

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

**Yale Myers School Forest**

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

**CERTIFICATION REGISTRATION NUMBER  
SCS-FM/COC-00043N**

**Submitted to:**

**Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies  
360 Prospect Street  
New Haven, Connecticut 06511  
USA**

**Lead Author:**

**Michael E. Thompson**

**Date of Field Audit: October 15, 2007**

**Date of Report: December 7, 2007**

**Certified: December 14, 2007**

**Updated: December, 2008**

**Updated: December, 2009**

**By:**

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

**SCS Contact: Dave Wager [dwager@scs-certified.com](mailto:dwager@scs-certified.com)**

**Client Contact: P. Mark S. Ashton, Ph.D., [mark.ashton@yale.edu](mailto:mark.ashton@yale.edu)**

## **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](http://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 Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies.

## **FOREWORD**

Scientific Certification Systems, a certification body accredited by the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC), was retained by the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies (Yale) to conduct a certification evaluation of its Myers School Forest property in northeastern Connecticut. Under the FSC/SCS certification system, forest management operations meeting international standards of forest stewardship can be certified as “well managed”, thereby enabling use of the FSC endorsement and logo in the marketplace.

In October of 2007, an SCS auditor familiar with the Yale Myers School Forest was authorized by SCS to conduct the evaluation. The auditor collected and analyzed written materials, conducted interviews, and completed a 1-day field and office audit of the subject property as part of the certification evaluation. The field visit was followed by several days of correspondence with the client, stakeholder consultation, and detailed document review. Upon completion of the fact-finding phase of the evaluation, the auditor determined conformance to the 56 FSC Criteria in order to determine whether award of certification was warranted.

This report is issued in support of a recommendation to award FSC-endorsed certification to the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies for management of its Myers School Forest property. In the event that a certificate is awarded, Scientific Certification Systems will post this public summary of the report on its web site ([www.scscertified.com](http://www.scscertified.com)).

Foreword.....	3
Section A- Public Summary and Background Information .....	5
1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION.....	5
1.1 FSC Data Request.....	5
1.2 Management Context.....	7
1.2.1 Environmental Context.....	8
1.2.2 Socioeconomic Context.....	9
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.....	11
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 .....	15
3.3.1 Itinerary.....	15
3.3.2 Evaluation of Management System .....	16
3.3.3 Selection of FMU's to Evaluate.....	16
3.3.4 Sites Visited (not needed for single SLIMF).....	16
3.3.5 Stakeholder Consultation.....	16
3.4 Total Time Spent on audit.....	17
3.5 Process of Determining Conformance.....	17
4.0 Results of the Evaluation .....	18
TABLE 5.....	19
Notable Strengths and Weaknesses of the Forest Management Enterprise.....	19
Relative to the FSC Principles and Criteria .....	19
4.2 Preconditions.....	25
5.0 Certification Decision .....	25
5.1 Certification Recommendation .....	25
5.2 Initial Corrective Action Requests.....	25
6.0 Surveillance Evaluations.....	25
7.0 Summary of SCS Complaint and appeal Investigation Procedures.....	25

## SECTION A- PUBLIC SUMMARY AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION

### 1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION

#### 1.1 FSC Data Request

Applicant entity	Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies
Contact person	P. Mark S. Ashton, Ph.D., Professor of Silviculture and Forest Ecology; Director of School Forests
Address	Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, Marsh Hall, 360 Prospect Street, New Haven, Connecticut 06511, USA
Telephone	203.432.9835
Fax	203.432.3809
E-mail	<a href="mailto:Mark.ashton@yale.edu">Mark.ashton@yale.edu</a>
Certificate Number	SCS-FM/COC-00043N
Certificate/Expiration Date	December 14, 2007 – December 14, 2012
Certificate Type	Single FMU
SLIMF <i>if applicable</i>	N/A
Group Members <i>if applicable</i>	N/A
Number of FMU's <i>if applicable</i>	1
Number of FMUs in scope that are	
less than 100 ha in area	0
100 - 1000 ha in area	0
1000 - 10 000 ha in area	1
more than 10 000 ha in area	0
Location of certified forest area	
Latitude	41°57'09.74"N
Longitude	72°07'27.14W
Forest zone	Nearctic, Temperate Broadleaf and Mixed Forest – Northeastern Coastal Forest (NA0411) as described by World Wildlife Fund.
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is included in FMUs that:	
are less than 100 ha in area	0
are between 100 ha and 1000 ha in area	0
meet the eligibility criteria as <i>low intensity</i> SLIMF FMUs	0
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is:	
privately managed <sup>1</sup>	7,840 acres (3,173 ha)
state managed	0
community managed <sup>2</sup>	0
Number of forest workers (including contractors) working in forest within scope of certificate	Approx. 10 (varies with season)
Area of forest and non-forest land protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for conservation objectives	2,051 acres (830 ha) including open areas, road buffers, research areas, early successional reserves, late successional reserves, future late successional reserves, old fields, water bodies, wetlands, and wetland buffers

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

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

Area of forest protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for the production of NTFPs or services	0
Area of forest classified as 'high conservation value forest'	0 (according to current Northeast Regional Standards)
List of high conservation values present <sup>3</sup>	N/A
Chemical pesticides used	None at the present time
Total area of production forest (i.e. forest from which timber may be harvested)	5,808 acres (2,350 ha)
Area of production forest classified as 'plantation' for the purpose of calculating the Annual Accreditation Fee (AAF)	0 (according to current Northeast Regional Standards)
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by replanting <sup>4</sup>	1-2 acres (0.4-0.8 ha)/year of supplemental planting, primarily as an educational tool for students
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by natural regeneration	<200 acres (80 ha)/year (varies by year with prescriptions and harvest schedules)
List of main commercial timber and non-timber species included in scope of certificate (botanical name and common trade name)	Red oak ( <i>Quercus rubra</i> ), white oak ( <i>Q. alba</i> ), black oak ( <i>Q. velutina</i> ), sugar maple ( <i>Acer saccharum</i> ), white pine ( <i>Pinus strobus</i> ), red pine ( <i>P. resinosa</i> ), hemlock ( <i>Tsuga canadensis</i> )
Approximate annual allowable cut (AAC) of commercial timber	450-500 MBF of mixed hardwood and softwood
Approximate annual commercial production of non-timber forest products included in the scope of the certificate, by product type	N/A, but Yale is considering sale of maple syrup, firewood, and Christmas trees
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.)	Hardwood and softwood round wood, pulp wood, and firewood

