

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

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

St. John Plt., ME

SCS-FM/COC-00121N

300 Union Street

St. John, NB, CA E2L4M3

Scott MacDougall, MacDougall.Scott@jdirving.com

www.jdirving.com

CERTIFIED	EXPIRATION
12/08/09	12/08/14

DATE OF FIELD AUDIT
15-17/Oct/13
DATE OF LAST UPDATE
12 Dec 2013

SCS Contact:

Brendan Grady | Director
Forest Management Certification
+1.510.452.8000
bgrady@scsglobalservices.com

SCSglobal
SERVICES
Setting the standard for sustainability™

Foreword

Cycle in annual surveillance audits			
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 st annual audit	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 nd annual audit	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 rd annual audit	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4 th annual audit
Name of Forest Management Enterprise (FME) and abbreviation used in this report:			
J.D. Irving Northern Maine Woodlands Forestry Division (JDI)			

All certificates issued by SCS under the aegis of the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) require annual audits to ascertain ongoing conformance with the requirements and standards of certification. A public summary of the initial evaluation is available on the FSC Certificate Database <http://info.fsc.org/>.

Pursuant to FSC and SCS guidelines, annual / surveillance audits are not intended to comprehensively examine the full scope of the certified forest operations, as the cost of a full-scope audit would be prohibitive and it is not mandated by FSC audit protocols. Rather, annual audits are comprised of three main components:

- A focused assessment of the status of any outstanding conditions or Corrective Action Requests (CARs; see discussion in section 4.0 for those CARs and their disposition as a result of this annual audit);
- Follow-up inquiry into any issues that may have arisen since the award of certification or prior to this audit; and
- As necessary given the breadth of coverage associated with the first two components, an additional focus on selected topics or issues, the selection of which is not known to the certificate holder prior to the audit.

Organization of the Report

This report of the results of our evaluation is divided into two sections. Section A provides the public summary and background information that is required by the Forest Stewardship Council. This section is made available to the general public and is intended to provide an overview of the evaluation process, the management programs and policies applied to the forest, and the results of the evaluation. Section A will be posted on the FSC Certificate Database (<http://info.fsc.org/>) no less than 90 days after completion of the on-site audit. Section B contains more detailed results and information for the use by the FME.

Table of Contents

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY	4
1. GENERAL INFORMATION	4
1.1 Annual Audit Team.....	4
1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation	4
1.3 Standards Employed	4
2 ANNUAL AUDIT DATES AND ACTIVITIES	5
2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities.....	5
2.2 Evaluation of Management Systems	7
3. CHANGES IN MANAGEMENT PRACTICES.....	8
4. RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION.....	8
4.1 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations	8
4.2 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations	10
5. STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS	11
5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted	12
5.2 Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Responses from the Team, Where Applicable	12
6. CERTIFICATION DECISION	13
7. CHANGES IN CERTIFICATION SCOPE	13
8. ANNUAL DATA UPDATE	17
8.1 Social Information.....	17
8.2 Annual Summary of Pesticide and Other Chemical Use	17

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY

1. General Information

1.1 Annual Audit Team

Auditor Name:	Mike Dann	Auditor role:	Lead Auditor
Qualifications:	Mike Dann is a Lead Forest Management and Chain-of-Custody auditor for SCS from Dixmont, Maine. He earned a BS in Forest Management from the University of Maine Orono and is a Licensed Forester in Maine. He has 40 years’ experience in natural resource management. He has completed a 3-day ISO 19011 training designed & presented in relation to the FSC Standards, a 3 day SCS training for Forest Management auditors and other SCS in-house training courses. He has conducted multiple FSC forest management and COC audits.		
Auditor Name:	Mike Thompson	Auditor role:	Team Auditor
Qualifications:	Mr. Thompson is the President of Penobscot Environmental Consulting, Inc., and a Certified Wildlife Biologist. He has worked as a subcontractor to SCS for over 15 years, conducting certification evaluations to the Forest Stewardship Council’s (FSC) forest management and chain-of-custody standards. Mr. Thompson has also conducted audits to the Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI) forest management standards. He received his B.Sc. degree in wildlife from the University of Idaho and his M.Sc. degree in wildlife from the University of Maine. Mr. Thompson has over 25 years of experience in ecology, wildlife management, wetland science, and rare species conservation.		

