

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

## *Irving Woodlands, LLC*

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

Maine, USA

### SCS-FM/COC-00121N

Client Address	PO Box 240, Fort Kent, ME 04743-0240, United States of America
Client Contact	Scott MacDougall: <a href="mailto:MacDougall.Scott@jdirving.com">MacDougall.Scott@jdirving.com</a>
Client Website	<a href="http://www.jdirving.com">www.jdirving.com</a>

CERTIFIED	EXPIRATION
08 December 2019	07 December 2024

DATE OF FIELD EVALUATION
19-21 October 2021
DATE OF REPORT FINALIZATION
10 May 2022

SCS Contact:  
**Brendan Grady** | Director  
 Forest Management Certification  
 +1.510.452.8000  
[bgrady@scsglobalservices.com](mailto:bgrady@scsglobalservices.com)



2000 Powell Street, Ste. 600, Emeryville, CA 94608 USA  
 +1.510.452.8000 main | +1.510.452.8001 fax  
[www.SCSglobalServices.com](http://www.SCSglobalServices.com)

## Foreword

Cycle in annual surveillance evaluations				
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <sup>st</sup> annual evaluation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2 <sup>nd</sup> annual evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <sup>rd</sup> annual evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 <sup>th</sup> annual evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (expansion of scope, Major CAR audit, special audit, etc.):
<b>Name of Forest Management Enterprise (FME) and abbreviation used in this report:</b>				
Irving Woodlands, LLC (IWLLC) or FME, J.D. Irving (JDI)				

All certificates issued by SCS under the aegis of the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) require annual evaluations 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 evaluations are not intended to comprehensively examine the full scope of the certified forest operations, as the cost of a full-scope evaluation would be prohibitive and it is not mandated by FSC evaluation protocols. Rather, annual evaluations 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 evaluation);
- Follow-up inquiry into any issues that may have arisen since the award of certification or prior to this evaluation; 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 evaluation.

### 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 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 evaluation. Section B contains more detailed results and information for required FSC record-keeping or the use by the FME.

## Table of Contents

---

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY .....	4
1. GENERAL INFORMATION .....	4
1.1 Evaluation Team.....	4
1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation .....	4
1.3 Applicable Standards .....	4
1.4 Conversion Table English Units to Metric Units.....	5
2. CERTIFICATION EVALUATION PROCESS .....	5
2.1 Evaluation Itinerary, Activities, and Site Notes.....	5
2.2 Evaluation of Management Systems .....	8
3. CHANGES IN MANAGEMENT PRACTICES.....	9
4. RESULTS OF EVALUATION .....	9
4.1 Definitions of Major CARs, Minor CARs and Observations.....	9
4.2 History of Findings for Certificate Period.....	9
4.3 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations .....	10
4.4 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations .....	11
5. STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS .....	12
5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted .....	12
5.2 Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Evaluation Team Responses .....	13
6. CERTIFICATION DECISION .....	13
7. ANNUAL DATA UPDATE .....	13

## SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY

### 1. General Information

#### 1.1 Evaluation Team

<b>Auditor name:</b>	Brendan Grady	<b>Auditor role:</b>	Lead Auditor
<b>Qualifications:</b>	Mr. Grady is the Director, Forest Management Certification for SCS. In that role, he provides daily management and quality control for the program. He participated as a team member and lead auditor in forest certification audits throughout the United States, Europe, and South East Asia. Brendan has a B.S. in Forestry from the University of California, Berkeley, and a Juris Doctorate from the University of Washington School of Law. Brendan is a member of the State Bar of California, and was an attorney in private practice focusing on environmental law before returning to SCS.		
<b>Auditor name:</b>	Gordon Moore	<b>Auditor role:</b>	Technical Expert
<b>Qualifications:</b>	Mr. Moore is a consulting forester in North Central Maine. As a consultant he has worked on inventory for carbon sequestration and served as a technical expert for forest certification. He also teaches basic silviculture for the Low Impact Forestry project of MOFGA for the Maine Forest Service. From 1991 to 2016 Moore worked for the Maine Forest Service.		

