforts.</p> <p>Because CAR 2004.1 was not fulfilled, it will be replaced with Major CAR 2006.1.</p>	
<p>Major CAR 2006.1</p>	<p>As a precondition to re-certification, the BPL must demonstrate final approval of Unit plans for Seboomook and Down East; renewed efforts on the Flagstaff and Northern Aroostook plans that will allow their completion and approval by 15 June 2007 and sufficient progress on the Kennebec Highlands plan to conform to the intended approval date of 15 September 2007. Evidence must be submitted to Scientific Certification Systems that confirms satisfactory progress toward achieving these benchmarks</p>
<p>Deadline</p>	<p>Before 15 March 2007</p>
<p>Reference</p>	<p>FSC Criterion 7.2</p>
<p>Company Action/Auditor Comments</p>	
<p>BPL Response: On March 14, 2007, prior to award of re-certification, the BPL submitted to SCS the following status update on the five plans:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seboomook - plan has been completed and signed. ▪ Downeast - plan has been completed and signed. ▪ Flagstaff - first draft completed and first Advisory Committee meeting held (2/27). Comment period for first draft ends 3/15. ▪ Northern Aroostook - first draft completed and first Advisory Committee meeting held (3/9). ▪ Kennebec Highlands - writing has been contracted out to Planning Decisions, a 	

The first four plans are available on the BPL website:
<http://www.maine.gov/doc/parks/index.html>

Auditor Comments: The status update provided by the BPL demonstrates that they are making earnest progress in meeting the stipulated approval dates for the Flagstaff, Northern Aroostook, and Kennebec Highlands plans.

Status: Major CAR 2006.1 **CLOSED** as of March 14, 2007

4.3 Status of Extant Conditions

As a result of the assessment, the team has recommended the following actions on outstanding Corrective Action Requests:

1. Close out Condition A.1-2001.1, Improved wood supply analysis.
2. Close out Condition A.1-2001.2, Balanced harvest by species and forest types.
3. Close out CAR 2004.1. Issue Major CAR 2006.1, Currency of management plans for Sustainable Harvest Units.
4. Close out Condition B.1-2001.8. Issue CAR 2006.2, Forest community structure and composition.
5. Continue CAR 2004.2 (Condition C.1-2001.10) Financial projections and analysis.
6. Close out CAR 2004.3, Pre-harvest review of stands with LSOG potential.

Condition A.1-2001.1. Improved wood supply analysis.

Within three years of the award of the certification certificate, the BP&L must have completed a comprehensive wood supply analysis of their timberlands, using a computer simulation approach acceptable to the team. This analysis should, at minimum, include the following:

1. A unique SHL by important species groups (e.g., spruce, fir, cedar, pine-hemlock, tolerant northern hardwood, intolerant hardwood) for each SHU, as proposed by the Bureau's IRP;
2. Forest composition and structure goals based on biodiversity as well as forest productivity issues;
3. Spatially explicit information for at least 5, preferably 10 years, (i.e., it should be mapped using model-based strata and knowledge from prior compartment surveys); and
4. Refined growth and yield assumptions for each of the Bureau's important silvicultural systems; these should be broken down by biologically based (not mensurationally based) strata, and would ideally be derived as much as possible from the Bureau's own inventory data.

Company Action/Auditor Observation, 2005:
Auditor's Assessment: This condition was due this year, but as of September 2005, work has not yet begun. BPL staff members have met with selected outside advisors to refine their strategy and a decision has been reached to contract this work with relatively short deadlines. A request for proposals was being drafted as this report was written, with the deadline for selection of a contractor by January, 2006.
Although the BPL has increased their harvest rates and income significantly since the original audit in 2001, 2004-05 harvest levels (Appendix A) remain below the calculated allowable cut using a simple area regulation strategy that was deemed conservative in the original audit report. We are therefore not concerned about the original deadline not being met, and hereby extend the deadline of condition until the 2006 surveillance audit.
Status Fall 2005:
Open; extended until 2006 surveillance audit.
Company Action/Auditor's Observation, 2006:
BPL's Response: Attached is the RFP for accomplishing this using an outside contractor. The Bureau has contracted with L.E. (Todd) Caldwell Company, and the RFP language has become part of the contract language. Todd is working on this currently, and though the Bureau should have the tools in place by early in 2007, it will be into the summer before all SHUs can be fully modeled and then critiqued/applied by staff (and probably longer for the application.)
Audit Team's Assessment: Although progress on this condition has proceeded slower than requested, growth and yield data presented in 2006 supported earlier observations that annual harvest volume is still far below annual growth. There is clear momentum by BPL to develop more sophisticated modeling. The team is confident that BPL will continue to pursue the specific objectives of the initial conditions and present results of their analyses during annual audits.
Status Fall 2006: Closed.

Condition A.1-2001.2: Balanced harvest by species and forest types - performance.
Within three years of the award of this certificate, the BP&L must have developed specific regional-level strategies to ensure that harvests are not preferentially removing high-value species and that they are not unduly targeted on high-value forest types or prescriptions.
Company Action/Auditor Observation, 2005:
Audit Team Assessment: Requires attainment of Condition 2001.1; see above.
Status at Fall 2005:
Open; extended until 2006 surveillance audit
Company Action/Auditor Observation, 2006:
Auditor's Assessment: Although related to making advances in modeling wood supply, progress has been made on this condition independent of the wood supply analysis. Tom Charles, Chief of Silviculture, has developed tables of existing species-diameter distributions for each region and suggested targets for future distributions. Targets are being reviewed by regional staff. As with the previous conditions, the audit team believes that future audits will continue to see refinements with this analysis.
Status Fall 2006: Closed.

CAR 2004.1. Currency of management plans for Sustainable Harvest Units
For the remaining term of this certificate, the BPL is bound by their strategy (detailed in the 2004 audit report) to complete management plans, with emphasis on lands which have no plan in place. The Bureau agrees that no timber management activities will occur on newly acquired lands requiring “Full Plans” (viz., Kennebec Highlands, Seboomook) until those plans have been approved. Progress will be closely scrutinized at future annual audits.
Company Action/Auditor Observation, 2005:
Auditor’s Assessment: BPL is making slow but satisfactory progress in their planning efforts. Small lots without plans have all been reviewed and MNAP is informed as needed prior to any harvest activity. No harvest activity is planned for any new acquisitions until plans are in place, and BPL is deemed to be in compliance with CAR 2004.1.
Status at Fall 2005:
Open; extended until 2006 surveillance audit.
Status Fall 2006: Replaced with Major CAR 2006.1

Condition B.1-2001.8 –Forest Community Structure and Composition:
Within four years of certification, goals and objectives for the age class distribution of each stand type, and the forest as a whole, should be established for each sustainable harvest unit. Goals and objectives should be developed in response to information obtained as part of Condition B.1.-2001.7 and based on a sound model of the natural distribution of stand types and age classes in each sustainable harvest unit. The MNAP should be given an opportunity to assist in establishing such goals and objectives. At a minimum, evidence must be provided that they were offered the opportunity to participate in the development of the goals and objectives and then given an opportunity to comment on draft policies. If the MNAP declines to participate in addressing this condition, evidence must be provided that at least one qualified community ecologist has peer-reviewed the goals and objectives developed by the BP&L.
Company Action/Auditor Observation, 2005:
Auditor’s Assessment: No progress was made on this condition, as it is closely linked with the analysis mandated by Condition 2001.1.
Status Fall 2005:
Open; one year remaining.
Company Action/Auditor Observation, 2006:
Auditor’s Assessment: Progress was made in 2006, related to analyses and goals for balanced harvest distributions (above). The audit team believes this is an activity that will continue to be developed and presented in future audits.
Status Fall 2006: Closed. Replaced with CAR 2006.2

CAR 2004.2, Financial Projections and Analysis:
--

By the 2006 surveillance audit BPL will have selected one sale from each Region for a detailed financial audit, including at least one long-term sale. Summaries will be available to FSC auditors. Depending on results of the financial audits, additional samples may be necessary.