## Conversion Table English Units to Metric Units

### Length Conversion Factors

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

### Area Conversion Factors

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

### Volume Conversion Factors

#### Volume

<u>To convert from</u>	<u>to</u>	<u>multiply by</u>
cubic foot (cu ft)	cubic meter (cu m)	0.02831685
gallon (gal)	liter	4.546

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

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

1 acre	= 0.404686 hectares
1,000 acres	= 404.686 hectares
1 board foot	= 0.00348 cubic meters
1,000 board feet	= 3.48 cubic meters
1 cubic foot	= 0.028317 cubic meters
1,000 cubic feet	= 28.317 cubic meters
Breast height	= 1.4 meters, or 4 1/2 feet, above ground level

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

## **1.2 Management Context**

As a private commercial enterprise located in the Northeast Region, management of the Yale Myers School Forest is subject to a host of local, state and federal regulations. The principal regulations of greatest relevance to forest managers in the Northeast Region are associated with the following statutes:

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

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

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

- Connecticut Forest Practices Act
- Connecticut Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Act and Regulations
- Town of Ashford Forestry Regulations

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

In Connecticut the primary regulatory authority over forest management operations resides in the local (town) Inland Wetlands Commission. These commissions have authority over wetlands as defined quite broadly using soil drainage classes based on soil types. Wetlands are defined as including soil types designated as poorly drained, very poorly drained, alluvial, and floodplain by the National Cooperative Soils Survey. Watercourses include all bodies of water that flow through or border upon Connecticut, including intermittent watercourses having a defined permanent channel and bank and two of three of the following characteristics: 1) recent scour or deposits of alluvium or detritus, 2) standing or flowing water for a duration longer than a particular storm incident, and 3) the presence of wetland vegetation. This broad definition was intended to go beyond the protection of standing-water

and other easily recognizable wetlands and to bring poorly drained soils under regulatory jurisdiction, in part to control the building of homes and septic systems in locations where they were likely to fail.

Many jurisdictional wetlands support the development of valuable mature forests and are well removed from locations with surface water wetland features. Most forest practices including harvesting of trees and silvicultural practices are permitted as of right under the law. Filling or altering of wetlands is regulated, however. Thus forest roads are normally the focus of regulatory review. The law and associated regulations have many exceptions and modifications to these exceptions, so most forestry projects, even those with no likely impacts on wetlands or watercourses, are reviewed by local wetlands commissions. This review process serves as an important venue for information exchange and often serves a valuable “public involvement” function.

Connecticut also has a Forest Practices Act authorizing the development of regulations for statewide regulation of forest practices and the licensing of foresters and loggers. Licensing has been implemented, and all silvicultural activities must be designed by a licensed forester and all commercial harvests (except for very small projects done by landowners) must include a licensed harvester on site at all times that harvesting takes place.

### **1.2.1 Environmental Context**

George H. Myers (Yale MF, 1902), a member of the first class to graduate from the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, established the Yale-Myers Forest in the early 1930s. The Forest is comprised of approximately 100 former farm holdings held by Mr. Myers and is one of the largest privately held and professionally managed forests in the region.

Forest vegetation is still strongly influenced by past land use practices. Much of the land was cleared for pasture or agriculture from 1730-1850. With settlement of the more fertile Midwest, this rocky part of Connecticut was one of the first to be abandoned. Forest vegetation began to re-colonize the region following the exodus of many farmers. From 1850-1870, however, many areas were used for raising sheep, temporarily setting back the re-establishment of forests in some areas.

White pine was one of the first species to re-colonize the abandoned fields and pastures, resulting in a stand type now known regionally as "old-field" white pine. Once white pines had shaded out grasses in the abandoned fields, hardwoods and hemlocks could become established in small numbers. Following harvest of the pines, these species became more dominant in the forest canopy, resulting in the present-day, more natural mix of hardwoods and hemlock with scattered white pine.

Most of the present stands are approximately the same age and date to heavy harvests that occurred from 1890 to 1910 (117-97 years BP). A program has started to replace the old stands with a balanced mix of age classes, ranging from 0-100 years old, by approximately 2070. A percentage of the forest, however, will be managed as late-successional reserves

and may have older aged stands. A major component of the forest also resulted from the 1938 hurricane (69 years BP).

### 1.2.2 Socioeconomic Context

The Wabbaquasset peoples are thought to have originally occupied the region encompassing the Yale Myers Forest. These were an apparently peaceful people who gave their allegiance to whichever was the most powerful among the Nipmucks, Mohegans, or Pequots. Native populations are not believed to have been high in the immediate vicinity of the Yale Myers Forest. A winter encampment, however, is thought to have been located near Boston Hollow, which is in the southwestern portion of the Yale Myers Forest. Native peoples still live in the Connecticut region, but SCS is not aware of any land claims related to the Yale Myers Forest.

The Yale Myers Forest is rocky and at a higher elevation relative to more fertile parts of Connecticut and nearby Massachusetts. For this reason, the region was settled last and abandoned first by early colonists. As noted above, the region went through a period of agriculture and animal husbandry following European colonization. Today, scattered farms are still found in the region, but most of the area has reverted to forest. Although relatively rural in comparison to more heavily developed portions of Connecticut, the proximity to Interstates 84 and 395 has brought an increase in commercial and residential development to the region.