1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation

A. Number of days spent on-site assessing the applicant:	3
B. Number of auditors participating in on-site evaluation:	2
C. Additional days spent on preparation, stakeholder consultation, and post-site follow-up:	1
D. Total number of person days used in evaluation:	7

1.3 Standards Employed

1.3.1. Applicable FSC-Accredited Standards

Title	Version	Date of Finalization
FSC-US Forest Management Standard	V1.0	July 8, 2010
All standards employed are available on the websites of FSC International (www.fsc.org), the FSC-US (www.fscus.org) or the SCS Standards page (www.scsglobalservices.com/certification-standards-and-program-documents). Standards are also available, upon request, from SCS Global Services (www.SCSglobalServices.com).		

2 Annual Audit Dates and Activities

2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities

Date: Oct. 15, 2013	
FMU / Location / sites visited	Activities / notes
Dyer Brook Town office	<p>Opening Meeting</p> <p>Attending:</p> <p>Scott MacDougall – Certification Manager</p> <p>Ked Coffin – Regional Forester</p> <p>Matt Stedman – Operations Forester</p> <p>John Gilbert – Mgr. Fish and Wildlife</p> <p>Mark McClellan – Planning Forester</p> <p>Josh Philbrook – Harvest Superintendent</p> <p>Kelly Honeyman – Naturalist/Biologist</p> <p>Lance Cunningham – Harvest Superintendent</p> <p>Mike Dann – SCS Lead Auditor</p> <p>Mike Thompson – SCS Team Auditor</p> <p>Review audit scope</p> <p>Review open Observations</p>
T7R5 Lane Brook	<p>New brook crossing on Hastings Brook</p> <p>Reroute of old road</p> <p>Discussion of crossing construction methods and protocol</p>
T7R5 Hastings Brook	<p>New brook crossing</p> <p>30" bypass culvert used during construction</p> <p>Discussion of silt fence and seeding</p>
T7R6 Ulmcolcus Lake Rd.	<p>Outcome Based Forestry (OBF) block.</p> <p>Old CC buffers appropriately treated with different harvest treatments which would not have been possible under Forest Practices Act. Resulted in appropriate stand level management.</p>
T8R6 Cranberry Pond	<p>Late successional softwood forest</p> <p>Discussion of LS policy; stands are reserved from harvest until landscape goals are met. Once goals are met if harvest is contemplated, stand is scored to make sure it ranks lowest on the scale and that there are enough that rank higher to continue to meet the goals.</p> <p>All LS stands greater than 20 acres are screened for Type II old growth.</p>
T8R5 St Croix siding	<p>150 acre blowdown across stream. Rare Tomah Mayfly site on stream. Kelly Honeyman consulting with Maine Natural Areas Program (MNAP) on proper management around site.</p>
Nashville Plt. Mill yard	<p>Discussion of chain of custody procedures with Rick Fowler and Guy Nadeau.</p>
Date: Oct. 16, 2013	