#### 1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation

A. Number of days spent on-site for evaluation	3
B. Number of auditors participating in on-site evaluation	1
C. Number of days spent by any technical experts (in addition to amount in line A)	1
D. Additional days spent on preparation, stakeholder consultation, and follow-up	2
<b>E. Total number of person days used in evaluation</b>	<b>8</b>

#### 1.3 Applicable Standards

All applicable FSC standards are available on the websites of FSC International ([www.fsc.org](http://www.fsc.org)) or SCS Global Services ([www.SCSglobalServices.com](http://www.SCSglobalServices.com)). All standards are available on request from SCS Global Services via the comment form on our website. When no national standard exists for the country/region, SCS Interim Standards are developed by modifying SCS's Generic Interim Standard to reflect forest management in the region and by incorporating relevant components of any Draft Regional/National Standard and comments from stakeholders. More than one month prior to the start of the field evaluation, SCS Draft Interim Standards are provided to stakeholders identified by FSC International, SCS, forest managers under evaluation, and the FSC National or Regional Office for comment. SCS's COC indicators for FMEs are based on the most current versions of the FSC Chain of Custody Standard, FSC Standard for Group Entities in Forest Management Groups (FSC-STD-30-005), and FSC Accreditation Requirements. "Applicable standards" are all FSC standards with which the certified entity must comply, not just the standards selected for evaluation this year.

Standards applicable <i>NOTE: Please include the full standard name and Version number</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Forest Stewardship Standard(s), including version: FSC-US Forest Management Standard (v1.0), July 8, 2010
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FSC Trademark Standard (FSC-STD-50-001 V2-0)
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SCS COC indicators for FMEs, V8-0

<i>and check all that apply based on type of certificate.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> FSC standard for group entities in forest management groups (FSC-STD-30-005), V1-1
	<input type="checkbox"/> Other:

### 1.4 Conversion Table English Units to Metric Units

Length Conversion Factors		
To convert from	To	multiply by
Mile (US Statute)	Kilometer (km)	1.609347
Foot (ft.)	Meter (m)	0.3048
Yard (yd.)	Meter (m)	0.9144
Area Conversion Factors		
To convert from	To	multiply by
Square foot (sq. ft.)	Square meter (m <sup>2</sup> )	0.09290304
Acre (ac)	Hectare (ha)	0.4047
Volume Conversion Factors		
To convert from	To	multiply by
Cubic foot (cu ft.)	Cubic meter (m <sup>3</sup> )	0.02831685
Gallon (gal)	Liter (l)	4.546
Quick reference		
1 acre	= 0.404686 ha	
1,000 acres	= 404.686 ha	
1 board foot	= 0.00348 cubic meters	
1,000 board feet	= 3.48 cubic meters	
1 cubic foot	= 0.028317 cubic meters	

## 2. Certification Evaluation Process

### 2.1 Evaluation Itinerary, Activities, and Site Notes

<b>Date:</b> October 19, 2021	
FMU / location / sites visited	Activities / notes
Dyer Brook Town Office	Opening Meeting: Introductions; client summary of land sales/acquisitions, annual management activities, and stakeholder issues; review scope of evaluation; finalize audit plan; intro/update to FSC and SCS standards; confidentiality and public summary; conformance evaluation methods and review of open CARs/OBS; emergency and security procedures for evaluation team; final site selection.
Field Sites	<u>Site 1, Dyer Brook, MH0743K</u> Open landfill, using existing road. Forestry staff demonstrated new tracking and data system installed '20 spring '21. All pertinent information loaded to operator through tablet in the operator's equipment. Real time connection. ARC GIS system forestry staff claims better GPS also. Rare and or unusual plants and habitats may be loaded into tablets in the field and placed in a work order.