## 1.3 Forest Management Enterprise

### 1.3.1 Land Use

The focus of the evaluation was the 7,840-acre (3,173 ha) Yale Myers School Forest owned by Yale University and located in the towns of Ashford, Eastford, Union, and Woodstock in Windham and Tolland Counties, Connecticut. This is the largest of the seven tracts of land in the Yale School Forest system. According to information supplied by Yale, this parcel has the most activity in terms of education, research, and harvesting operations of all Yale's holdings. Table 1 illustrates the diversity of land uses found on the Yale Myers Forest.

**TABLE 1  
LAND USE ON YALE MYERS FOREST**

Land Use Zone	Acres	Percent
Production Forest	5,513	70.3%
Selection Systems	251	3.2%
Planted Red Pine Stands	25	0.3%
Open Areas	22	0.3%
Road Buffers	155	2.0%
Research Areas	54	0.7%
Early Successional Reserves	175	2.2%
Future Late Successional Reserves	184	2.3%

Late Successional Reserves	141	1.8%
Old Fields	75	1.0%
Water Bodies	112	1.4%
Wetlands	643	8.2%
50-foot Wetlands and Water Body Buffers	488	6.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>7,840</b>	<b>100%</b>

The Yale Myers Forest is located near several relatively large state parcels, including Bigelow Hollow State Park, Nipmuck State Forest, and Natchaug State Forest. Most of the adjacent private landholdings are small in terms of acreage, but Hull Forest Products owns two large in-holdings in the forest. The Yale Myers Forest is in one of Connecticut’s most remote forest areas, although residential dwellings are becoming more common in the region.

This forest is managed for a variety of purposes, including revenue generation, as a site for instruction and the development of professional skills, and as a research forest. Many of the forest managers are internationally recognized experts (see Smith *et al.* 1997<sup>5</sup>) and a substantial amount of the knowledge base for the management of mixed species forests has been developed here.

A variety of activities in addition to forest management are also occur on the Yale Myers Forest, including:

- Hiking;
- Forest management outreach and demonstration forestry;
- Ecological research;
- Teaching;
- Hunting of white-tailed deer<sup>6</sup>.

### 1.3.2 Land Outside Scope of Certification

The Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies manages seven forests totalling 10,880 acres in Connecticut, New Hampshire, and Vermont. Parcels range in size from 75 acres to the largest, Yale Myers, at 7,840 acres and only the Yale Myers parcel is certified.

According to Yale forest managers, they participate in certification as part of the University’s overall educational mission. The cost of certification can be justified at Yale Myers, therefore, because it is where most of the field teaching occurs and it is the focus of the majority of active forest management efforts.

---

<sup>5</sup> Smith, D.M., B.C. Larson, M.J. Kelty, and P.M.S. Ashton. 1997. *The Practice of Silviculture: Applied Forest Ecology*, Ninth Edition. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York. 537 pp.

<sup>6</sup> This program is administered through the State of Connecticut’s Wildlife Division. A lottery permit system is utilized. Since the hunt was started in the mid 1980s the program has been extremely successful in controlling the deer herd so that natural regeneration is viable. Prior to the hunt, deer consumed nearly all pine, hemlock, and oak seedlings. After an initial period of slightly higher deer harvests, the number of deer taken each year has been quite stable.

## **1.4 Management Plan**

### **1.4.1 Management Objectives**

The management objectives for the Yale-Myers Forest are described in the School's *Forest Manager's Handbook*, which is a controlling document for management of the forest. The overall goals for management of the forest are to provide:

- A hands-on, working (managed) forest laboratory for teaching;
- A permanent, fully owned site for scientific research, especially that which extends over several decades;
- An asset in the School's investment portfolio;
- Maintain the overall integrity and health of the forest ecosystem dynamic.

Specific management objectives are:

- The forest ecosystem dynamics paradigm is used in formulating management decisions;
- All faculty members of the School should be able to use the Yale Forest System for any instruction or research that can be carried out on New England forestland;
- It should be possible for any faculty member of the School to use the Yale Forest System to develop or practice professional management expertise;
- All faculty members of the School should be able to establish research plots (either long or short term) without fear that the study will be destroyed before completion;
- The total value of the Yale Forest System should be caused to continue to rise;
- The Yale Forest System should represent a source of financial flexibility for the School;
- The School should make information available to the public regarding current activities on the Yale Forest System;
- The Yale Forest System should be available to researchers and faculty outside of the School.

### **1.4.2 Forest Composition**

The forest is dominated by mixed hardwoods on glacial till soils with a large component of hemlock, several scattered white pine stands (mainly of old field origin), and occasional red pine planted areas started in the 1940s after field abandonment. There are also numerous small ponds and wetland areas created by beaver activity.

### 1.4.3 Silvicultural Systems

The shelterwood silvicultural system is the predominant approach utilized on the forest. This system has proven successful in regenerating valuable, productive mixed species forests that are structurally similar to those in place. The goal is to maintain even aged or nearly even aged stands on most of the forests. Intermediate treatments generally involve a series of harvests designed to develop trees of high quality and which have large crowns. Regeneration treatments often include a shelterwood establishment harvest designed to assure that conditions are suitable for the germination and successful establishment of seedlings of desirable species, with a particular emphasis on red oak. Red oak is the most valuable timber produced locally, and has proven to be somewhat difficult to regenerate throughout its range. Establishment harvests designed to favor red oak generally also regenerate a large number of associated hardwood and softwood species, assuring that stands have tree species diversity.

