

# 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
18-20 October 2022
DATE OF REPORT FINALIZATION
28 November 2022

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

**SCS**global  
SERVICES  
Setting the standard for sustainability™

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 type="checkbox"/> 2 <sup>nd</sup> annual evaluation	<input checked="" 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 .....	5
3. CHANGES IN MANAGEMENT PRACTICES .....	11
4. RESULTS OF EVALUATION .....	12
4.1 Definitions of Major CARs, Minor CARs and Observations .....	12
4.2 History of Findings for Certificate Period.....	12
4.3 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations .....	12
4.4 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations .....	14
5. STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS .....	14
5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted .....	15
5.2 Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Evaluation Team Responses .....	15
6. CERTIFICATION DECISION .....	16
7. ANNUAL DATA UPDATE .....	16

## SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY

### 1. General Information

#### 1.1 Evaluation Team

<b>Auditor name:</b>	Kyle Meister	<b>Auditor role:</b>	Audit Team Leader
<b>Qualifications:</b>	<p>Kyle Meister is an FSC Forest Management (FM) and Chain of Custody (COC), Sustainable Biomass Partnership, and Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil Supply Chain Certification Lead Auditor with SCS Global Services. He has conducted FSC FM pre-assessments, evaluations or surveillance audits in Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Indonesia, India, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Spain, and all major forest producing regions of the United States. He has conducted COC assessments in Bolivia, Canada, Panama, and the United States (California, Georgia, Kentucky, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia). Mr. Meister has successfully completed CAR Lead Verifier, ISO 9001:2008 Lead Auditor, SA8000 Social Systems Introduction and Basic Auditor, RSPO Supply Chain Lead Auditor, SBP Lead Auditor, and FSC Lead Auditor and Trainer Training Courses. He holds a B.S. in Natural Resource Ecology and Management and a B.A. in Spanish from the University of Michigan; and a Master of Forestry from the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies.</p>		
<b>Auditor name:</b>	Dan Simonds	<b>Auditor role:</b>	Team Auditor/ Local expert
<b>Qualifications:</b>	<p>Mr. Simonds is an independent forester, consultant, and environmental systems auditor with expertise in the application and certification of the major forest product standards (Forest Management and Chain of Custody), including FSC, SFI, PEFC, and ISO 14001. He is a Certified Forester (SAF #3655), a Licensed Professional Forester (Maine #883), an Environmental Management System Lead Auditor, a Chain of Custody Lead Auditor (FSC, SFI, PEFC), and a Forest Management Lead Auditor (FSC and SFI). He has personally led over 250 audits to the standards noted above; and involved in managing, reviewing, and supervising several thousand others.</p>		

#### 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	2
C. Number of days spent by any technical experts (in addition to amount in line A)	0
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 and check all that apply based on type of certificate.</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Forest Stewardship Standard(s), including version: FSC-US Forest Management Standard, V1-0
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FSC Trademark Standard (FSC-STD-50-001 V2-0)
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SCS COC indicators for FMEs, V8-0
	<input type="checkbox"/> FSC standard for group entities in forest management groups (FSC-STD-30-005), V1-1
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: FSC Pesticides Policy (FSC-POL-30-001, V3)

### 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> 18 October 2022	
FMU/location/ sites visited	Activities/ notes
FME office (Nashville Plantation)	Opening Meeting: Introductions, client update, review scope of evaluation, audit plan, intro/update to FSC and SCS standards, confidentiality and public summary, conformance evaluation methods and tools, review of open CARs/OBS, emergency and security procedures for evaluation team, final site selection.
Field visits (full audit team)	1. T10, R6: ¼ mile of road closure at property acquired in 2020.