	<p>Site is Hardwood site which has had multiple entries. Currently completed harvest targeted the worst first, removing Balsam Fir, Aspen, low grade Hardwood (a lot of Beech removed). Most Beech were and are infected with Beech Bark Nectria, however all smooth bark beech were retained. Staff indicated that this is an example of JDI Beech management.</p> <p>This harvest was conducted in December '20 – January '21. Resulted in little ground disturbance. BMP's were implemented on the site including water bars, brush water bars, hay mulch and seeding with DOT mixture. Witnessed a discontinued temporary stream crossing which was revegetated and stable. The location of stream crossings such as this one are determined by JDI forestry staff. Trail locations are only determined by the operator where there is no water. The staff indicated that in this district about 80 to 85% of the harvests are CTL, however this harvest was whole tree.</p> <p><u>Site 2, Bridge and roadway on Grand Lake Road at Umcolcus Stream, Block 7186</u></p> <p>Bridge used approach construction termed a rock sandwich. This technique allows water infiltration beyond bankfull elevation and allows water movement through and below the rock sandwich. The old road outside the buffer alongside Umcolcus stream is discontinued using an excavator to move buckets of material onto the old road surface.</p> <p><u>Site 3, Replacement of 3, 36" pipes with 1, 7-foot pipe on the Grand Lake Road.</u></p> <p>This was a rebuild of an existing road. Though the pipe does meet state cross sectional area requirements the pipe is still creating a constriction of flow, however a substrate is establishing itself on the floor of the pipe. The crossing was appropriate with respect to state law.</p> <p><u>Site 4, MH07307 Planted stand (White Spruce) Commercial Thin</u> Property was acquired from HC Haynes who acquired it from P&amp;C who acquired it from Frasier Paper in 1997. A harvest was conducted on the site which was completed in March 2021. The harvest was a crown release (crop tree release). The prescription was to release 900 trees per hectare. Planted stand was created by Frasier Paper. Only studwood quality product was removed from site. Small tops, limbs and leaf material was left on site.</p> <p><u>Site 5, South Brook Falls and Late Successional Site</u> South Brook falls protected area. Marked trail leads to small falls. Associated with falls is a small 75 acre site with Late Successional softwood. The site is not old growth though it does have at least 24 trees per acre in the 12"-16" range (mostly Red Spruce). The site is steep and would prove difficult to work at the bottom of the slope is well within the buffer zone for the stream. In addition, the soils at the base of the slope are wet making for more difficulties.</p>
--	---

	10% of the overall landscape is in this late successional category. Discussed JDI process for identifying and designating unique areas.
<b>Date:</b> October 20, 2021	
<b>FMU / location / sites visited</b>	<b>Activities / notes</b>
St. John Office	Review of documentation, including chain of custody, logging contracts, training records, chemical use and ESRAs, stakeholder log, monitoring records,
	<p><u>Site 1 68258 Rock Brook</u>                  Site of a “final harvest” clear cut. The clearcut size was allowed under Outcome Based Forestry. The site will be treated chemically to site prep the ground prior to planting with spruce. The harvest entered a riparian area which it surrounds. A 100 foot buffer was marked along a small unnamed stream where 40% of the timber was removed. The landowner has concerns about spruce budworm in the area and removed mature Balsam Fir within the buffer area to mitigate the potential problem.                  Interviewed an operator at the site, had fire suppression equipment on board and first aid kit. He was working within an enclosed cab but had PPE (hardhat with him in the cab)</p> <p><u>Site 2, 6838 S1</u>                  Herbicide site, cut, roll, plant. Treatment 1, 5<sup>th</sup> of August using aerial tank mix. Trying to use Imazypry rather than Glyphosate. Process cut year 1, year 2 roll and trench then spray in August, possible spray in the spring of year 3 and plant in spring. Aerial spray has a 100 foot setback from water bodies, 1 mile from any building. Current planting on land base 65% White Spruce, 20% Norway Spruce and the remainder Black or Red Spruce. Nursery tree stock comes from the Sussex tree lab and seed nursery. The original seed came from Northern Maine and New Brunswick.</p> <p><u>Site 3, 6826B3</u>                  Shelterwood second entry. Mixed wood site leaning toward hardwood. 1st entry left a lot of Balsam Fir, 2<sup>nd</sup> entry remove Balsam Fir. Site is currently stocked with pole stage Sugar Maple, Yellow Birch in the better soil near the top of the stand and Yellow Birch, Red Maple near the lower or lesser soil near the bottom of the stand. More softwood occurs near the bottom and wetter part of the stand.</p> <p><u>Site 4, Cross drain culvert ¼ mile from St Francis gate</u>                  Problem cross drain culvert. Multiple reason for culvert failure. Silt is partially blocking intake of culvert. Ditch is eroding, banks are eroding where harvest machinery disturbed the stabilization efforts, probably not enough cross drainage on the long slope. JDI</p>