Company Action/Auditor Observation, 2005:

BPL Response: The North had initiated, prior to the 2005 audit, tracking of a sale at Deboullie, this being the first portion of a long-term sale. The East has completed tracking of the Seboeis sale and will have the analysis done prior to the 2006 audit. The West has begun tracking a long term sale on which the first compartment is at Bigelow.

Auditor's Assessment: Satisfactory progress; monitoring has begun but data are too premature to summarize.

Status at Fall 2005: Open

Company Action/Auditor Observation, 2006

BPL Response: Compiling and analysis has been done for the completed harvest on Seboeis Compartments 10 and 12, an operation producing 4,500 cords and just under \$130,000. The North is tracking a long-term sale which started with Deboullie C-9, and little the but right-of-way has been cut there so far. The West is working with another long-term sale which started at Bigelow C-10A. About 1/3 of this initial tract, and perhaps 10% of overall sale volume, has been harvested to date.

Audit Team Assessment: The report submitted for the Sebois compartments is adequate. Because the other two sales selected for these analyses are 5-year sales, this requirement will carry through to future annual audits.

Status Fall 2006: Open; continued until 2008 or until long-term sales are complete.

CAR 2004.3 – Preharvest review of stands with LSOG potential

By six months after the finalization of this report, the Bureau will implement the following: on all timber sales where the compartment exam or field observations by staff suggest high value as late-successional forest and/or the strong presence of an old-growth component, MNAP specialists will be consulted during the prescription development process. Prior to adoption of the policy, the BPL will define specifically what is meant by “high value late-successional forest” and “strong presence of an old-growth component” with input from MNAP and BPL’s silvicultural advisory committee. The BPL will annually produce a list of such sales by region, which will be subject to future audits. Any harvest conducted in such stands must conserve the late-successional attributes (large trees, large down woody debris, presence of indicator lichen species) consistent with the Bureau’s policies on such, and will be formally monitored by post-harvest, quantitative inspections.

Company Action/Auditor Observation:

BPL Response: 2005 report: The policy has not yet been formally adopted as we approach the six months - final 2004 report was received 3-24-05. However, the two definitions (see below) have been drafted and circulated for comment, and the basic provisions of the CAR have been

applied to prescriptions completed since last March, and to the Molunkus prescription, completed in fall, 2004. Those prescriptions reviewed in May (with Andy Cutko at the review session) were at Bigelow, Wassataquoik, and Squapan. The latter two have each received relatively heavy cutting in the past several decades, Squapan the more recent, and though late successional species are common to predominant in many stands, so are early successional species in most. The Bigelow Rx included evaluations of several stands using the Manomet index, and definitely holds stands meeting both definitions. Andy has been kept in the loop throughout this Rx process. MNAP has also visited hardwood stands with possibly significant LS character on the center lot of Coplin Plantation, and their evaluations will be addressed in the Rx.

“high value late-successional forest”: A stand or stands with at least 50% canopy closure of stems 40’+, and with at least 50% of that “tall” canopy’s basal area made up of trees estimated/measured as over 100 years old. Also included are any stands which measures at least 6.0 out of 10 on the current Manomet LS Index tools (could be revised if the tools are changed).

“strong presence of an old-growth component”: Any stand holding at least 25 sq.ft. BA of live trees meeting Old Growth ages as noted in the “Information” section attached to the BPL Legacy/Reserve policy, i.e. 150+ years, except 200+ for cedar, hemlock, white pine.

(Note: The BPL proposed definition for “OG stand” is that the stand has 50% crown closure in tall trees and 50% of the tall tree BA meet the OG age thresholds. Any stand meeting “OG stand” should easily exceed the threshold for “strong presence . . .”, thus avoiding the contradiction of an OG stand lacking “strong OG component”.)

Auditor’s Assessment (abbreviated): We believe the BPL’s response to this CAR represents a good faith effort to address the issue of managing for LS/OG structure. The thresholds listed above are reasonable points of departure, given the fact the definition of just exactly what constitutes significant LSOG value is a moving target. . . . we strongly urge BPL to make special efforts during compartment exams to delineate such conditions and designate them as separate mapped stands even if they are smaller than the typical stand in the managed landscape as a whole.

We further note that the issue of harvesting in LSOG stands has emerged publicly in a BPL timber sale which was just beginning during late summer on the Bigelow Preserve. On Sept. 29, 2005, Rob Bryan and David Publicover (writing on behalf of the Northern Forest Alliance) summarized their concerns in a letter to BPL Director David Soucy, alleging among other things a lack of compliance with CAR 2004.3. Director Soucy promptly convened a meeting of interested scientists and stakeholders on Oct. 13, 2005, attended by auditor Robert Seymour who had been copied on this correspondence. Meanwhile, Manomet scientists visited the proposed sale and made independent assessments of their late-successional index, as background for the meeting. Throughout this entire process, our observations indicate that the BPL has been completely open and accommodating to stakeholder criticism and input, while reserving their option to implement a harvest prescription that was, they argued, directed at conserving LSOG character. Following this meeting, BPL foresters planned to revisit this harvest with special attention to any old-growth inclusions which may not have been identified during initial forest typing (that was done from aerial photos).

This issue will obviously be of growing importance to BPL's management and will continue to scrutinize their performance under CAR 2004.3 which technically did not come into force until Sept. 2005. A recommendation (2005.1) is offered that may bring greater clarity to the Bureau's performance surrounding this issue.

Status at Fall 2005:

Open. Due September 24, 2006

Company Action/Auditor Observation, 2006:

BPL Response: Foresters are using the guidelines for "high-value LS forest" and "strong presence of OG component" attached to the Bureau's Legacy/Reserve Tree Policy in writing prescriptions. Revisions were made to one of the definitions above, based on more current information presented in May 2006 by Manomet researchers, and distributed to BPL staff by the Chief of Silviculture later that month:

"high value late-successional forest": A stand or stands with at least 50% canopy closure of stems 40'+, and with at least 50% of that "tall" canopy's basal area made up of trees estimated/measured as over the "usual" BPL rotation age for the long-lived species.

Possible examples (taken from Allowable Cut info, and from the rare Rx on which single age management is recommended for LS species): RS: 120-140; HE: 120-150; WP/CE 120-160; N.Hwd 120-140. (For simplicity, each stand should have a single number for each LS species, and to the extent appropriate, the same number should be used for multiple species, and perhaps for all the LS species in some stands.) Also included are any stands which measure at least 7.0 out of 10 on the current (5/25/06) Manomet LS Indexes.

In addition, field staff are frequently contacting MNAP and the chief of silviculture and/or wildlife specialist about interesting or questionable stands. Harvest operations (begun or soon to begin) which hold stands fitting the two values noted above and which are prescribed for harvest and/or road building activity include the following parcels and compartments (all of which have been visited by MNAP):

Northern Region:

1. Squapan, T11R4 C-2 and C-6 (seen during 2005 audit), T10R4 C-1 (Orig. P.L.) – Only 11-4 C-6 has had recent/ongoing harvesting;
2. St. John North Lot – Harvest not yet under way.

Eastern Region:

1. Wassataquoik C-29 – (West end - No harvest yet);
2. Nahmakanta C-34 (T1R12, SE corner of BPL ownership on town, no harvest yet);
3. Duck Lake C-24,25,26 – (S. of Gassabias Lake - significant harvest last fall and this summer/fall.)