	<p>Old stream crossing was pulled and stream banks stabilized with riprap to allow for free passage of aquatic organisms. Old road was bermed from either side to control access and seeded to allow for natural vegetation to recolonize the area.</p> <p>2. MH7097 (Craigville): harvest on FME lands adjacent to private property (MPS3723A). Private landowner abutting the FMU needed to be consulted over installing a road for access and to confirm the property boundaries. Landowner also wanted to sell stumpage, which the FME purchased. Inspected the property boundary, log decks, and FME harvest site. FME parcel was harvested first and has a different location for its log decks than the stumpage tract. Observed log deck labeled with unit number, which is evidence of maintaining chain of custody. Inspected log deck for sorting, which is done by species group, grade, and length to facilitate loading and delivery to the purchasing mill. Inspection of retention islands and individually retained trees within harvest unit. Reasons for retention include wildlife trees such as individual wind-firm Eastern white pine, and natural features such as vernal pools or patches of younger trees.</p>
<p>Field visits (Meister)</p>	<p>3. MH07315W: clearcut of semi-natural stand with modified harvest in riparian area. New road installed in 2021 for access and stream crossing installed to grade in 2022. Inspection of crossing to confirm grade and use of riprap. Cross-drains installed 100 ft away from crossing. Stream management zone (SMZ) is 150 ft in width. No-harvest zone established at 50 ft. mark and harvest allowed in outer 100 feet. Observed broad-based dips at approaches to crossing. Inspection of riparian harvest area confirms installation of harvest trails 60-ft apart in which all trees were harvested within the trail and the trail margins were thinned. Overall impact in the outer-zone of riparian buffer was a 40% removal. Inspection of clearcut area and observation of retained patches and wind-firm Eastern white pines. Interviews with two owner-operators (i.e., contractors) and inspection of machines. Observed first aid kits, spill kits, fire extinguishers, SDS, fire suppression systems, communications equipment, and overall good working machinery.</p> <p>4. MH7345-40: commercial thinning of planted Norway spruce stand with Red spruce in outer margins of unit. Site was infested at some point with white pine boll weevil and thinning was targeting poorly formed, forked, suppressed trees. No issues observed with thinning quality or residual damage. Interviews with one owner-operator (i.e., contractors) and inspection of machine. Observed first aid kit, spill kit, fire extinguishers, SDS, communications equipment, fire suppression system, and overall good working machinery.</p>
<p>Field visits (Simonds)</p>	<p>1. T6R10 road closure site: Otter Brook crossing.</p>

	<p>Decommissioned road and stream crossing. Discussion and demonstration of adaptive road access strategy. ¼ mile of road surface fully retired, stabilized, and discontinued – including stream crossing and adjacent wetland riparian area.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. MPS 3723A/MHO 7097C2: Clearcut harvest (2022) in MW stand. Active harvest operating on adjacent, private stumpage sale (out of scope). BMP implementation is verified. Road upgrade and extension with conventional drainage (no crossings). Observed and reviewed layout and patch retention strategy (islands). Observed and discussed roundwood sorting and utilization standards (HW pulp, cedar, s/f logs &amp; pulp piled on site).</li> <li>3. T7R6 HW regeneration Inspected and discussed 3 adjacent treatments in Tolerant HW stand: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2012 Seed Tree (Beech whip) in FPA separation zone</li> <li>• 2003 OSR – effective composition shift in small pole HW stand</li> <li>• Island retention patch (Beech dominated TH residual)</li> <li>• Discussed general HW management policy and retention strategy.</li> </ul> </li> <li>4. T7R6 – MHO7268SI Active Harvest – Allagash Enterprises (operator on site) – Reviewed Rx briefing and GIS guidance (on board tablet). Contractor SOP &amp; training record. Clearcut harvest in HS stand. Road to road layout on moderate slope. BMP implementation is verified. Discussed Rx adaptation and stand layout process. Regeneration plan (planting) linked to site/stand evaluation.</li> <li>5. MHO7297C Completed harvest (fall 2021) – ME partial cut in high quality tolerant hardwood stand. Moderate slopes. BMP implementation: negligible stand/site damage. Discussed Rx guidance and communication of objectives: Standard Rx Guide – discussed use as coaching for harvesting crews</li> </ol>
<p><b>Date:</b> 19 October 2022</p>	
<p><b>FMU / location / sites visited</b></p>	<p><b>Activities / notes</b></p>
<p>Field visits (Meister)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. MH6635R9 (Hewes Brook Rd): new road construction and crossing. Old road downslope was put to bed and old piped crossing was removed. The new road is higher in elevation and had a bridged crossing installed. Cross-drains installed on either approach to the crossing at ~100 yards. Additional cross-drain planned and installation site marked with blue tape, which is about 100 feet from the stream. Inspection of new crossing confirms use of broad-based dips to keep water off of the bridge. Old crossing has riprap installed and old road was planted with alder and spruce in some locations.</li> <li>2. MH06619R1 (Hewes Brook Rd): road extension to be added in 2022-23. Old road will be put to bed, which was installed under prior ownership. New road has been cleared of</li> </ol>