	plans on addressing the issue when next road maintenance is conducted. Management problem, not environmental at present.
<b>Date:</b> October 21, 2021	
<b>FMU / location / sites visited</b>	<b>Activities / notes</b>
	<p><u>Site 1, Cross Lake Fen</u>                      Unique natural area. Ribbed Fen or Patterned Fen. Established by JDI as HCVF in 1997. Thinning harvest was conducted in the Black Spruce wetland near the bog using a small CTL system. JDI wetland people are aware of the importance of the site and monitor. There appeared to be no soil disturbance or compaction residual from the CTL operation though this was conducted about 25 years ago.</p> <p><u>Site 2, Planted stand thinning operation.</u>                      Thinning operation in a 21 year old White Spruce planted stand. PCT was conducted on the site 10 years ago. Current operation will reduce stocking from 1750 Trees Per Hectare to 800-900 trees per Hectare (323 TPA).                      Interview with contractor, Owns processor (JD 1270). Runs three shifts a day. Has several employees. Fire prevention equipment on the machine as is first aid kit. Contractor is CLP trained however employee that was talked to is not.</p> <p><u>Site 3, 15-5 Joe Dubay road</u>                      5' pipe is place below grade and is currently creating a substrate in the pipe with in a very short time. This was put in place to replace a crushed pipe that had been in place. The site is at a chronic beaver problem site. Food source appear to be gone and so the beaver problem may not exist for some time at this location. The site only partially stabilized however an attempt has been made to hay mulch and rip rap the ends of the pipe.</p> <p><u>Site 4, Cross drain pipe</u>                      There is a great amount of exposed mineral soil at the site, however this is a cross drain on a low topography site. There is no channel and water is filtering through the substrate in the woods. This is a non-maintenance issue and it was recommended by JDI staff that they implement their ongoing checklist process to monitor the site.</p>
Ashland Mill office	Closing Meeting Preparation: Auditor(s) consolidate notes, deliberate, and confirm evaluation findings.
Ashland Mill office	Closing Meeting: Review preliminary findings (potential non-conformities and observations) and discuss next steps.

## 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 reviewing documents and records, interviewing FME personnel and



contractors, implementing sampling strategies to visit a broad number of forest cover and harvest prescription types, observing implementation of management plans and policies in the field, and collecting and analyzing stakeholder input. When there is more than one team member, each member 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, interviews, stakeholder comments, and reviewed documents and records. Where consensus among 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

- There were no significant changes in the management and/or harvesting methods that affect the FME’s conformance to the FSC standards and policies.
- Significant changes occurred since the last evaluation that may affect the FME’s conformance to FSC standards and policies (*describe*):

### 4. Results of Evaluation

#### 4.1 Definitions of Major CARs, Minor CARs and Observations

*Major CARs:* Major nonconformances, either alone or in combination with nonconformances of all other applicable 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 before a certificate can be awarded. If Major CARs arise after an operation is certified, the timeframe for correcting these nonconformances is typically shorter than for Minor CARs. Certification is contingent on the certified FME’s response to the CAR within the stipulated time frame.

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

*Observations:* These are subject areas where the evaluation team concludes that there is conformance, but either future nonconformance may result due to inaction or the FME could achieve exemplary status through further refinement. Action on observations is voluntary and does not affect the maintenance of the certificate. However, observations can become CARs if performance with respect to the indicator(s) triggering the observation falls into nonconformance.