FMU / Location / sites visited	Activities / notes
St John Plt. office	<p>Opening meeting to discuss final site selections for the remainder of the audit.</p> <p>Attending:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Blake Brunsdon – Chief Forester Kelly Honeyman – biologist/naturalist Scott MacDougall – Certification Manager Ked Coffin – Regional Forester Matt Stedman – Operations Forester John Gilbert – Mgr. Fish and Wildlife Nick Pelletier – Planning Forester Josh Philbrook – Harvest Superintendent Chris Huston – GIS Peter Tabor – Regional Manager Andrew Willett – Silviculture Manager Mike Dann – SCS Lead Auditor Mike Thompson – SCS Team Auditor
St. John Plt office	<p>Presentation on JDI’s proactive approach to the pending Spruce Budworm outbreak.</p>
T16R8 1 st & 2 nd Wallagrass Lakes	<p>Harvest area on slope adjacent to lakes.</p> <p>Road and harvest planned to mitigate visual impact.</p> <p>Mature tolerant hardwood stand with tertiary component of spruce and cedar being managed on an unevenaged basis.</p> <p>Discussion of JDI Legacy Tree Policy.</p> <p>Rare plant site (giant rattlesnake plantain) found by layout forester and confirmed by Kelly Honeyman.</p>
T16R8	<p>Interview with J.D.Hummel harvesting crew</p>
T16R8	<p>OBF management block that resulted in appropriate stand level management. Mature softwood with intolerant hardwood was clearcut and will be planted. Adjacent tolerant hardwood stand managed on an unevenaged basis to promote sugar maple.</p>
T16R8 road WL4	<p>OBF management block. Softwood/intolerant hardwood stand CC to be planted. Mature softwood stand managed under shelterwood system to address visual concerns from Wallagrass Lakes. Tolerant hardwood stand being managed on unevenaged basis to promote sugar maple. Riparian zone on small brook appropriately managed.</p>
T16R8	<p>Irregular shelterwood in mature tolerant hardwood leaving a widely, but uniformly, spaced stand of mature trees, primarily sugar maple. This combined with all beech being removed in the harvest hopes to promote more sugar maple in the residual stand.</p>
McLean Mountain LS Stand	<p>500 acre +/- late successional forest composed of tolerant hardwood with pockets of softwood. Further discussion of JDI LS policy, including placement of LS stands across the landscape and relationship to more intensively managed stands.</p>
St Francis	<p>Visit to old sawmill site discovered by JDI staff that is listed in JDI</p>

	Unique Areas program.
Date: Oct. 17, 2013	
FMU / Location / sites visited	Activities / notes
St. John Plt. office	Review of documents and staff interviews related to Principle 4 and review of new Forest Management Plan in relation to requirements of Principle 7.
T15R6	Interviews with harvesting contractors.
Nashville Plt. Mill office	<p>Closing Meeting In attendance: Blake Brunson – Chief Forester Scott MacDougall – Certification Manager Ked Coffin – Regional Forester Matt Stedman – Operations Forester John Gilbert – Mgr. Fish and Wildlife Nick Pelletier – Planning Forester Josh Philbrook – Harvest Superintendent Lance Cunningham – Harvest Superintendent Toby Pineo Road Construction Superintendent Mike Dann – SCS Lead Auditor Mike Thompson – SCS Team Auditor Gary Donovan – Outcome Based Forestry Panel member</p> <p>Review of audit Resolution of open Observations Discussion of audit findings.</p>

2.2 Evaluation of Management Systems

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

3. Changes in Management Practices

This is the second year that JDI is operating under the Outcome Based Forestry Agreement with the Maine Forest Service. This agreement frees JDI from requirements of the Maine Forest Practices Act concerning clearcut size, buffer zones between clearcuts, and management plan and reporting requirements. In return, JDI commits to maintaining 3rd party certification, documenting efforts to improve the quantity and/or quality of its timber resource, annually reporting information about its harvests and silvicultural metrics, and reporting average clearcut size and total acres. A Maine Licensed Forester shall review their management plan. Harvests will be laid out with consideration to visual aesthetics in visually sensitive areas. JDI will accommodate other reasonable requests for information.

4. Results of the Evaluation

4.1 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations

Certificate holder/applicant	J.D. Irving Northern Maine Woodlands Forestry Division, Irving Woodlands, LLC (JDI)
CAR/OBS identified by (SCS representative)	Mike Dann and Mike Thompson
Date of Issuance	October 18, 2012
Audit Year/Type	3 rd Surveillance Audit

Finding Number: 2012.1	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator(s):	FSC-US Forest Management Standard V1-0 6.3.a.3.
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): JDI's protocol for identifying late successional and potential old growth stands was reviewed. Field sites were visited. Forest stands are being appropriately identified and protected. The protocol meets the intent of the Standard. JDI conducted a harvest adjacent to a potential Type 1 Old Growth stand prior to the company's ecologist evaluating whether the stand actually was Type 1 Old Growth and before the ecologist could advise on the potential impact of the harvest on the stand's functional value.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): A clarification of the protocol under which forest operations can take place adjacent to known or potential old growth stands would improve conformance.	
FME response	Document "Old Growth" Management on the Irving Woodlands LLC Landbase -