Western Region:

1. Richardson C-45 (Immediately S. of Upper Dam – significant harvesting starting late 20 05);
2. Bigelow C-10A (the "LSOG" sale, with significant harvesting this summer/fall);
3. Coplin C-14 (center lot, significant harvesting since fall, 2005);
4. King and Bartlett (small, isolated lot, harvest began late last month);
5. Holeb (Barrett Brook area, roadwork has begun, not sure if any other cutting yet)

Audit Team’s Assessment: BPL has satisfactorily addressed the requirements of this condition, as evidenced by definitions amended in May 2006 and by the listing of compartments above. Furthermore, the audit team visited the Bigelow C-10A harvest unit and was impressed with the level of pre-harvest review that had taken place, and with the prescription, which is aimed at perpetuating the late-successional characteristics of these stands.

Status Fall 2006: 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 Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands be awarded FSC certification as a “Well-Managed Forest” subject to closing the precondition stated in Section 4.2; and working to close the extant corrective actions requests still open from previous assessments, stated in Section 4.3; as well as new corrective action requests stated in Section 5.2 . Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands has demonstrated that their system of management is capable of ensuring that all of the requirements of the Northeast Region of the U.S.A. Forest Stewardship Standard are met over the forest area covered by the scope of the evaluation. Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands 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 Corrective Action Requests

Background/Justification: A CAR specified in the initial certification assessment (CAR 2001.8) encouraged BPL to develop goals and objectives for the age class distribution of each stand type, and the forest as a whole, for each sustainable harvest unit. Goals and objectives were to be based on a sound model of the natural distribution of stand types and age classes in each sustainable harvest unit. A four-year deadline was established for this request. The CAR was closed in 2006 based on data presented to the audit team. Nevertheless, it was acknowledged that goals for age class distributions for each sustainable harvest unit need to be refined, reviewed thoroughly by regional staff, and then appended to revised SHU plans.	
CAR 2006.2	By the 2008 surveillance audit, timber supply calculations, harvest rates, and locations of harvest need to be communicated in coherent, accessible documents that correspond with geographical regions of Unit plans and/or administrative regions, and the entire base of lands managed for timber harvest. These plans shall also document procedures for monitoring growth and yield.
Deadline	By the 2008 annual audit
Reference	FSC Criterion 5.6

Background/Justification: See justification for Major CAR 2006.1.

CAR 2006.3	In addition to completion of the four plans listed in Major CAR 2006.1 and satisfactory progress on the fifth, a revised schedule for the unit planning process shall be submitted by the time of the 2007 annual audit.
Deadline	By the 2007 annual audit
Reference	FSC Criterion 7.2

Background/Justification: The Maine Forest Biodiversity Project conducted a thorough assessment of state lands to delineate exemplary examples of forest communities, with emphasis on late successional and old-growth forests. Independently, a variety of surveys has resulted in identification of special habitats for plants and animals and important natural communities. Initial FSC certification was conducted under interim standards, however. More definitive requirements for identification and assessment of HCVF are required by the Northeast Regional Standard, as well as from general direction from FSC International. BPL must complete an assessment and report how current management explicitly meets HCVF objectives, particularly as found in Criteria 9.2 and 9.4.

CAR 2006.4	<p>By the 2008 surveillance audit, BPL must complete the following actions with regard to the identification, management, and monitoring of areas meeting the FSC’s definition of “high conservation value forests” as further guided by the FSC Northeast Regional Standard and the FSC Canada’s High Conservation Value Forest National Framework- Appendix 5 in National Boreal Standard*:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Assess how well BPL’s current special management and protected areas cover HCVF types and categories. b) Designate any new HCVF areas that result from gaps identified in item a). c) Establish/clarify the processes by which members of the public are consulted regarding HCVF and how the public can make nominations to HCVF. d) As needed, develop and implement additional guidelines for appropriate management of HCVF. (Note: designation as HCVF does not prohibit management.) e) Assess the effectiveness of BPL’s maintenance of HCVF. (Note: this does not necessarily involve in-depth complex scientific monitoring and research.) f) Document and revise as needed procedures for assuring coordination with other ownerships possessing HCVF areas within the landscape. <p>*HCVF National Framework is based on the HCVF Tool Kit, but Appendix 5 provides a clearer approach; either document is acceptable.</p>
Deadline	By the 2008 annual audit

Reference	FSC Criterion 9.1 and HCVF Toolkit
------------------	------------------------------------

5.3. Recommendations

Background/Justification: The audit team acknowledges the close cooperation and involvement of the IFWD biologist assigned to FPR and MNAP ecologists who conduct surveys on BPL lands and review harvest prescriptions where rare species and communities are involved. For the most part, these cooperative relationships assure protection of the subject resources. However, after numerous conversations with foresters and forest technicians, the team observed a wide range in individual knowledge about wildlife species and non-woody forest plants. Given the many requirements for managing the entire forest ecosystem, it was felt that there is a clearly defined need for encouraging and rewarding individual study in these areas of expertise, so that all field personnel have a better understanding of ecosystems that they manage.	
Recommendation 2006.1	Although supervision is adequate (e.g., the wildlife biologist’s involvement in field assessments and stand prescriptions), there is wide variability among field staff in their abilities and understanding of the ecology of wildlife and non-woody plants, including invasive species, that should be addressed through (1) improved guidelines and references in field offices, (2) continued education, and (3) criteria for hiring or promotion.
Reference	FSC Criteria 7.3, 4.1.j

6.0 SURVEILLANCE EVALUATIONS

6.1 2007 Annual Audit

6.1.1 Assessment Dates

Since the 2006 re-certification audit conducted in November and December, audit activities were undertaken on the following dates:

- On 5 December 2006, David Soucy, Director of Bureau of Parks and Lands, submitted (via email) a written response to Major CAR 2006.1 outlining the efforts the Bureau will take to comply with this precondition before 15 March 2007.
- On 15 March 2007, the Bureau presented evidence that they had complied with Major CAR 2006.1; this CAR was closed; and the agency was re-certified by SCS as a well-managed forest.

David Capen and Mike Ferrucci spent two full days interviewing employees of BPL and conducting site visits. Another half day was spent reviewing and auditing documents and records. Thus, a total of five days was allocated to the audit, not including travel to and from the audit site or writing the report.

6.1.2 Assessment Personnel

Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands holds sustainable forest management certification from both FSC and SFI. Both programs require surveillance audits. The audit conducted from 13-15 August 2007 was a joint effort between two firms: SCS for FSC certification and NSF for SFI certification. David Capen represented SCS, and Mike Ferrucci represented NSF, but both auditors worked together, sharing notes and evaluations for both systems of certification.

Dr. David E. Capen, a member of the four-person team that conducted the re-certification audit of SILC in November 2004, conducted this annual audit. Dr. Capen is a Research Professor 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, having recently retired from teaching. Dr. Capen is a Certified Wildlife Biologist and a Certified Forester. He has conducted FSC audits in Massachusetts, Maine, Michigan, and Minnesota.

Mike Ferrucci is the SFI Program Manager for NSF – International Strategic Registrations and is responsible for all aspects of the firm’s SFI Certification programs. Mike has led Sustainable Forest Initiative (SFI) certification and precertification reviews throughout the United States. He has also led joint SFI and FSC certifications in Wisconsin, Maryland, Maine and Connecticut. Mike has a B.S. in Forestry from the University of Maine and 27 years of forest management experience. He is a founding partner and President of Interforest, LLC and is also a Lecturer at the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies.