#### 4.2 History of Findings for Certificate Period

FM Principle	Cert/Re-cert Evaluation (2019)	1 <sup>st</sup> Annual Evaluation (2020)	2 <sup>nd</sup> Annual Evaluation (2021)	3 <sup>rd</sup> Annual Evaluation (2022)	4 <sup>th</sup> Annual Evaluation (2023)
No findings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

P1	OBS 1.1.a				
P2					
P3					
P4	OBS 4.4.b				
P5					
P6		OBS 6.5.b			
P7					
P8					
P9			Obs 9.1.a		
P10					
COC for FM					
Trademark					
Group					
Other					

### 4.3 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations

<b>Finding Number: 2020.1</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):	
<b>Deadline</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification/recertification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> 12 months or next regularly scheduled audit, whichever comes first ( <i>surveillance or re-evaluation</i> ) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation – response is optional <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):	
<b>Primary standard reference:</b>	FSC-US, V1-0, 6.5.b
<b>Other applicable standard reference(s):</b>	
<b>Non-Conformity</b> (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):	
<p>Nearly all drainage features observed were installed and functioning per Best Management Practices (BMP). However, the auditor observed three drainage culverts located between mile 9 and 10 on the Lane Brook Road that were not effectively draining water from one side of the road to the other. In these cases, better grading around the mouth of the culverts would allow for more efficient flow of water. In one instance, the culvert seemed to be set too high (perched). JDI utilizes a road construction checklist “Road Construction Site Audit &amp; Quality Assurance”, which is completed post road construction by the Road Construction Supervisor. However, it appears that the checklist is not being used effectively in these instances.</p>	
<b>Corrective Action Request</b> (or Observation):	
<p>The FME should ensure that cross drains on newly constructed roads are installed in a way that meet or exceed Maine Best Management Practices (BMPs) (Best Management Practices for Forestry: Protecting Maine’s Water Quality p. 70-71) and minimize erosion.</p>	
<b>FME response</b> (including any	<b>December 2020:</b> Prior to commencement of road construction and maintenance activities in the spring of 2021, JDI superintendents in charge of those activities

<i>evidence submitted)</i>	will provide BMP training on the installation of new and maintenance of, existing drainage culverts to all contractors and staff that are involved with these activities. The focus on this training will be to ensure that natural water flow is maintained or improved in ditch lines where activities are to be conducted.
<b>SCS review</b>	<b>December 2020:</b> The FME’s actions will be evaluated at the next audit. <b>October 2021:</b> Multiple crossings and culvert installations were reviewed during the 2021, and these were done in compliance Maine BMPs. Some culverts were in need of maintenance after their initial installation, but none posed any environmental risks. See site notes for more details. On this basis, the observation is closed.
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i>

#### 4.4 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations

<b>Finding Number: 2021.1</b>	
<b>Finding and Deadline</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Major CAR:</b> Pre-condition to certification/recertification <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Major CAR:</b> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Minor CAR:</b> 12 months or next regularly scheduled audit, whichever comes first ( <i>surveillance or re-evaluation</i> ) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Observation</b> – response is optional <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other</b> and deadline (specify):	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):	
<b>Standard and Indicator</b>	FSC-US Forest Management Standard, 9.1.a
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Non-Conformity Evidence</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Observation Justification and/or Explanation</b> Some environmental features that make up the FME’s unique areas are present in identified HCVF areas and also in other geographic areas of the FMU. An example includes ribbed fens, some of which are designated as HCVF, and others not. Currently the HCVF areas were designated where there was a concentration of these values. FME should consider that the draft FSC-US standard is more focused on identifying High Conservation Values, and then protecting them wherever they are identified on the landscape. Therefore the expected identified HCV areas may need to be expanded when the standard changes. This is not currently a non-conformance since these features receive the same protection under the FMEs unique areas program regardless of whether they are in a mapped HCVF area or not.	
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Non-Conformity Corrective Action Request</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Observation; no Corrective Action is required</b>  With the impending revision to the FSC-US National Standard, more focus will be placed on protecting HCVs regardless of where they occur in the management unit. In preparation for that change, the FME should review and reconsider directly how their High Conservation Values are defined, and how these HCVs are being protected, regardless of whether they occur in the currently designated HCVFs or not.	