<i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	<u>2013</u>
SCS review	Document was reviewed and found to meet the intent of the Observation. While no new examples of old growth were found in the past year our understanding is that no harvest adjacent to Type I old growth will occur without the consultation with an expert.
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2012.2	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator(s):	FSC-US Forest Management Standard V1-0 6.3.f.
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): JDI's current Legacy Tree definition is broader than the FSC definition, resulting in trees such as snags and nest trees being defined as Legacy Trees in addition to those meeting the FSC definition.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): While all trees currently protected under the JDI policy are valuable stand components that warrant protection under the Indicator, a clarification and/or redefinition of "Legacy Tree" in the JDI policy would help ensure conformance with the Indicator.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	JDI's policy document <u>Policy for Maintaining Diversity in Harvested Areas</u> and associated training documents have been changed to incorporate the FSC definition of Legacy Tree.
SCS review	Policy document reviewed and found to meet the intent of the Observation.
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2012.3	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	

Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator(s):	FSC-US Forest Management Standard V1-0 6.3.h.
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): JDI's current strategy to assess the risk of, prioritizing, and implementing a strategy to prevent or control invasive species contains the 4 elements listed in the Indicator. An assessment of the invasive plant Phragmites was reviewed by the audit team. The assessment concluded that control of Phragmites was not feasible, but documentation for how this conclusion was reached was general in nature.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): The assessment was found to meet the intent of the Indicator. JDI should, however, develop a report with more explicit information on extent, costs, control alternatives, and consultation with State and regional experts to guide future assessments of invasive species.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	<u>FSC 2012 Field Audit: Invasive Species</u> <u>Response to Finding # 2012-3, - FSC –US Forest Management Standard V1 – 06.3.h</u>
SCS review	Document reviewed by audit team and found to meet the intent of the Observation. It is our understanding that this reporting protocol will be further incorporated into Management planning and reporting.
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

4.2 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations

Finding Number: 2013-1	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US Forest Management Standard V1-0 6.3.f.
Non-Conformity: Field visit to T16R8 1 st &2 nd Wallagrass Lakes site showed that there were tertiary cohorts of spruce and cedar that potentially met the JDI definition of Legacy Trees. Some of these trees had been harvested and several outstanding examples had been retained. On-site discussion with JDI staff and the auditors concluded that while a change in the definition to answer Observation 2012-2 had occurred and foresters were aware of it, further training would improve consistency in application of the policy.	

Corrective Action Request: JDI should conduct further training on Legacy Tree identification to improve consistency in application of their new policy.	
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2013-2	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US Forest Management Standard V1-0 7.1.c
Non-Conformity: Discussion of desired future conditions of timber and non- timber resources in the <u>2013 – 2037 Forest Management Plan J.D. Irving Northern Maine Woodlands</u> is cursory and not cross referenced to other documents which contain the full details of the topics.	
Corrective Action Request: A more thorough cross referencing of all policy documents with the Forest Management Plan would improve comprehension and readability.	
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

5. Stakeholder Comments

In accordance with SCS protocols, consultation with key stakeholders is an integral component of the evaluation process. Stakeholder consultation takes place prior to, concurrent with, and following field evaluations. Distinct purposes of such consultation include:

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

Principal stakeholder groups are identified based upon results from past evaluations, lists of stakeholders from the FME under evaluation, and additional stakeholder contacts from other sources (e.g., chair of the regional FSC working group). The following types of groups and individuals were determined to be principal stakeholders in this evaluation:

5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted

Maine Forest Service	Harvesting Contractors
Outcome Based Forestry panel members	

Stakeholder consultation activities are organized to give participants the opportunity to provide comments according to general categories of interest based on the three FSC chambers, as well as the SCS Interim Standard, if one was used. The table below summarizes the major comments received from stakeholders and the assessment team’s response. Where a stakeholder comment has triggered a subsequent investigation during the evaluation, the corresponding follow-up action and conclusions from SCS are noted below.