6.1.3 Assessment Process

The scope of the 2007 annual audit included document review, interviews with management and field personnel, and visits to selected sites in the Northern Region of Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands. The Northern Region was not visited in the re-certification audit conducted in November 2006. The audit was conducted in mid-August, only nine months after the 2006 re-certification audit in an effort to coordinate with timing necessary for the SFI surveillance audit and to establish a more regular schedule for future audits.

13 August 2007

Ashland Motor Inn, Ashland, ME (Tom Charles, Joe Wiley)

- Updates on changes in BPL personnel since 2006 re-certification audit.
- Review of progress for Annual Allowable Harvest calculations.
- Discussions about progress on management plans for Harvest Management Units.

14 August 2007

Northern Regional Office, BPL, Ashland ME (Vern Labbe, Don Kidder, Mark Deschene, Theresa Spooner, Tom Charles, Joe Wiley)

- Discussion of current lands base: 7,000 acres added in Machias; 7,000 acres lost at Katahdin Lakes; total acreage of forest land is about 580,000.
- New Director of BPL, Will Harris; New Deputy Director, Allan Stearns; one forester has left the Eastern Region, but position will be filled soon.
- Discussed process for the recently completed management plan for Northern Aroostook Region and the revised schedule for completing plans for other units.
- Reviewed progress for setting standards to assess rutting and soil compaction during forest harvest operations and heard about a training session on this topic, which was conducted in Spring 2007.

Field Site Visits (Vern Labbe, Tom Charles, Joe Wiley, Mark Deschene, Jacob Guimond, Ed Dube, Dave Pierce, Don Kidder. Personnel changed from site to site.)

- T15R9, Deboullie Unit, Compartment 9, 10 stands lumped together for a total area of 564 acres being harvested. Excellent site conditions; mostly hardwood, with high quality sugar maple. Harvest prescription is to take trees across diameter classes to maintain age classes in residual stand; trees to cut were marked. Harvest ongoing, two fixed-head processors, one large and one small; limbs removed at point of harvest. Some rutting on main trails at bottom of hill, but most trails are in good shape. Many trees left in reserve and as legacies. New all-year road construction into this site; excellent construction. A second stop nearby was in the same harvest area. Waterbars installed recently on harvest trails.
- T15R9, Deboullie Unit, Between Eco-reserve and Togue Pond. Quick stop at a site that was harvested three years ago. Inspected the riparian buffer around Togue Pond: 330 feet with no harvest.
- T15R9, Deboullie Unit. Barrier dam and recent bridge installation between Togue Pond and Crater Pond. Both well done.
- T15R9, Deboullie Unit. New barrier dam under construction in cooperation with MDIFW.
- T15R9, Deboullie Unit, Eco-reserve, Denny Pond. New Adirondack Hut built by BPL staff and assembled on site.
- Town of Nashville. Deer winter area, ca 300 acres, harvested carefully by retaining small patches of cedar and hemlock, working closely with DIFW. Dense hardwood regeneration. Excellent results.

15 August 2007

Field Site Visits (Vern Labbe, Tom Charles, Joe Wiley, Mark Deschene, Randy Lagasse, Don Kidder. Personnel changed from site to site.)

- T16R5, Eagle Lake, Compartments 12 and 13. Active harvest with large processor in stand of mixed hardwoods and softwoods; harvest trail into area of damage from wind; no-cut delineation around wetland clearly marked.
- T16R5, Eagle Lake, Compartments 12 and 13. On-going overstory removal harvest with feller-buncher, 100-foot spacing between harvest trails; winter harvest area, ½ cut in 2007, remainder in 2007-08. Abundant residual woody debris well distributed on site.
- T16R5, Eagle Lake, Compartment 12 and 13, Stand 42. Across road from previous stop; walked through stand to shoreline of Eagle Lake to observe the result of leaving a scenic buffer around the lakeshore.
- T10R4, Squapan Unit, Stand 16. Active harvest, contractor on site, Burby Logging from Ashland; small operation with processor, which was down for repairs at time of visit; CLP certified. Wet site with

- T10R4, Squapan Unit. Inspection of 40-inch culvert installed summer 2006. Culvert is a little high, but otherwise a nice installation. Rock armoring installed by hand by Don Kidder, Forester.
- T10R4, Squapan Unit. Brief inspection of ATV/Snowmobile trail on road constructed by BPL. Trail to be maintained by local clubs.
- T10R4, Squapan Unit, Cove Forest site. Adjacent to harvest site, but protected because of rich growth of both hardwoods and softwoods and protected species of ferns. Recent inspection of site by MNAP.

Northern Regional Office, BPL, Ashland ME (Vern Labbe, Don Kidder, Theresa Spooner, Tom Charles, Joe Wiley)

- Closing meeting and discussion of outstanding CARs.

6.1.4 Status of Corrective Action Requests

CAR 2004.2. Reference Criterion 5.1
Background Information/Justification: One of the key assumptions used to justify the hiring of additional staff is that net volume/revenue receipts will remain relatively steady over the additional acres harvested. BPL to formally track this important assumption. At a minimum, the projections should include sensitivity analyses for potential swings in market prices, past and expected revenue yields per acre and past/expected costs net from stumpage sales. Such an analysis should be based on the results of the wood supply analysis.
CAR 2004.2
By the 2006 surveillance audit, BPL will have selected one sale from each Region for a detailed financial audit, including at least one long-term sale. Summaries will be available to FSC auditors. Depending on results of the financial audits, additional samples may be necessary.
BPL Actions 2007:
Two of three sales selected to be tracked were long-term sales and are still well short of completion. At this time it appears unlikely that they will be completed during this upcoming winter, 2007-08, which would be necessary if the final accounting was needed by audit 2008.
Auditor Assessment 2007:
Closing this CAR depends on completion of the long-term sales tracked, so auditors will expect to be briefed on these sales during annual audits,
Status August 2007: Open; continued until 2008 or until long-term sales are complete.

CAR 2006.1. Reference Criterion 5.6
Background Information/Justification: A CAR specified in the initial certification assessment (CAR 2001.8) encouraged BPL to develop goals and objectives for the age class distribution of each stand type, and the forest as a whole, for each sustainable harvest unit. Goals and objectives were to be based on a sound model of the natural distribution of stand types and age classes in each sustainable harvest unit. A four-year deadline was established for this request. The CAR was closed in 2006 based on data presented to the audit team. Nevertheless, it was acknowledged that goals for age class distributions for each sustainable harvest unit need to be refined, reviewed thoroughly by regional staff, and then appended to revised SHU plans.

CAR 2006.1
By the 2008 surveillance audit, timber supply calculations, harvest rates, and locations of harvest need to be communicated in coherent, accessible documents that correspond with geographical regions of Unit plans and/or administrative regions, and the entire base of lands managed for timber harvest. These plans shall also document procedures for monitoring growth and yield.
BPL Actions 2007:
Trial runs of the Woodstock model have been made for three Sustainable Harvest Units, but work remains to be done to refine the model and extend it to the entire land base under management.
Auditor Assessment 2007:
Auditors will expect to see results in 2008.
Status August 2007: CAR Continued