<b>FME response</b> <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	Maine staff with some assistance from corporate Fish & Wildlife personnel will review the proposed changes in HCV guidance. An assessment of present HCV's and potential additions will be undertaken after that review.
<b>SCS review</b>	
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i>

## 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 FME 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).

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.

### 5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted

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. Stakeholder groups who are consulted as part of the evaluation include FME management and staff, consulting foresters, contractors, lease holders, adjacent property owners, local and regionally-based social interest and civic organizations, purchasers of logs harvested on FME forestlands, recreational user groups, tribal members and/or representatives, members of the FSC National Initiative, members of the regional FSC working group, FSC International, local and regionally-based environmental organizations and conservationists, and forest industry groups and organizations, as well as local, state, and federal regulatory agency personnel and other relevant groups.

## 5.2 Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Evaluation Team Responses

The table below summarizes the comments falling within scope of the standard 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.

<input type="checkbox"/> FME has not received any stakeholder comments from interested parties (who are not members of the enterprise under evaluation) as a result of stakeholder outreach activities during this annual evaluation.	
<b>Summary of Outreach Activities Conducted (Check all that apply):</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Face to face meetings <input type="checkbox"/> Phone calls <input type="checkbox"/> Email, or letter <input type="checkbox"/> Notice published in the national and/or local press <input type="checkbox"/> Notice published on relevant websites <input type="checkbox"/> Local radio announcements <input type="checkbox"/> Local customary notice boards <input type="checkbox"/> Social media broadcast	
Stakeholder Comment (Negative, positive, and neutral)	SCS Response
Logging contractors working with the company generally reported a positive working relationship. The company has assisted in securing loans for purchasing logging equipment, and payment for services rendered was always prompt.	Noted as evidence of conformance.

## 6. Certification Decision

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

## 7. Annual Data Update

<input type="checkbox"/> No changes since previous evaluation.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information in the following sections has changed since previous evaluation.

<input type="checkbox"/> Name and Contact Information <input type="checkbox"/> FSC Sales Information <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scope of Certificate <input type="checkbox"/> Non-SLIMF FMUs <input type="checkbox"/> Social Information	<input type="checkbox"/> Pesticide and Other Chemical Use <input type="checkbox"/> Production Forests <input type="checkbox"/> FSC Product Classification <input type="checkbox"/> Conservation & High Conservation Value Areas <input type="checkbox"/> Areas Outside of the Scope of Certification
---	--

**Name and Contact Information**

<b>Organization name</b>	Irving Woodlands, LLC (IWLLC)		
<b>Contact person</b>	Scott MacDougall		
<b>Address</b>	PO Box 240	<b>Telephone</b>	506-632-7777
	Fort Kent, ME 04743-0240	<b>Fax</b>	506-632-4421
	United States of America	<b>e-mail</b>	<a href="mailto:MacDougall.Scott@jdirving.com">MacDougall.Scott@jdirving.com</a>
		<b>Website</b>	<a href="http://www.jdirving.com">www.jdirving.com</a>

**FSC Sales Information**

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

**Scope of Certificate**

<b>Certificate Type</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Single FMU	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple FMU
	<input type="checkbox"/> Group	
<b>SLIMF (if applicable)</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Small SLIMF certificate	<input type="checkbox"/> Low intensity SLIMF certificate
	<input type="checkbox"/> Group SLIMF certificate	
<b># Group Members (if applicable)</b>		
<b>Number of FMUs in scope of certificate</b>	1	
<b>Geographic location of non-SLIMF FMU(s)</b>	Latitude & Longitude: 47.221541°, -68.755697°	
<b>Forest zone</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Boreal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Temperate
	<input type="checkbox"/> Subtropical	<input type="checkbox"/> Tropical
<b>Area in scope of certificate which is:</b> Units: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac		
privately managed	512,000	
state managed	0	
community managed	0	
<b>Total forest area in scope of certificate</b>	512,000	