Removal (regeneration) harvests are conducted according to guidelines developed by Dr. Mark Ashton, Director of School Forests (see sidebar). Dr. Ashton, or the School Forest Manager, must approve any removal harvests in advance of marking.

The ecosystem management and stand development paradigms are used throughout the management program at Yale. Impacts of management on the ecosystem as a whole are considered in decision-making, and no activity is done that would knowingly eliminate a species from the forest. Treatments are only applied if there is likely to be a positive future benefit.

### 1.4.4 Management Systems

Management of the Yale School Forests is executed by the Director, Mark Ashton, with assistance from Ann Camp, Assistant Director. Both are members of the Yale School of

#### **Regeneration Considerations Dr. Mark Ashton, Director of School Forests**

The following regeneration guidelines apply to any harvests that involve significant removal of the overstory, e.g. removal cutting of a shelterwood or seed-tree, or a one-cut shelterwood.

1. On hardwood sites, a matrix of black birch should establish after complete canopy removal (or be easy to establish in the case of one-cut-shelterwoods). A matrix can be defined as the majority of the regeneration to be released (at least 1000 per acre; approximately 6.5 foot spacing for a regular grid). Established black birch can be defined as seedlings at least three years old and 15 cm in height.
2. On conifer sites the majority of regeneration to be released should comprise a matrix of established pine or hemlock (at least 1000 per acre). Established pine and hemlock must be at least three years old and 15 cm in height.
3. On both hardwood and conifer sites other species (maples, hemlock, pine, hickories, and oaks) should be well represented as advanced regeneration (at least 100 per acre of several species; approximately 21 foot spacing for a regular grid). This should complement the birch or pine/hemlock matrix, according to site. Advanced regeneration can be considered seedlings at least three years old and above 15 cm in height.
4. On sites managed for oak, advanced regeneration of oak should be at least five years of age and 15 cm in height. There must be at least 100 individuals of this size and age per acre.

Forestry and Environmental Studies faculty. Day-to-day management of the forest is accomplished by a full-time forest manager with assistance from graduate students in capacities that include Research Coordinator, Mapping Coordinator, Extension Coordinator, Forest Historian, and Strategic Planning Coordinator. Graduate student participation in management of the School Forests is one of the primary functions of the school forest system.

Yale Myers is organized into eight management units – Myers, Morse, French, Still River, Turkey Hill, Boston Hollow, and Plusnin – of roughly similar size. Harvesting is generally restricted to one management unit per year, which provides a form of area regulation to complement the volume control used to schedule harvests (see below).

#### 1.4.5 Monitoring System

Yale has an active monitoring program that addresses both terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems as well as invasive species (see <http://www.yale.edu/schoolforest/monitoring.html>). Cover type changes are periodically evaluated through aerial photo interpretation and ground truthing and growth and yield are documented through a Continuous Forest Inventory (CFI) supplemented by stand inventories conducted during harvest planning operations.

Yale also has an active research program on the Myers Forest that provides data related to the structure and composition of plant and animal communities. In addition, inventories for rare plants and animals have been periodically performed and all data is stored in the School’s GIS.

#### 1.4.6 Estimate of Maximum Sustainable Yield

The calculated allowable annual cut (AAC) for the entire school forest system is 1 million board feet, about 720 MBF of which can be attributed to the Myers Forest. The actual harvest, however, has generally been significantly below the allowable cut.

CFI data collected in 2004 indicate that the standing volume of merchantable timber declined for the first time since this type of data has been collected (see Table 2). The decline in volume is attributed to planned redistributions in age classes and possibly declines in hemlock increment growth as a result of hemlock woolly adelgid (*Adelges tsugae*) infestations.

**TABLE 2**  
**Yale-Myers Stand Volume, Growth and Yield Estimates**  
**Based on CFI System (millions of board feet)**

Species Group	Standing Volume 1993	Standing Volume 2004	Harvested 1994-2004	Net Change
Oak	14.7	12.9	1.3	-1.8 (-12.2%)
Pine	9.3	12.0	1.4	+2.7 (+29.0%)
Hemlock	13.3	12.1	1.0	-1.2 (-7.6%)

Other Hardwood	9.3	6.2	0.4	-3.1 (-33.3%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>46.6</b>	<b>43.2</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>-3.4 (-7.30%)</b>

The harvest schedule for Yale Myers is based primarily on area regulation with volume targets. The objective is to treat about 300 acres to remove between 450 and 500 MBF annually according to the guidelines in Table 3.

**TABLE 3  
YALE-MYERS ANNUAL TREATMENT GUIDELINES**

<b>Area (acres)</b>	<b>Silvicultural Treatment</b>	<b>Volume (MBF)</b>
100-200	Low, crown and free form thinnings, crop tree management, timber stand improvement, firewood cuts	100-200
50-100	Establishment cut of a two-cut shelterwood/seed tree	150
50-100	Overstory removal of a two cut shelterwood/seed tree and various irregular, two- and multi-age class systems; occasional one-cut shelterwoods and patch clearcuts	150

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

The school tracks volume of timber marked and harvested annually (see Table 4). Harvests can lag several years behind marking or sale layout, however, so marking tally estimates are used to control the volume for harvest. Current and projected production estimates shown in Table 4 are predominantly for oak, pine, hemlock, and other hardwoods.

**TABLE 4  
Summary of Current and Estimated Projected Production  
On the Yale Myers School Forest**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Marked Volume (MBF)</b>	<b>Harvested Volume (MBF)</b>
2007 Harvested Sales	174	244
2007 Marked Sales	309	TBD
2006 Marked Sales	431	TBD

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

Forest practices do not result in the need to use herbicides to manage vegetation on the Yale Myers Forest. Control of undesirable species, such as mountain laurel, is accomplished without using chemicals and efforts to control forest pests have not warranted the application of pesticides to date.