5.2 Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Responses from the Team, Where Applicable

<input type="checkbox"/> FME has not received any stakeholder comments from interested parties as a result of stakeholder outreach activities during this annual audit.	
Stakeholder comments	SCS Response
Economic concerns	
Harvesting Contractor interviews revealed a range of satisfaction concerning the negotiation process to address contractor concerns.	JDI has continued to employ an 8 week review process where contractors can express operational and business concerns. A natural tension exists concerning prices paid. An examination of a summary of issues raised showed that JDI responded positively in the majority of cases.
Social concerns	
Harvesting contractor interviews revealed overall satisfaction with the working relationship with JDI harvest planners and supervisors.	Duly noted.

Environmental concerns	
Outcome Based Forestry (OBF) could result in less protection in riparian zones.	Site visits to riparian zones managed under OBF uniformly showed protection meeting or exceeding State standards and the requirements of 6.3.c.
JDI is converting northern hardwood stands to softwood plantations.	In 2009, and again in 2011, JDI’s planting policy and practices were reviewed by the audit team and determined to be “planted stands” and not plantations. Hardwood sites containing predominantly low quality growing stock such as beech have been clearcut and planted. The audit team found no evidence of tolerant hardwood sites containing quality growing stock being converted to softwood planted stands.

6. Certification Decision

The certificate holder has demonstrated continued overall conformance to the applicable Forest Stewardship Council standards. The SCS annual audit team recommends that the certificate be sustained, subject to subsequent annual audits and the FME’s response to any open CARs.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments:	

7. Changes in Certification Scope

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

Name and Contact Information

Organization name	J.D. Irving Woodlands LLC		
Contact person	Scott MacDougall		
Address	300 Union Street St. John, New Brunswick E2L 4M3, Canada	Telephone	506-632-6085
		Fax	506-432-0518
		e-mail	MacDougall.Scott@jdirving.com
		Website	

FSC Sales Information

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

Scope of Certificate

Certificate Type	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Single FMU		<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple FMU	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Group			
SLIMF (if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/> Small SLIMF certificate		<input type="checkbox"/> Low intensity SLIMF certificate	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Group SLIMF certificate			
# Group Members (if applicable)				
Number of FMU's in scope of certificate	1			
Geographic location of non-SLIMF FMU(s)	Latitude: 47.237250 Longitude: -68.581444			
Forest zone	<input type="checkbox"/> Boreal		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Temperate	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Subtropical		<input type="checkbox"/> Tropical	
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is:			Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac	
privately managed	1,255,000 acres			
state managed	0			
community managed	0			
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	0	more than 10 000 ha in area	1	
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is included in FMUs that:			Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac	
are less than 100 ha in area	0			
are between 100 ha and 1000 ha in area	0			
meet the eligibility criteria as <i>low intensity</i> SLIMF FMUs	N/A			
Division of FMUs into manageable units:				

Production Forests

Timber Forest Products	Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac
Total area of production forest (i.e. forest from which timber may be harvested)	1,185,000 ac
Area of production forest classified as 'plantation'	0
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by replanting or by a combination of replanting and coppicing of the planted stems	55,826 acres 5%
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by natural regeneration, or by a combination of natural regeneration and coppicing of the naturally regenerated stems	1129174 acres 95%
Silvicultural system(s)	Area under type of management
Even-aged management	
Clearcut (clearcut size range > 35 acres)	17%
Shelterwood	53%