<i>(Is also equal to [productive area] + [conservation area])</i>			
<b>Prior year total forest area in scope of certificate</b> <i>(from prior year report)</i>		519,000	
<b>Has Total forest area changed from prior year?</b>		<input type="checkbox"/> No Change from prior year <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, there was a change from prior year. Explain change: Land sales	
<b>Number of FMUs in scope that are:</b>			
less than 100 ha in area		100 - 1000 ha in area	
1000 - 10 000 ha in area		more than 10 000 ha in area	1
<b>Total forest area in scope of certificate which is included in FMUs that:</b>			<b>Units:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac
are less than 100 ha in area			
are between 100 ha and 1000 ha in area			
meet the eligibility criteria as <i>low intensity SLIMF</i> FMUs			
<b>Division of FMUs into manageable units:</b>			
The forestlands have also been grouped geographically into five economic zones that are used to guide transportation and potential silvicultural investments decisions; the zones include Allagash, Blackstone, Estcourt, Oakfield and Rocky Brook.			

**Non-SLIMF FMUs (Group or Multiple FMU Certificates)**

Name	Contact information	Latitude/ longitude of Non-SLIMF FMUs	

**Social Information**

<b>Number of forest workers (including contractors) working in forest within scope of certificate (differentiated by gender):</b>		
male workers: # 548 woodlands and mills	female workers: 38	
<b>Number of accidents in forest work since previous evaluation:</b>	Serious: 0	Fatal: 0

**Pesticide and Other Chemical Use**

<input type="checkbox"/> <i>FME does not use pesticides.</i>				
Commercial name of pesticide / herbicide	Active ingredient	Quantity applied since previous evaluation (kg or lbs.)	Total area treated since previous evaluation (ha or ac)	Reason for use
Oust XP	Sulfometuron methyl	454 lbs	2423 ac	Site Prep

Accord XRTII	Glyphosate	1817 gals	2423 ac	Site prep
Arsenal AC	Imazapyr	227 gals	2423 ac	Site Prep
Escort XP	Metsulfuron methyl	.49 gals	72 ac	Site Prep Test
Rodeo	Glyphosate	4198 gals	9106 ac	Release
Arsenal AC	Imazapyr	71 gals	9106 ac	Release
Oust XP	Sulfometuron methyl	2185 lbs.	11654 ac	Release

**Production Forests**

<b>Timber Forest Products</b>	<b>Units: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac</b>
Total area of production forest (i.e. forest from which timber may be harvested)	492,800
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	35,491 7.2%
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by natural regeneration, or by a combination of natural regeneration and coppicing of the naturally regenerated stems	457,309 92.8%
<b>Silvicultural system(s)</b>	<b>Area under type of management</b>
Even-aged management	5-year averages –2016 – 2020)
Clearcut (clearcut size range      )	25%
Shelterwood	55%
Other:	4%
Uneven-aged management	
Individual tree selection	17%
Group selection	
Other:	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (e.g. nursery, recreation area, windbreak, bamboo, silvo-pastoral system, agro-forestry system, etc.)	
<b>Non-timber Forest Products (NTFPs)</b>	
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	Unknown, but relatively minor
<b>Species in scope of joint FM/COC certificate: <i>Scientific/ Latin Name (Common/ Trade Name)</i></b>	
Red spruce, <i>Picea rubens</i> Black spruce, <i>Picea mariana</i> White spruce, <i>Picea glauca</i> Norway spruce, <i>Picea abies</i> Balsam fir, <i>Abies balsamea</i>	



Hemlock, <i>Tsuga canadensis</i> Northern white cedar, <i>Thuja occidentalis</i> Eastern white pine, <i>Pinus strobus</i> Red pine, <i>Pinus resinosa</i> White ash, <i>Fraxinus americana</i> Black ash, <i>Fraxinus nigra</i> American beech, <i>Fagus grandifolia</i> White birch, <i>Betula papyrifera</i> Yellow birch, <i>Betula alleghaniensis</i> Red maple, <i>Acer rubrum</i> Sugar maples, <i>Acer saccharum</i> Northern red oak, <i>Quercus rubra</i> Big leaf aspen, <i>Populus grandidentata</i> Trembling aspen, <i>Populus tremuloides</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