In the recent past the only chemical use was glyphosphate (Roundup) application to 96 study plots at 2 sites covering approximately one-quarter of a hectare. If necessary in response to

future pest outbreaks, catastrophic weed invasion, or for research purposes, Yale may use limited quantities of FSC-approved chemicals on an as-needed basis.

## **2.0 GUIDELINES/STANDARDS EMPLOYED**

As the applicant forest property is located in Connecticut, the certification evaluation that is the subject of this report was conducted against the duly-endorsed FSC Northeast Regional Standard (version 9.0, February 10, 2005). The standard is available at the FSC-US web site ([www.fscus.org](http://www.fscus.org)) or is available, upon request, from Scientific Certification Systems ([www.scs-certified.com](http://www.scs-certified.com)).

## **3.0 THE CERTIFICATION ASSESSMENT PROCESS**

### **3.1 Assessment Dates**

The assessment began in early October 2007 when Yale provided SCS with detailed audit-related documents, which were subsequently reviewed in detail. The field portion of the assessment took place on October 15, 2007, and there was follow up correspondence over the next several weeks to clarify points discussed during the site visit.

### **3.2 Assessment Team**

Michael Thompson served as Team Leader for the evaluation. He was the Team Leader for the initial certification evaluation of the Yale Myers Forest in 2001 and he conducted several of the subsequent annual audits. Mr. Thompson has been conducting audits for SCS for approximately 10 years and he was a member of the FSC Northeast Regional Standards Working Group. He is a Certified Wildlife Biologist and the owner of Penobscot Environmental Consulting, Inc., which is based in Maine.

The assessment was conducted by a single team member with multi-disciplinary experience due to the fact that harvest intensities are quite low on the Yale Myers Forest. Every harvest block for the last 5 years, in fact, has been visited one or more times by SCS auditors during annual audits. Prior to the assessment, however, the Team Leader, consulted auditors who had conducted previous annual audits to become familiar with their observations.

### **3.3 Assessment Process**

#### **3.3.1 Itinerary**

Yale shipped a number of audit-related documents to the auditor in early October of 2007. These were reviewed and then discussed via email correspondence prior to the site visit on October 15, 2007. Following the site visit, the auditor engaged in additional stakeholder consultation, reviewed documents provided by Yale during the site visit, and engaged in follow-up email correspondence with Yale staff members.

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

With the graduation of many of the students who had been working on the Yale Myers Forest, a primary focus of the audit was meeting the new student managers and receiving an update on management activities over the previous 12 months. The field portion of the audit, therefore, began with a meeting at Yale Myers with the Director, Mark Ashton, the new forest manager, and the new student managers. This provided an opportunity to review the Northeast Regional Standards and make inquiries relevant to the indicators for each criterion. This office visit was then followed by visits to the majority of the recent harvests and several marked harvest blocks.

### **3.3.3 Selection of FMU's to Evaluate**

The forest management operation undergoing certification consists of a single Forest Management Unit with very low harvest intensities. All harvest blocks over the last 5 years have been visited by SCS auditors on more than one occasion. The norm for an audit, therefore, is to visit the majority – if not all – harvest blocks.

### **3.3.4 Sites Visited (not needed for single SLIMF)**

Yale managers provide harvest blocks with unique names and sites visited during 2007 included:

1. *Director's Cut*, a representative recent harvest block that also provided an opportunity to discuss how vernal pools are considered as part of forest management;
2. *Market Garden*, a salvage cut in response to recent wind throw associated with heavy storms; and
3. *Never Been in Nature*, a recently harvested block that provided an opportunity to view recent harvests in two stand types.

### **3.3.5 Stakeholder Consultation**

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

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

Principal stakeholder groups of relevance to this evaluation were identified based upon results from the initial evaluation and subsequent annual audits, lists of stakeholders from the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, and additional stakeholder contacts from other sources. The following types of groups and individuals were determined to be

principal stakeholders:

- Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies faculty and staff
- Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies graduate students who work – or recently worked – on the Yale Myers School Forest
- Logging contractors
- Local (Town) Conservation Commissions
- University of Connecticut Extension Forestry
- Connecticut Chapter of The Nature Conservancy

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

All stakeholders consulted praised the management of the Yale Myers School Forest and expressed appreciation for the numerous outreach and extension activities that occur on the forest. Faculty members seeking to conduct research on the Yale Myers School Forest all reported positive working relationships with management staff. Recent graduate students, many of whom now teach at universities throughout the country, uniformly expressed appreciation for the opportunities provided to them while assisting with the management of School Forest. Notably, members of the local Conservation Commissions expressed great appreciation for Yale's role in the community.

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

Approximately 5 person-days were spent reviewing documents, visiting Yale staff members and students, inspecting harvest blocks, consulting with stakeholders, and preparing evaluation reports.

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

FSC accredited forest stewardship standards consist of a three-level hierarchy, principle, then the criteria that make up that principle, then the indicators that make up each criteria. Consistent with SCS Forest Conservation Program evaluation protocols, the team collectively determines whether or not the subject forest management operation is in conformance with every applicable indicator of the relevant forest stewardship standard. Each non-conformance must be evaluated to determine whether it constitutes a major or minor non-conformance at the level of the associated criterion or sub-criterion. Not all indicators are equally important, and there is no simple numerical formula to determine whether an operation is in non-conformance. The team must use their collective judgement to assess each criterion and determine if it is in conformance. If the forest management operation is determined to be in non-conformance at the criterion level, then at least one of the indicators must be in major non-conformance.

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

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

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

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

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

## **4.0 RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION**

Table 5 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.