Other:	
Uneven-aged management	
Individual tree selection	30%
Group selection	
Other:	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (e.g. nursery, recreation area, windbreak, bamboo, silvo-pastoral system, agro-forestry system, etc.)	
The sustainable rate of harvest (usually Annual Allowable Harvest or AAH where available) of commercial timber (m3 of round wood)	<i>m³ by species/mix</i> <i>Spruce/Fir: 547,000</i> <i>Hardwood: 558,000</i> <i>Cedar: 53,000</i> <i>White Pine: 4,000</i> <i>Other Softwood:18,000</i> <i>These are based on the 2013-2037 Management Plan.</i>
Non-timber Forest Products (NTFPs)	
Area of forest protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for the production of NTFPs or services	0
Other areas managed for NTFPs or services	0
Approximate annual commercial production of non-timber forest products included in the scope of the certificate, by product type	<i>Unknown, but relatively minor</i>
Explanation of the assumptions and reference to the data source upon which AAH and NTFP harvest rates estimates are based:	
Species in scope of joint FM/COC certificate: <i>Scientific/ Latin Name (Common/ Trade Name)</i>	
<i>red, black, white and Norway spruces</i> <i>balsam fir,</i> <i>hemlock,</i> <i>northern white cedar,</i> <i>white and red pines,</i> <i>white and black ash,</i> <i>American beech,</i> <i>white and yellow birch,</i> <i>red and sugar maples,</i> <i>northern red oak,</i> <i>aspens/poplars</i>	

FSC Product Classification

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

Conservation Areas

Total area of forest and non-forest land protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for conservation objectives		15,700 acres		
High Conservation Value Forest/ Areas				
High Conservation Values present and respective areas:			Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac	
	Code	HCV Type	Description & Location	Area
<input type="checkbox"/>	HCV1	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g. endemism, endangered species, refugia).		
<input type="checkbox"/>	HCV2	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant large landscape level forests, contained within, or containing the management unit, where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance.		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV3	Forests or areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems.	Yankeetuladi St Francis Floodplain Orchard Bog Cross Lake Fen	153 699 534 618
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV4	Forests or areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g. watershed protection, erosion control).	Long Lake Smelt Fishery Chase Lakes	931 1283
<input type="checkbox"/>	HCV5	Forests or areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g. subsistence, health).		
<input type="checkbox"/>	HCV6	Forests or areas critical to local communities' traditional cultural identity (areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in cooperation with such local communities).		
Total Area of forest classified as 'High Conservation Value Forest/ Area'			4218 ac (6 sites) that MNAP mapped as HCVF acres (to be refined as part of CAR 2009.3)	

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A – All forestland owned or managed by the applicant is included in the scope.
<input type="checkbox"/> Applicant owns and/or manages other FMUs not under evaluation.
<input type="checkbox"/> Applicant wishes to excise portions of the FMU(s) under evaluation from the scope of certification.

Explanation for exclusion of FMUs and/or excision:		
Control measures to prevent mixing of certified and non-certified product (C8.3):		
Description of FMUs excluded from, or forested area excised from, the scope of certification:		
Name of FMU or Stand	Location (city, state, country)	Size (<input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac)

8. Annual Data Update

8.1 Social Information

Number of forest workers (including contractors) working in forest within scope of certificate (differentiated by gender):		
# of male workers	63	# of female workers 3
Number of accidents in forest work since last audit	Serious: # 0	Fatal: # 0

8.2 Annual Summary of Pesticide and Other Chemical Use

Commercial name of pesticide/ herbicide	Active ingredient	Quantity applied annually (kg or lbs)	Size of area treated during previous year	Reason for use
Rodeo	Glyphosate	2364.33 gallons	4372.52 acres	Conifer release in planted stands
Entree	Ethoxylated tallow amine	1480.11 gallons	4372.52 acres	Conifer release in planted stands
Arsenal ac	Imazapyr	10 gallons	1279.50 acres	Conifer release in planted stands
Oust xp	Sulfometuron	848 ounces	1032.10 acres	Conifer release in planted stands

Pesticide Application Note: The treatment area size for 2013 was characterized by a total program of approximately 4400 acres. All of these acres were treated for a region typical release of planted conifers from raspberry and hardwood competition utilizing a combination of the surfactant Entrée, combined with the Glyphosate product Rodeo. In a cross section of these same areas grass competition was of special note and a trial of the chemical Oust was mixed in for application. In another cross section of the same acres the chemical Arsenal was mixed in for the control of maple competition.