*\*Note: W1, W2, and W3 product groups usually do not require a separate evaluation to FSC-STD-40-004 (COC) if processing occurs in the field for FM/COC and CW/FM certificate types. N1-N10 (NTFPs) are eligible to be sold with FSC claims under FM/COC certification if reported here. Bamboo and NTFPs derived from trees (e.g. cork, resin, bark) may be eligible for FM/COC and CW/FM certification. NTFPs used for food and medicinal purposes are not eligible for CW/FM certification. Check with SCS if you have any products intended to be sold with an FSC claim outside of any of these categories.*

**Conservation and High Conservation Value Areas**

Conservation Area	Units: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac
Total amount of land in certified area protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for conservation objectives (includes both forested and non-forested lands).*	97,095 ha total Conservation Forest 7,233 ha Unique Area (this is an internal designation and is included in the total area reported)

*\*Note: Total conservation and HCV areas may differ since these may serve different functions in the FME’s management system. Designation as HCV may allow for active management, including commercial harvest. Conservation areas are typically under passive management, but may undergo invasive species control, prescribed burns, non-commercial harvest, and other*

management activities intended to maintain or enhance their integrity. In all cases, figures are reported by the FME as it pertains local laws & regulations, management objectives, and FSC requirements.

High Conservation Value Forest / Areas			Units: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac
Code	HCV Type	Description & Location	Area
HCV1	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g. endemism, endangered species, refugia).		
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.		
HCV3	Forests or areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems.	Yanketuladi St Francis Floodplain Orchard Bog Cross Lake Fen Dead Brook Deadwater White Pine	62 283 216 250 22
HCV4	Forests or areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g. watershed protection, erosion control).	Long Lake Smelt Fishery Long Lake Slopes Chase Lakes	202 174 519
HCV5	Forests or areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g. subsistence, health).		
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).		
<b>Total area of forest classified as 'High Conservation Value Forest / Area'</b>			<b>1728</b>

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

<input type="checkbox"/> N/A – All forestland owned or managed by the applicant is included in the scope.	
<input checked="" 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.	
<b>Explanation for exclusion of FMUs and/or excision:</b>	The parent company of Irving Woodlands LLC (IWLLC) is J.D. Irving Limited, corporately located in New Brunswick, Canada. J.D. Irving Limited owns 3.2 million acres of forestland in Canada and Maine. In total, these lands are divided into five operating

	<p>districts, four of which are located in Canada. Only those lands under the control of the JD Irving Maine operating district within the State of Maine are within the scope of this certification evaluation; Canadian lands and nurseries are outside the scope of this certificate. The rationale for partial certification, when initially getting FSC certified was due largely to differing regional standards between the Maritime and Northeast regions. The company did not believe that the Maritime standard, which encompassed the balance of its ownership, was an appropriate normative standard for industrial/commercial forest management. J.D. Irving had been actively engaged in the Maritime standards development process. Given the circumstances outlined above and commitments to other certifications currently used in Canada, J.D. Irving is continuing with their current certification approach. The balance of the ownership is Canadian lands which are managed under the same system as the Maine Woodlands. Because of this common management system, there are no concerns about the forest management of these non-certified lands in Canada.</p>	
<b>Control measures to prevent mixing of certified and non-certified product (C8.3):</b>	<p>The other areas that are not within the scope of this Certificate are located in Canada and are geographically separate from these areas located in Maine.</p>	
<b>Description of FMUs excluded from or forested area excised from the scope of certification:</b>		
<b>Name of FMU or Stand</b>	<b>Location (city, state, country)</b>	<b>Size ( <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac)</b>
JD Irving Canada	New Brunswick Canada	728,000
JD Irving Canada	Nova Scotia Canada	50,000