CAR 2006.2. Reference Criterion 7.2
Background Information/Justification: As a result of earlier annual audits, CAR 2004.1 was still open at the time of the 2006 re-certification assessment. The CAR read as follows: “For the remaining term of this certificate, the BPL is bound by their strategy (detailed in the 2004 audit report and reproduced below) to complete management plans, with emphasis on lands which have no plan in place. The Bureau agrees that no timber management activities will occur on newly acquired lands requiring “Full Plans” (viz., Kennebec Highlands, Seboomook) until those plans have been approved. Progress will be closely scrutinized at future annual audits.”
Progress on the new and revised Unit plans mentioned above did not conform to the schedule proposed in 2004. Abundant evidence was submitted to demonstrate that planners have been reassigned to high priority projects that were not anticipated in 2004, but that completion of these plans will once again become the highest priority, and that additional planning staff will be placed on contract to assist with the efforts. Because CAR 2004.1 was not fulfilled, it was replaced with Major CAR 2006.1. Major CAR 2006.1 read as follows: As a precondition to re-certification, the BPL must demonstrate final approval of Unit plans for Seboomook and Down East; renewed efforts on the Flagstaff and Northern Aroostook plans that will allow their completion and approval by 15 June 2007 and sufficient progress on the Kennebec Highlands plan to conform to the intended approval date of 15 September 2007. Evidence must be submitted to Scientific Certification Systems that confirms satisfactory progress toward achieving these benchmarks. This CAR was closed on 15 March 2007. CAR 2006.2 followed.
CAR 2006.2
In addition to completion of the four plans listed in Major CAR 2006.1 and satisfactory progress on the fifth, a revised schedule for the unit planning process shall be submitted by the time of the 2007 annual audit.
BPL Actions 2007:
The first four plans have been completed and signed within the timeframes cited. Kennebec Highlands is in progress, with first draft completed and advisory committee and focus group meetings held. This plan will not be completed by September 15 due to additional workloads placed on the planning shop by the legislature during its most recent session. We anticipate that by this date the final draft will be completed and the public meeting will have taken place, putting us into the comment period. This would lead to a signed plan sometime during the first half of

October. A schedule for additional management plans was prepared before the audit, as specified. The schedule calls for nine new planning efforts to be completed by 2012, thus one or two plans per year. It is noted that the order of plans on the schedule might change and that some might take longer than one year if they contain large tracts of new acquisitions.

Auditor Assessment 2007:

The planning staff and other personnel of BPL have done an exemplary job of finishing plans and involving the public in their approval since the time of the re-certification audit.

Status August 2007: CAR Closed.

CAR 2006.3. Reference Criterion 9.1 and HCVF Toolkit

Background Information/Justification: The Maine Forest Biodiversity Project conducted a thorough assessment of state lands to delineate exemplary examples of forest communities, with emphasis on late successional and old-growth forests. Independently, a variety of surveys has resulted in identification of special habitats for plants and animals and important natural communities. Initial FSC certification was conducted under interim standards, however. More definitive requirements for identification and assessment of HCVF are required by the Northeast Regional Standard, as well as from general direction from FSC International. BPL must complete an assessment and report how current management explicitly meets HCVF objectives, particularly as found in Criteria 9.2 and 9.4.

CAR 2006.1

By the 2008 surveillance audit, BPL must complete the following actions with regard to the identification, management, and monitoring of areas meeting the FSC's definition of "high conservation value forests" as further guided by the FSC Northeast Regional Standard and the FSC Canada's High Conservation Value Forest National Framework- Appendix 5 in National Boreal Standard*:

- g) Assess how well BPL's current special management and protected areas cover HCVF types and categories.
- h) Designate any new HCVF areas that result from gaps identified in item (a).
- i) Establish/clarify the processes by which members of the public are consulted regarding HCVF and how the public can make nominations to HCVF.
- j) As needed, develop and implement additional guidelines for appropriate management of HCVF. (Note: designation as HCVF does not prohibit management.)
- k) Assess the effectiveness of BPL's maintenance of HCVF. (Note: this does not necessarily involve in-depth complex scientific monitoring and research.)

Document and revise as needed procedures for assuring coordination with other ownerships possessing HCVF areas within the landscape.

BPL Actions 2007:

Little progress on this to date, beyond obtaining reference materials on HCVFs from the Canadian/Boreal standards, and consulting with another recently recertified land manager.

Auditor Assessment 2007:

Auditors will expect to see results during the 2008 Annual Audit.

Status August 2007: CAR Continued.

6.1.5 General Observations

Personnel of the Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands remain committed to sustainable forest management and FSC certification, a commitment that begins in the office of the state's Governor. Since the re-certification assessment in November 2006, the Bureau has a new Director, Will Harris, and new Deputy Director, Allan Stearns, and has hired a consultant to work with the three Bureau planners in their efforts to catch up with management planning. One experienced forester has left the Eastern Region, but the search for a replacement was progressing quickly at the time of the annual audit. Very significantly, the long-time service of a wildlife biologist assigned to the Bureau by Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife will end with retirement in August 2008. In future audits, SCS will assess what, if any, affect this change has had on BPL's conformance with relevant aspects of the certification standard.

6.1.6 New Corrective Action Requests and Recommendations

No new Corrective Action Requests or recommendations were issued during the annual audit. One CAR that was issued during the 2006 re-certification was closed. Three others, including one from 2004, were continued, but this was expected because one awaits data from two long-term harvest operations and two others were issued with 2008 as the anticipated date of closure.

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 the Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands continues to be in strong overall compliance with the FSC Principles and Criteria, as elaborated by the Northeast Regional Stewardship Standards. As such, continuation of the certification is warranted.

6.2 2008 Annual Audit

6.2.1 Assessment Dates

Since the 2006 re-certification audit conducted in November and December, audit activities were undertaken on the following dates:

- On 5 December 2006, David Soucy, Director of Bureau of Parks and Lands, submitted (via email) a written response to Major CAR 2006.1 outlining the efforts the Bureau will take to comply with this precondition before 15 March 2007.
- On 15 March 2007, the Bureau presented evidence that they had complied with Major CAR 2006.1; this CAR was closed; and the agency was re-certified by SCS as a well-managed forest.
- On 13-15 August 2007, the first annual audit was conducted by David Capen and Mike Ferrucci, a joint FSC, SFI audit.
- In August 2008, the Bureau presented documents addressing High Conservation Value Forests, sustainable harvest calculation, projected age-class distribution for harvest units, and economic evaluations of harvest costs.
- On 13-14 August 2008, the second annual audit was conducted.

David Capen and Gerald Grossman and spent 1.5 days interviewing employees of BPL and conducting site visits. Another half day was spent reviewing and auditing documents and records. Thus, a total of four days was allocated to the audit, not including travel to and from the audit site or writing the report.

6.2.2 Assessment Personnel

Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands holds sustainable forest management certification from both FSC and SFI. Both programs require surveillance audits. The audit conducted from 13-15 August 2007 was a joint effort between two firms: SCS for FSC certification and NSF for SFI certification. David Capen represented SCS, and Gerald Grossman represented NSF, but both auditors worked together, sharing notes and evaluations for both systems of certification.

David E. Capen, a member of the four-person team that conducted the re-certification audit of SILC in November 2004, conducted this annual audit. David is a Research Professor 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, having recently retired from teaching. David is a Certified Wildlife Biologist and a Certified Forester. He has conducted FSC audits in Massachusetts, Maine, Michigan, Indiana, New York, and Minnesota.

Gerald Grossman, ACF & CF, is a SFI Lead Auditor for NSF – International Strategic Registrations. Gerald has led or participated in over 40 Sustainable Forest Initiative (SFI) certifications throughout the Eastern United States. Gerald has a B.S. in Forestry from the University of Michigan and a M.S in Forestry and M.B.A. from Michigan State University. He has been President of Grossman Forestry Company, a full service consulting forestry firm located in the Eastern Upper Peninsula of Michigan, since 1990. The Grossman Forestry Company employees 7 full time foresters and manages over 260,000 acres of timberland for a wide variety of landowners.