	<p>vegetation, which was felled for pulp.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. MH6517D: planned hardwood seed-tree removal to occur in 2022-23. Site had seed-tree preparation step done in 2012. Overstory seed-trees consist of sugar maple, yellow birch, and poplar with good form. Intermediate treatment (mechanical control of beech seedlings). Retention island designated in 2012 will be left. Discussion on potential for precommercial thinning versus overstory removal.</li> <li>4. MHE6516A2: hardwood seed-tree removal completed in 2022. Seed-tree preparation step was done 2011-12. Overstory trees were whole-tree harvested: felling by harvester, skidding by grapple, delimbed at landing, and higher-grade logs were cut-to-length at landing. Pulp-grade material is now chipped off-site. Tops and other slash were skidded back into the site and used to meet BMPs on trails. Inspection confirms understory is now free to grow and consists of sugar maple, yellow birch, white birch, fire cherry, beech, and red spruce. Observed snags and midstory sized sugar maple and yellow birch scattered as retention over site. Island retention observed on inoperable slope.</li> <li>5. MH06516: precommercial thinning (PCT) of adjacent planted Norway spruce and natural hardwood stands. Planted stand was thinned from 1800 trees/ha to 1500 trees/ha in 2022, and hardwood cut. Hardwood stand had beech targeted for felling to favor release of sugar maple, yellow birch, and poplar.</li> <li>6. MH06516: salvage harvest of natural hardwood blowdown conducted in 2010. Natural red spruce regeneration was released. An herbicide treatment was done in 2012 to further release the regeneration and an excellent response was observed. Inspection of stream management zone (SMZ) to review modifications to minimum BMPs to accommodate salvage operation; normal 50 ft equipment exclusion zone was maintained or reduced to 25 ft or less in certain areas to reach material. Maine Forest Service was consulted on harvest and did a post-harvest inspection. Site harvested in frozen conditions. Salvage within SMZ consisted of red spruce, northern white-cedar, and hardwood species. Regeneration observed consisted of balsam fir, northern white-cedar, red spruce, and hardwood species. Discussion on research and training opportunities.</li> <li>7. MH6516B2: planned northern hardwood harvest to be conducted 2022-23. Observation of stick nest in yellow birch tree for broad-winged hawk. 100 m buffer installed around nest and incorporated into retention island designated on slope. Observation of harvest unit map confirms buffer and retention area.</li> <li>8. MH6516B2: interview with harvesting contractor and inspection of machinery and trailer in hardwood harvest unit.</li> </ol>
--	---



	<p>Observed first aid kit, spill kit, fire extinguishers, SDS, communications equipment, fire suppression system, and overall good working machinery.</p> <p>9. Interview with harvesting contractor and inspection of machinery in thinning unit of planted Norway spruce. Observed first aid kit, spill kit, fire extinguishers, SDS, communications equipment, fire suppression system, and overall good working machinery.</p>
<p>Field visits (Simonds)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. MHO 6440A1: Completed harvest in upland hardwood site (2020). Heavy shelterwood removal (classed “Seed Tree”), with clear objectives for regeneration of high-quality tolerant hardwoods (birch &amp; maple) and inhibition of diseased beech. Harvest used in-woods chipping for product recovery – utilizing off-road “chipper box” clearings (still scheduled for rehabilitation &amp; re-stocking). BMP implementation and site impact mitigation is verified. Structural retention strategy, using “island” patches is evident. An example (ID’d as potential vernal pool) was inspected. Marketing challenges related to limited low-grade markets was discussed. In-woods chipping is currently not active, and s/f pulp marketing has recently re-started.</li> <li>2. MHO 6341AU/ZO Completed summer (2021) clearcut harvest of softwood site. Original harvest layout was adjacent to a powerline right-of-way, and modified at request of Versant Power. Modifications are intended to reduce blowdown hazard and contribute to community values with minor cost to the FME &amp; utility. Site access involved sensitive soil adaptation and challenging BMP implementation. Inspected block layout details adjacent to low order, intermittent stream zones. Riparian protection zone (“no track wash”) is providing both shade and reducing soil impacts in marginal conditions. An example of non-conforming wheel ruts was observed and confirmed the appropriate incident reporting &amp; resolution process. CSW Report: EMS Incident Details by Program V.2 (record 9/17/21). Additional demonstration of recently updated incident reporting system. Example: INC 000696 – reviewed/rejected by supervisor. 2nd example (hose break/spill) closed. Discussed function of weekly staff meeting and process review.</li> <li>3. Plantation release site (not ID’d; adjacent to MHO 6341AU): Spruce plantation established in 2021, following clearcut harvest, site preparation. Release 2022 (appropriately buffered from minor watercourse). Verified BMP implementation &amp; sensitive site impact mitigation.</li> <li>4. West Side Road – McLean Brook crossing: Recent full replacement of 35’ bridge. Steel stringers over wooden deck. Riprap abutments &amp; armored ditch. Inspected and confirmed BMP conformance and ditch relief (in extremely wet</li> </ol>