**TABLE 5**  
**Notable Strengths and Weaknesses of the Forest Management Enterprise**  
**Relative to the FSC Principles and Criteria**

<b>Principle/Subject Area</b>	<b>Strengths Relative to the Standard</b>	<b>Weaknesses Relative to the Standard</b>	<b>CAR/REC #s</b>
<b>P1: FSC Commitment and Legal Compliance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Appear to be in compliance with relevant Local, State, and Federal regulations</li> <li>▪ Forest managers are committed to sustainable forest management and demonstrate support for the FSC Principles and Criteria</li> <li>▪ Commitment to FSC Principles and Criteria is now explicit in management plans and on School Forest web site</li> <li>▪ Yale is a member of the FSC</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ With recent turnover of staff and graduate students, Yale will need to ensure the continuity in management according to FSC Principles and Criteria</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ None</li> </ul>
<b>P2: Tenure &amp; Use Rights &amp; Responsibilities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Forest managers meet with members of local communities to discuss issues of concerns to the community</li> <li>▪ Forest boundaries are posted, gates are used, and signage is employed to indicate allowed and banned activities</li> <li>▪ Customary access patterns, such as hiking trails, are maintained</li> <li>▪ Close working relationship with State wildlife managers concerning permit deer hunting system</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ None observed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ None</li> </ul>

<b>P3: Indigenous Peoples' Rights</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There are apparently no active claims to the land by indigenous peoples of the region</li> <li>▪ Known or potential pre-historic archaeological sites are recorded in School Forest GIS protected from impacts related to forest management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ If road building occurs, potential road alignments should be surveyed by an archaeologist</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ None</li> </ul>
<b>P4: Community Relations &amp; Workers' Rights</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Yale conducts numerous public outreach workshops on a variety of forest management topics that are highly praised by stakeholders</li> <li>▪ Within certain guidelines, other academic institutions are encouraged to conduct research on the Yale Myers School Forest</li> <li>▪ Graduate students express satisfaction with their compensation and note that the opportunity to work on the School Forest is a strong positive in their careers</li> <li>▪ Yale works closely with local and regional conservation initiatives</li> <li>▪ Yale has long-term, stable relationships with harvest contractors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDS) should be posted prominently in areas where chemicals of any kind are stored or used</li> <li>▪ The social impact of operations on the Yale Myers School Forest, while minimal, are not explicitly addressed in detail; informal consideration is, however, given to groups such as adjacent landowners, local forest products companies, and recreational users</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ None</li> </ul>

<p><b>P5: Benefits from the Forest</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Management of the forest is financially stable</li> <li>▪ Several building improvements have been made over the last 5 years, improving the facilities functioning as a teaching and research institution</li> <li>▪ Managers monitor market conditions and generally time harvests to coincide with favorable product prices</li> <li>▪ Timber revenues are turned back into facility improvements on the Yale Myers School Forest</li> <li>▪ Forest management is directed toward establishing a balanced age class distribution and long-term, sustainable timber harvests</li> <li>▪ Stands are well-stocked and regeneration is carefully planned and monitored</li> <li>▪ Harvest levels are conservative and below the AAC</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Material benefits to the surrounding communities appear to be minor, but indirect benefits, such as maintaining open space, are substantial</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ None</li> </ul>
--	---	---	--

<p><b>P6: Environmental Impact</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Forest managers are internationally recognized experts who understand the natural dynamics of the region’s forest</li> <li>▪ Forest managers strive to conserve a range of representative stand types and age classes</li> <li>▪ Ecological inventories for features such as vernal pools and rare plants are current and recorded in the GIS</li> <li>▪ Existing and future late successional forest reserves are explicitly identified</li> <li>▪ Managers make explicit and detailed efforts to conserve within-stand diversity</li> <li>▪ Coarse woody debris, snags, and other ecological features are conserved at the stand level</li> <li>▪ Ecological experts from the Yale faculty and graduate student body are used to modify harvest boundaries to minimize potential impacts to plant and animal habitats (e.g., vernal pools)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ With the turnover in management and student staff, Yale must ensure that harvest blocks continue to be screened for rare plants, vernal pools, and other stand-level ecological features</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ None</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--

<b>P7: Management Plan</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Management objectives are explicit and address a wide variety of resources in addition to timber</li> <li>▪ Stand type maps are current and included on publicly-available web sites</li> <li>▪ Plans are clearly focused on the very long-term sustainable management of the forest</li> <li>▪ Buffers and reserves are clearly identified on forest maps</li> <li>▪ Management plans address all elements of P&amp;C 7.1 and include much more detailed information than is normally found for parcels of this size</li> <li>▪ Silvicultural and other management systems are strongly grounded by an understanding of natural stand dynamics and ecological processes for the region</li> <li>▪ CFI plot data were recently collected and used to adjust management planning goals and objectives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A quantitative wood supply analysis with future financial forecasts could be prepared as a learning opportunity for an interested graduate student</li> <li>▪ With the recent turnover in staff and graduate students, Yale will need to ensure that new managers are familiar with all aspects of the management plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ None</li> </ul>
----------------------------	--	--	--

<b>P8: Monitoring &amp; Assessment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Forest monitoring efforts include both ecological and timber elements and are far above the norm for forests of this size</li> <li>▪ Historic and current CFI data has been organized and summarized for use in modern management activities</li> <li>▪ GIS maps now explicitly identify all long-term research plots to help avoid potential impacts on monitoring activities</li> <li>▪ A forest historian works to ensure that modern managers have a detailed understanding of the history of the forest and the effects of past land use and management activities</li> <li>▪ The results of monitoring efforts are reported on publicly available web sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Social impacts, while minimal, could be more explicitly monitored</li> <li>▪ The true costs and benefits of FSC certification of small forestlands could be the subject of research and reporting at the Yale Myers School Forest</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ None</li> </ul>
<b>P9: Maintenance of High Conservation Value Forest</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ According to current definitions of HCVF contained in the Northeast Regional Standards, there are no HCVFs on the Yale Myers School Forest</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Forest managers must monitor evolving definitions of HCVF that might be associated with future revisions to the FSC standards</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ None</li> </ul>

## **4.2 Preconditions**

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

No preconditions were placed on the Yale Myers School Forest during the 5-year re-evaluation.