6.2.3 Assessment Process

The scope of the 2008 annual audit included document review, interviews with management and field personnel, and visits to selected sites in the Western Region of Maine Department of Parks and Lands. Although the audit focused mostly on assessments of field sites, a number of documents were reviewed relative to three open CARs and in preparation for the field audit:

- An assessment of High Conservation Value Forests
- Revised policy for identification and management of late-successional and old-growth (LSOG) forests
- Sustainable harvest levels calculations by management units
- Characteristic diameter distributions for sustainable management units
- Analysis of harvest-related costs for selected timber sales
- Listing of harvest sales, 2006-2008.

13 August 2008

Rangeley, ME (Tom Charles, Joe Wiley, Pete Smith, Bill Haslam)

- *Updates on changes in BPL personnel since 2007 annual audit: (1) Joe Wiley's retirement date is uncertain, but IFWD has indicated that his position and assignment to BPL will be replaced; (2) Cindy Bastey, Chief Planner, has left the agency; (3) Rex Turner is a new recreation planner; (4) Dave Hobson has been hired as a forest technician on the Bigelow Unit.*
- *Down East plan has been approved*
- *Review of progress for Annual Allowable Harvest calculations.*
- *Discussions about progress on management plans for Sustainable Harvest Units.*

Field Sites

- ***Compartments W155 and W157, Adamstown and Richardsontown Twps.,** a "mini-prescription," prepared because of stand conditions; harvested in March 2008 by Maine-ly Trees, a local operator who used a cut-to-length processor to implement a prescription that left large white pines; trees were not marked, but a number of wet areas were flagged prior to harvest, including a 50-foot no-cut buffer around a wetland that is important for wading birds and waterfowl; a mapped deer yard is present also, and was excluded from the harvest area. Bill Haslam was the forester.*
- ***Landing on Rt. 16** used in harvest described above; a road used by public; effort was made to retain an uncut appearance along the road; landing was very clean; harvest trails dogleg along the road and are nearly invisible.*
- ***Compartment 162, Adamstown Twp.,** next to Richardson Lake; harvest occurred in 2005-06 along the road to recent harvest, with excellent response in the understory; inspected new road built for winter 2008 harvest, which will be closed with culverts removed; 2008 harvest in winter by Nichols Bros; inspected several harvest trails, some with recent waterbars and many with dense brush to prevent rutting; some of the stand is mixed forest, but also areas of hardwood; residual stand is well stocked and advanced regeneration is excellent.*

14 August 2008

Field Site Visits (Tom Charles, Joe Wiley, Pete Smith, Eric Hoar, Ben Webb, Mandy Farrar[Orion forester], Chris Dean [New Page forester])

- ***Barrett Brook, Holeb Unit,** 5000-6000 acre harvest area; 5-year contract to Orion Timberlands; Jackman Lumber is sub-contracted for harvest operations and supervised by Orion forester as well as BPL foresters. Harvest in progress with CAT processor; careful brushing of harvest trails, no rutting; a mix of marked trees and designated harvest prescriptions. Several harvest sites in the Barrett Brook area were visited; all demonstrated well stocked residual stands and ample woody debris left behind; landings were small and well cleaned up; buffers near and around ponds and wetland were well marked and harvested lightly or not at all.*

- *New bridge on Barrett Brook Road, Holeb, just completed day before inspection; box culvert used, steep hill on one approach, but very well drained and constructed; banks will be seeded soon.*
- *Compartment 206, Bigelow Preserve, mini-prescription for six stands, totaling 682 acres; harvest pushed up 2-3 years because of declining condition of many canopy trees; New Page is the contractor, but harvesting sub-contracted to Dunphy Logging; New Page forester supervises harvest as well as BPL foresters; processor harvesting in winter 2008, but feller-buncher used in summer harvest; about 50% of stems were cut, but 33% of volume, leaving a stand with a patchy appearance, plenty of standing trees, both dead and alive, and abundant woody debris on the ground. In one instance, cedar logs were piled and left for structure. Inspected a winter stream crossing where a rubber mat was used to protect the stream, with excellent results.*
- *Short closing meeting held in Farmington.*

6.2.4 Status of Corrective Action Requests

CAR 2004.2. Reference Criterion 5.1
Background Information/Justification: One of the key assumptions used to justify the hiring of additional staff is that net volume/revenue receipts will remain relatively steady over the additional acres harvested. BPL to formally track this important assumption. At a minimum, the projections should include sensitivity analyses for potential swings in market prices, past and expected revenue yields per acre and past/expected costs net from stumpage sales. Such an analysis should be based on the results of the wood supply analysis.
CAR 2004.2
By the 2006 surveillance, audit BPL will have selected one sale from each Region for a detailed financial audit, including at least one long-term sale. Summaries will be available to FSC auditors. Depending on results of the financial audits, additional samples may be necessary.
BPL Actions 2007:
Two of three sales selected to be tracked were long-term sales and are still well short of completion. At this time it appears unlikely that they will be completed during this upcoming winter, 2007-08, which would be necessary if the final accounting was needed by audit 2008.
Auditor Assessment 2007:
Closing this CAR depends on completion of the long-term sales tracked, so auditors will expect to be briefed on these sales during annual audits,
Status August 2007: Open; continued until 2008 or until long-term sales are complete.
BPL Actions 2008:
In August 2008, BPL submitted an analysis of timber sales expenses, as requested, for two harvest operations, Seboeis Compartments 10,12 and Deboullie Compartment 9.
Auditor Assessment 2008:
BPL has instituted the tracking of expenses on selected sales, as requested, and has consistently provided summaries of sale expenses during annual audits. As long as BPL continues to collect these data and provide them during audits, there is no need to extend this CAR. The intent has been achieved.
Status August 2008: Closed.

CAR 2006.1. Reference Criterion 5.6
Background Information/Justification: A CAR specified in the initial certification assessment (CAR 2001.8) encouraged BPL to develop goals and objectives for the age class distribution of each stand type, and the forest as a whole, for each sustainable harvest unit. Goals and objectives were to be based on a sound model of the natural distribution of stand types and age classes in each sustainable harvest unit. A four-year deadline was established for this request. The CAR was closed in 2006 based on data presented to the audit team. Nevertheless, it was acknowledged that goals for age class distributions for each sustainable harvest unit need to be refined, reviewed thoroughly by regional staff, and then appended to revised SHU plans.
CAR 2006.1
By the 2008 surveillance audit, timber supply calculations, harvest rates, and locations of harvest need to be communicated in coherent, accessible documents that correspond with geographical regions of Unit plans and/or administrative regions, and the entire base of lands managed for timber harvest. These plans shall also document procedures for monitoring growth and yield.
BPL Actions 2007:
Trial runs of the Woodstock model have been made for three Sustainable Harvest Units, but work remains to be done to refine the model and extend it to the entire land base under management.
Auditor Assessment 2007:
Auditors will expect to see results in 2008.
Status August 2007: CAR Continued
BPL Actions 2008:
BPL has continued to refine calculations of sustainable harvest levels by management units and has compiled projected age-class distributions by species for management units.
Auditor Assessment 2008:
Documents and table submitted by BPL in August 2008 show continued progress and satisfactory results in calculating SHL for each management unit and modeling the distribution of stand types and age-class distributions. These documents satisfy the intent of the CAR, with the understanding that these analyses are dynamic and must, therefore, continue, along with similar reports in future audits.
Status August 2008: Closed.

CAR 2006.3. Reference Criterion 9.1 and HCVF Toolkit
Background Information/Justification: The Maine Forest Biodiversity Project conducted a thorough assessment of state lands to delineate exemplary examples of forest communities, with emphasis on late successional and old-growth forests. Independently, a variety of surveys has resulted in identification of special habitats for plants and animals and important natural communities. Initial FSC certification was conducted under interim standards, however. More definitive requirements for identification and assessment of HCVF are required by the Northeast Regional Standard, as well as from general direction from FSC International. BPL must complete an assessment and report how current management explicitly meets HCVF objectives, particularly as found in Criteria 9.2 and 9.4.
CAR 2006.3
By the 2008 surveillance audit, BPL must complete the following actions with regard to the identification, management, and monitoring of areas meeting the FSC's definition of "high

conservation value forests” as further guided by the FSC Northeast Regional Standard and the FSC Canada’s High Conservation Value Forest National Framework- Appendix 5 in National Boreal Standard*:

- l) Assess how well BPL’s current special management and protected areas cover HCVF types and categories.
- m) Designate any new HCVF areas that result from gaps identified in item (a).
- n) Establish/clarify the processes by which members of the public are consulted regarding HCVF and how the public can make nominations to HCVF.
- o) As needed, develop and implement additional guidelines for appropriate management of HCVF. (Note: designation as HCVF does not prohibit management.)
- p) Assess the effectiveness of BPL’s maintenance of HCVF. (Note: this does not necessarily involve in-depth complex scientific monitoring and research.)

Document and revise as needed procedures for assuring coordination with other ownerships possessing HCVF areas within the landscape.

BPL Actions 2007:

Little progress on this to date, beyond obtaining reference materials on HCVFs from the Canadian/Boreal standards, and consulting with another recently recertified land manager.

Auditor Assessment 2007:

Auditors will expect to see results during the 2008 Annual Audit.

Status August 2007: CAR Continued.

BPL Actions 2009:

BPL has compiled a document that addresses each of the five actions listed in the CAR and a detailed table that identifies HCVF acreage by management unit and the rationale for each of the tracts listed and recognized as HCVF.

Auditor Assessment 2008:

The analysis of identification, management, and analysis addresses the five actions as follows:

- (a) Further refining definitions of old growth and late successional forest to supplement ecoreserves that are currently protected;
- (b) Establishing an on-going policy for identifying and protected any areas that are found to qualify for HCVF status, rather than completing another one-time inventory (such an inventory was done as part of Maine Forest Biodiversity Project);
- (c) Regional planning underway has incorporated HCVF discussions as part of the public input process, and this will continue as plans are developed and revised;
- (d) In addition to existing management guidelines for existing ecoreserves and new guidelines for late successional and old-growth forests, revised unit planning addresses management of HCVF;
- (e) A variety of monitoring efforts are in place to determine the effectiveness of maintenance. Although it may be premature to compile such assessments, an evaluation of monitoring should be reported at suitable intervals, e.g., as unit plans are written or revised.

Status August 2008: Closed

6.2.5 General Observations

Personnel of the Maine Department of Parks and Lands remain committed to sustainable forest management and FSC certification, a commitment that begins in the office of the state's Governor. Since the re-certification assessment in November 2006, the Bureau has caught up with management planning and continues to adhere to a schedule of producing unit plans on a 15-year schedule, with interim reviews and updates. The departure of a senior planner creates an important vacancy to fill, but otherwise, there has been stability among personnel during the past year. An experienced forester has been hired to fill a technician's position in the Western Region.

6.2.6 New Corrective Action Requests and Recommendations

No new Corrective Action Requests or recommendations were issued during the annual audit. Three CARs that were open prior to the 2008 audit have now been closed. Thus, there are no open CARs associated with certification of the Bureau of Parks and Lands.

6.2.7 General Conclusions of the Annual Audit

Based upon information gathered through site visits, interviews, and document reviews, the SCS audit team concludes that the Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands continues to be in strong overall compliance with the FSC Principles and Criteria, as elaborated by the Northeast Regional Stewardship Standards. As such, continuation of the certification is warranted.

6.3 2009 Annual Audit

6.3.1 Assessment Dates

Since the 2006 re-certification audit conducted in November and December, audit activities were undertaken on the following dates:

- On 5 December 2006, David Soucy, Director of Bureau of Parks and Lands, submitted (via email) a written response to Major CAR 2006.1 outlining the efforts the Bureau will take to comply with this precondition before 15 March 2007.
- On 15 March 2007, the Bureau presented evidence that they had complied with Major CAR 2006.1; this CAR was closed; and the agency was re-certified by SCS as a well-managed forest.
- On 13-15 August 2007, the first annual audit was conducted by David Capen and Mike Ferrucci, a joint FSC, SFI audit.
- In August 2008, the Bureau presented documents addressing High Conservation Value Forests, sustainable harvest calculation, projected age-class distribution for harvest units, and economic evaluations of harvest costs.
- On 13-14 August 2008, the second annual audit was conducted.
- On 21-22 September 2009, the third annual audit was conducted.

David Capen and Keri Yankus spent 2.0 days interviewing employees of BPL and conducting site visits. Another half day was spent reviewing and auditing documents and records. Thus, a total of five days was allocated to the audit, not including travel to and from the audit site or writing the report.

6.3.2 Assessment Personnel

Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands holds sustainable forest management certification from both FSC and SFI. Both programs require surveillance audits. The audit conducted from 21-22 September 2009 was a joint effort between two firms: SCS for FSC certification and NSF for SFI certification. David Capen represented SCS, and Keri Yankus represented NSF, but both auditors worked together, sharing notes and evaluations for both systems of certification.

David E. Capen, a member of the four-person team that conducted the re-certification audit of SILC in November 2004, conducted this annual audit. David 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, having recently retired from teaching. David is a Certified Wildlife Biologist, and was formerly a Certified Forester (2002-2008). He has conducted numerous FSC audits in Massachusetts, Maine, Michigan, Indiana, New York, and Minnesota.

Keri Yankus has more than 17 years of experience in the forestry industry. She has a B.S. in Forest Management from the University of Maine. After graduation she went to work for West Virginia Division of Forestry as a full time District Forest Products Utilization Forester. She also has worked for National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, NRCS, Weyerhaeuser Company, and USDA Wildlife Services. Keri holds Professional forestry licenses and or registrations in Michigan, West Virginia, and North Carolina, and is a Certified Forester. She has worked for NSF as an auditor since 2002.

6.3.3 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 Eastern Region of Maine Department of Parks and Lands. The audit focused mostly on assessments of field sites, but a number of documents were reviewed relative to

- Revised policy for identification and management of late-successional and old-growth (LSOG) forests,
- Sustainable harvest levels calculations by management units,
- Listing of harvest sales, 2007-2009,
- Detailed harvest plans for compartments in Donnell Pond Unit, Bradley Unit, and Duck Lake Unit,
- Standard operating procedures for timber stand layout and supervision in the Eastern Region of BP&L ,
- The Downeast Region SHU plan.