## **5.0 CERTIFICATION DECISION**

### **5.1 Certification Recommendation**

As determined by the full and proper execution of the SCS *Forest Conservation Program* evaluation protocols, the evaluation team hereby recommends that the Yale Myers School Forest be awarded FSC certification as a “Well-Managed Forest”. The Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies has demonstrated that their system of management is capable of ensuring that all of the requirements of the Northeast Regional Standard are met over the forest area covered by the scope of the evaluation. Yale has also demonstrated that the described system of management is being implemented consistently over the forest area covered by the scope of the certificate.

### **5.2 Initial Corrective Action Requests**

No Corrective Action Requests (CARs) are recommended.

## **6.0 SURVEILLANCE EVALUATIONS**

### **6.1.0 2008 SURVEILLANCE DECISION AND PUBLIC RECORD**

#### **6.1.1 Assessment Dates**

Since the 2007 5-year re-evaluation, there were audit activities undertaken on the following dates:

- In October 2008, Yale sent the auditor a comprehensive notebook describing forest management, research, and educational/outreach activities on the subject forest since the time of the 2007 5-year re-evaluation; these materials were reviewed prior to the audit

The assessment included document review, phone and email correspondence with the client, a 1-day site visit, and report preparation and totaled approximately 2 person-days.

#### **6.1.2 Assessment Personnel**

The annual audit was conducted by Michael Thompson, who was the lead auditor for the 5-year full re-evaluation

**Michael Thompson:** Michael Thompson served as Team Leader for the annual audit. He was the Team Leader for the initial certification evaluation of the Yale Myers Forest in 2001 and the 5-year re-evaluation in 2007. He also conducted several of the subsequent annual audits. Mr. Thompson has been conducting audits for SCS for over 10 years and he was a member of the FSC Northeast Regional Standards Working Group. He is a Certified Wildlife Biologist and the owner of Penobscot Environmental Consulting, Inc., which is based in Maine.

### 6.1.3 Assessment Process

The scope of the 2008 surveillance audit included (1) document review, (2) the auditor spending time in the field inspecting pre- or post-harvest blocks, and (3) interviews with management personnel. The auditor was provided, before the field visit, with a binder that included a chronology of events since the last audit, and detailed documentation on all active sales (recently completed, ongoing, and marked).

The opening meeting convened in Morse House on the Yale-Myers Forest. Personnel present were Richard Campbell, School Forest Manager, Brent Frey, Ph.D. candidate and Coordinator of Research for School Forests, and Jake Munger, MFS candidate. We were joined later by Dr. Mark Ashton, Director of School Forests. During the opening meeting we discussed recent management activities, MFS student training, the sale of FSC-certified wood for a Yale University construction project, and recent research activities on the forest.

As part of the field audit, the auditor visited a sample of marked, ongoing, and recently completed timber sales. The sale sites visited were in the Morse and French Divisions and included:

**Shelter From The Storm:** French Division Stands 5003 and 5007, Compartments 150 and 151. This 26-acre sale was marked in 2008. The prescription was an irregular shelterwood with group and individual tree reserves.

**The Pie Thief:** French Division Stand 5020, Compartment 154. This 19-acre sale was marked in 2008. The prescription was a crown thinning in an oak/hickory and ash canopy with sugar maple in the lower stratum. A hemlock reserve is located near the center of the stand on the western boundary.

**Roast Beef and Stuff:** Morse Division Stands 30 and 63, Compartments 38, 40, and 44. This 43-acre sale was marked in 2006 and harvested in 2008. It was predominantly a thinning in hardwoods on a slope surrounding Lost Pond, which was buffered from the harvest.

### 6.1.4 Status of Corrective Action Requests

There were no open Corrective Action Requests at the time of the surveillance audit.

### 6.1.5 General Observations

As always, Yale prepared a comprehensive set of materials documenting all manner of activities on the Yale Myers Forest since the last site visit, which was in 2007 for the 5-year full re-evaluation. There have been no major changes in management and the only unique facet of recent management activities was the sale of wood from the forest for use in building construction on the Yale University campus.

In 2007, the final two divisions of Yale Myers Forest – Still River and Boston Hollow – were cover-typed, delineated into stands, and entered in the GIS. With this effort, the entire 7,840-acre forest has been delineated into current stand types under a common system. As part of an on-going project, the School is digitizing old harvest maps to provide an accurate digital record of past management activities.

Yale hosted numerous extension and outreach activities during 2008 and remains actively engaged in the community. A wide variety of research projects are still on-going at Yale Myers, many resulting in papers published in peer-reviewed journals. As part of an ongoing effort, the School maintains an active Research Committee that coordinates research and management activities on the Forest.

The 2008 MFS Forest Crew worked on the Myers French Division, as well as on Yale's Toumey, Crowell, and Bowen Forests.

Yale's inventory and monitoring data continues to far exceed the norm for similar sized forests in the region.

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

There were no new Corrective Action Requests or Recommendations issued during the audit.

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

Based upon information gathered through site visits, interviews, and document reviews, the SCS auditor concludes that Yale's management of the Yale Myers School Forest continues to be in strong overall compliance with the FSC Principles and Criteria, as now further elaborated by the Northeast Regional Standards. As such, continuation of the certification is warranted.

### **6.2.0 2009 SURVEILLANCE DECISION AND PUBLIC RECORD**

#### **6.2.1 Assessment Dates**

Since the 2008 annual audit, there were audit activities undertaken on the following dates:

- In October 2009, Yale sent the auditor a comprehensive notebook describing forest management, research, and educational/outreach activities on the subject forest since the time of the 2008 annual audit.

The assessment included document review, phone and email correspondence with the client, a 1-day site visit, and report preparation and totaled approximately 2 person-days.

### **6.2.2 Assessment Personnel**

The annual audit was conducted by Michael Thompson, who was the lead auditor for the 5-year full re-evaluation and the auditor for the 2008 annual audit.

**Michael Thompson:** Michael Thompson served as Team Leader for the annual audit. He was the Team Leader for the initial certification evaluation of the Yale Myers Forest in 2001 and the 5-year re-evaluation in 2007. He also conducted several of the subsequent annual audits. Mr. Thompson has been conducting audits for SCS for over 12 years and he was a member of the FSC Northeast Regional Standards Working Group. He is a Certified Wildlife Biologist and the owner of Penobscot Environmental Consulting, Inc., which is based in Maine.

### **6.2.3 Assessment Process**

The scope of the 2009 surveillance audit included (1) document review, (2) the auditor spending time in the field inspecting pre- or post-harvest blocks, and (3) interviews with management personnel. The auditor was provided, before the field visit, with a binder that included a chronology of events since the last audit, and detailed documentation on all active sales (recently completed, ongoing, and marked).

The opening meeting convened near Morse House on the Yale-Myers Forest. Personnel present were Mark Ashton, Ph.D., Director of School Forests, Richard Campbell, School Forest Manager, Brent Frey, Ph.D. candidate and Coordinator of Research for School Forests, and several MFS candidates. During the opening meeting we discussed recent management activities, MFS student training, and recent research activities on the forest.

As part of the field audit, the auditor visited a sample of marked, ongoing, and recently completed timber sales. The sale sites visited were in the French Division and included:

**Mexican Blanket:** Mixed wood stand with prescriptions ranging from thinning to shelterwood. This site also included a stop to review a study transect for permanent regeneration/deer use plots.

**The Pie Thief:** A mixed hardwood stand marked in 2008 and recently harvested. American chestnut has been planted in small patches in an experimental recovery effort.

**The Fur Donut:** Mixed hardwood-hemlock site with recent harvest.

### **6.2.4 Status of Corrective Action Requests**

There were no open Corrective Action Requests (CARs) at the time of the surveillance audit.

### **6.2.5 General Observations**

Yale prepared a comprehensive set of materials documenting all manner of activities on the Yale Myers Forest since the last site visit, which was in 2008 for the first annual audit following the 5-year full re-evaluation in 2007. There have been no major changes in management staff or activities.

In 2009, Yale completed digitizing all of their old harvest maps, allowing access to harvest histories from 1946 to the present time. Yale also continues with its efforts to integrate all harvest data with stand mapping.

Yale hosted numerous extension and outreach activities during 2009 and remains actively engaged in the community. A wide variety of research projects are still on-going at Yale Myers, many resulting in papers published in peer-reviewed journals. As part of an ongoing effort, the School maintains an active Research Committee that coordinates research and management activities on the Forest.

The Summer 2009 Forest Crew (MFS students) worked in the Curtis Division of Yale Myers Forest and conducted CFI work at the Yale Toumey Forest.

Yale's inventory and monitoring data continues to far exceed the norm for similar sized forests in the region.

Yale used a very small amount of the chemical Tordon in 2009 for timber stand improvement work in an old shelterwood.

Yale did not sell any forest products as FSC-certified in 2009.

Yale uses the FSC logo and other FSC trademarks for promotional purposes in various publications and on its website. Such uses are subject to certain requirements imposed by the FSC and must be approved prior to use by the certification body (SCS). Yale has not received the necessary approvals from SCS for the promotional use of the FSC logo and other trademarks (see **Minor CAR 2009.1** below).

Yale intends to eventually build a new research facility near the French House. This would represent a conversion of use that would be subject to FSC Criterion 6.10. Yale has already screened the area and has determined that there are no unique ecological resources or HCVF in the proposed building envelope.

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

<p><b>Background/Justification:</b> Yale uses the FSC logo and other FSC trademarks for promotional purposes in various publications and on its website. Such uses are subject to certain requirements imposed by the FSC and must be approved prior to use by the certification body (SCS). Yale has not received the necessary approvals from SCS for the promotional use of the FSC logo and other trademarks.</p>
---

<b>CAR 2009.1</b>	Yale must comply with FSC requirements related to logo and trademark use by: a) contact SCS staff and request informational materials related to logo and trademark use; b) review such informational materials and determine which logo and trademark uses are subject to SCS review; and c) submit requests to SCS for approval of all existing promotional uses of the FSC logo or other trademarks.
<b>Deadline</b>	Within 30 days of the date of report finalization
<b>Reference</b>	Use of FSC Trademarks and Logo

### 6.2.7 General Conclusions of the Annual Audit

Based upon information gathered through site visits, interviews, and document reviews, the SCS auditor concludes that Yale’s management of the Yale Myers School Forest continues to be in strong overall compliance with the FSC Principles and Criteria, as now further elaborated by the Northeast Regional Standards. As such, continuation of the certification is warranted.

## 7.0 SUMMARY OF SCS COMPLAINT AND APPEAL INVESTIGATION PROCEDURES

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

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

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

The written Complaint or Appeal must:

- Identify and provide contact information for the complainant or appellant
- Clearly identify the basis of the aggrieved action (date, place, nature of action) and which parties or individuals are associated with the action

- Explain how the action is alleged to violate an SCS or FSC requirement, being as specific as possible with respect to the applicable SCS or FSC requirement
- In the case of complaints against the actions of a certificate holder, rather than SCS itself, the complainant must also describe efforts taken to resolve the matter directly with the certificate holder
- Propose what actions would, in the opinion of the complainant or appellant, rectify the matter.

Written complaints and appeals should be submitted to:

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

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