21 September 2009

Eastern Regional Office, Bangor, ME, Opening Meeting (Tom Charles, Joe Wiley, Chuck Simpson, Douglas Reed, Nicole Drisko, Terri Coolong, Eric Nosel, Tyler McIntosh, George Ritz)

- *Updates on changes in BPL personnel since 2008 annual audit: two senior planners have retired, but both positions have been filled. In Eastern Region, Tyler McIntosh is the newest hire, filling the technician position that Terri Coolong vacated when she was promoted to Forester I. In the Western Region, Josh Bubier left the agency and was replaced by Dave Hobson.*
- *Review of progress for Annual Allowable Harvest calculations; only minor work on harvest models since 2008 annual audit; handout provided by Tom Charles.*
- *Management plans for Sustainable Harvest Units: Kennebec Highlands plan still on hold because of legal uncertainties about legal aspects of road access; 5 different towns involved, so road issues are complex. Eastern Interior plan just finished. Western Maine is still in progress. Amherst region is a new acquisition, where planning will be done in cooperation with The Forest Society and the Town of Amherst, a 50:50 partner in ownership and management.*
- *580,000 acres is the current scope for certification—all are certified under both SFI and FSC; this reflects an addition of 5,500 acres acquired by the Bureau in Amherst.*
- *No changes in Integrated Resource Policies (2000), but a review is set to begin soon.*
- *State employees will have 10 furlough days each year in 2009 and 2010, combined with no merit increases, and increased employee contributions for health insurance.*
- *Inspected attendance list for contractor training, 15 June 2009. Spring training involved exotic pests. Numerous examples of inspections for hearing, visual display, workplace safety. No equipment-related injuries among staff or contractors, but two foresters have injured knees while on the job; at least one requires surgery.*
- *BPL has a specific contract specification that prevents bonded laborers on contractor crews.*
- *SFI management review was done last week, addressing OFIs issued in 2008 by the SFI auditor: three regional managers, Tom Charles, and Tom Morrison, participated in the review.*
- *Firewood program in Fall 2008 took equivalent of 4 FTEs for 6 weeks in the Eastern Region—about \$100 spent for \$20 worth of income from cut-your-own firewood sales. The program is still in effect for 2009, but interest has waned as people learned that it may not be cost-effective to travel long distances for small loads of wood.*
- *Review of CFRU projects and contributions from BPL. Manomet is doing a carbon life-cycle study; Bigelow is a study site.*
- *Chuck Simpson reports that he communicates regularly with a representative of the Passamaquoddy Indian Tribe, Dale Covey.*

Field Site Visits (Tom Charles, Joe Wiley, Chuck Simpson, Doug Reed, Eric Nosel, Lindsay McMahon)

- **Spring River Lake Trail Access**, Discussion of recreation opportunities and challenges with Lindsay McMahon, Seasonal Recreation Ranger. *Illegal ATV use is present, but not many examples of damage to soil and water. Enforcement is frequent, and most use is on roads. DOT, IFW and BPL cooperate on placement and maintenance of toilets. No trash containers, and most visitors take trash out. Lakes in this unit offer outstanding fishing opportunities. Campgrounds are primitive and most are accessible only by boat.*
- **Compartment 49**, Doug Reed was the forester on this Fall 2008 harvest conducted by Dean Young, a favored operator who negotiated for this harvest without bidding because of his performance on nearby cuts where aesthetics were important. *Most of volume removed was whole tree, chipped on the landing, and sold for biomass power production.*

- **Compartment 51**, Harvest was initiated by former forester Jim Frohn, but completed and supervised by Chuck Simpson. Chuck “schooled” the operator, Gavin McClain (subcontracted by SAPPI), by marking parts of the stand, then giving the operator more and more freedom to maintain the harvest prescription. As with other harvests in this unit, shoreline on three Great Ponds and visual considerations from surrounding mountain peaks were concerns. Numerous photographs document the care taken during harvest not to disturb the look of the forest landscape: narrow harvest trails and small, configured openings. Dense retention and abundant softwood regeneration with small pockets of oak.
- **Compartment 50**, Another harvest overseen by Chuck Simpson; inspected road construction completed two years ago, prior to harvest. Harvest took place in Spring 2008 by same operators as above. Nice mix of spruce and white pine on the site, with abundant pine left in the overstory, including some large diameter, tall trees. For this low-quality hardwood stand, the harvest prescription included the creation of seven openings, all in abstract shapes with feathered edges. Note the written guidelines provided to harvest crews.

22 September 2009

Field Site Visits (Tom Charles, Joe Wiley, Chuck Simpson, Terri Coolong, Tyler McIntosh, George Ritz)

- **Bradley, Compartment 45**, A 2008-09 harvest marked and supervised by George Ritz; Tony Madden was the harvest contractor; this was a “type” cut for white pine, with the prescription designed for the type, not the stand; harvest was conducted by processors; abundant woody debris, and also widespread white pine regeneration; a small landing next to the Baker Brook Road has been cleaned up enough for a picnic table; numerous protected wetlands are interspersed in the compartment; Great Works Stream, with a fishway for Atlantic Salmon, is nearby; site of a temporary bridge was inspected—deck has been removed but log abutments were left to support a small foot bridge.
- **Bradley, Compartment 39**, The Island Swamp area is an extensive mix of wetlands and lowland forest stands harvested heavily before being acquired by BPL in 1984. The area is part of a large on-going conservation project. A recent purchase of adjacent land by TNC has closed off one point of access to BPL lands; the state has no deeded access.
- **Compartment 39, Stand 12**, Even-aged stand of white pine; harvest completed by Tony Madden the day before site visit, using processor; logs still left to haul, so the site has not been closed out; trees were individually marked by George Ritz, with an objective of pushing this even-aged stand toward an uneven-aged condition; very little soil damage and no observable damage to growing stock from the harvest; result is a nicely thinned stand with abundant residual structure.
- **Compartment 39**, Visit to this site was mostly to deliver a book of trip tickets to the operator, Derek Madden, but the audit team took advantage of the opportunity to interview Madden, the son of the contractor. He was working alone, spending time on the processor, and then operating the forwarder to bring logs to the landing. Derek is a Master Logger and CLP. He was aware of a flagged vernal pool

- *Duck Lake Unit, Compartments 14 and 15, 21 and 22, A “type” prescription for about one-third of the Unit that was burned repeatedly since 1920, with the last burn in 1944; soils are shallow; the forest is an early successional mix of hardwoods and softwoods; a large harvesting operation has been in progress for 3-4 years, totaling about 21,000 cords; Gardiner & Sons are the contractors. Much of the harvested area was viewed from the road, with time for only two stops. Stop No. 1 was at a harvest site in Compt. 14, where equipment was being repaired; Stop No. 2 was another active harvest where a feller-buncher operation was in progress; wood was being chipped, both hard- and softwood. The harvest site is an excellent example of management to benefit ruffed grouse and associated species, leaving numerous large aspen while creating openings of various sizes and shapes; some of these opening were marked, but others resulted from prescriptions given to the operators; limbs and tops were being dragged back into the stands after stems were de-limbed on the landing. Various BPL foresters have been involved in implementing the prescription on this unit.*
- *Eastern Regional Office, Bangor, ME, Closing Meeting (Charles, Joe Wiley, Chuck Simpson), Discussion of an improved process for management review of certification-related activities (mostly SFI); advice that the 2010 surveillance audit for FSC would revisit the subject of three former CARs: economic studies of harvest operations; AAC modeling and revisions in proposed harvest levels; and desired future conditions of sustainable harvest units.*

6.3.4 Status of Corrective Action Requests

No corrective action requests were in effect prior to the 2009 surveillance audit.

6.3.5 General Observations

Personnel of the Maine Department of Parks and Lands remain committed to sustainable forest management and FSC certification, a commitment that begins in the office of the state’s Governor. Since the re-certification assessment in November 2006, the Bureau has caught up with management planning and continues to adhere to a schedule of producing unit plans on a 15-year schedule, with interim reviews and updates. Job opening for planners, foresters, and forest technicians have been filled promptly. Although mandatory furlough days have been imposed on all or most state employees, the Bureau’s workforce is in better shape than most sister agencies in other states.

6.3.6 New Corrective Action Requests and Recommendations

No new Corrective Action Requests or recommendations were issued during the annual audit. Thus, there are no open CARs associated with certification of the Bureau of Parks and Lands.

6.3.7 General Conclusions of the Annual Audit

Based upon information gathered through site visits, interviews, and document reviews, the SCS audit team concludes that the Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands continues to be in strong 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 INVESTIGATION PROCEDURE

Summary of SCS Complaint and Appeal Investigation Procedures

The following is a summary of the SCS Complaint and Appeal Investigation Procedures, the full version of the procedures is 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 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: rhurbes@scscertified.com