	<p>conditions). Discussed access obligations to nearby camps and homes.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. MHO 6343S4 – Cross Lake shoreland &amp; camplot community, Duck Cove: Inspected completed winter harvest (Jan-Feb 2022) in lakeside mixedwood site, immediately adjacent to a developed lakeshore and public road.</li> <li>6. MHO 6339S5, Huntress Road: Irregular shelterwood treatment was completed in a highly visible and sensitive area, immediately adjacent to camps, homes, great pond shoreland, and a public road. Considerable adaptive design and mitigation measures were demonstrated and observed. Communications and planning strategy for this challenging operation was discussed. BMP implementation verified.</li> <li>7. MHO 6366S Completed (2020) Commercial Thinning (CT) harvest in spruce plantation. Stand age 25 on high site (SM/Be). Discussed stocking and growth objectives, as well as plans for future management. BMP implementation verified.</li> <li>8. Long Lake Slope (HCV): Observed, discussed, and reviewed HCV strategy for protection of water quality (lakeside camp springs), late successional HW stands, and smelt streams.</li> <li>9. Caswell Ribbed Fen (HCV) – Unique #20897: Observed and inspected an identified and mapped Unique Area, newly designated as HCV. Discussed the FME’s adaptation in anticipation of new P9 requirements in the updated FSC FM standard. Confirmed staff support and training for rare plant communities and habitats.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Date:</b> 20 October 2022</p>	
<p><b>FMU/location/ sites visited</b></p>	<p><b>Activities/ notes</b></p>
<p>Document review (Meister) FME office (Nashville Plantation)</p>	<p>Forest chain of custody, growth &amp; yield, ownership record-keeping system, updates to HCV classification, etc.</p>
<p>Field visits (Simonds)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. MHO 7326J – Webbertown: Completed harvest (summer 2022) in complex mixedwood site, immediately adjacent to an open wetland and minor headwater streams. Harvest was planned and executed following recent purchase of the property from an adjacent landowner. Part of ongoing effort to consolidate and rationalize FME holdings. Harvest treatment uses “Multiple Entry (ME)” technique in HS stand type, allowing commercial management in sensitive site. A graduated riparian buffer was employed allowing access to areas adjacent to overlapping riparian zones. BMP implementation and mitigation of impacts to sensitive site is verified.</li> <li>2. MHO 7376 – Merrill Twp: Completed harvest (winter 21-22) of mixed hardwood stand, accessed via temporary stream crossing. Harvest type is irregular shelterwood, which varies across the site to adapt to the variable composition. Stand objectives include regeneration and a long re-entry interval; retaining structural complexity. Advantages and importance of</li> </ol>

	<p>Outcome Based Forestry (OBF) are evident in this stand layout – following natural vegetation and habitat patterns. BMP implementation is verified – including a temporary stream crossing (decommissioned and stabilized) and considerable riparian protection measures.</p> <p>3. MHO 7301 – T7R5: Clearcut harvest (2018) and plantation establishment (2022), including site preparation. This site is immediately adjacent to a public highway, requiring considerable adaptive mitigation for aesthetic and other factors. Mechanical site preparation (rolling and disc trenching) was used to reduce non-merchantable residual, as well as improve the visual appearance of the young stand. Chemical treatment was ground based. Discussed modifications to roadside treatment protocols to allow full and appropriate management of this highly visible site.</p>
<p>FME office (Nashville Plantation)</p>	<p>Closing Meeting Preparation: Auditor(s) take time to consolidate notes and confirm evaluation findings</p>
	<p>Closing Meeting: Brief summary of audit activities, present preliminary findings, confidentiality, SCS/FSC dispute policy, timeline for report, and discuss next steps.</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 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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: 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> (including any evidence submitted)	<p><b>2021:</b> Maine staff with some assistance from corporate Fish &amp; 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.</p> <p><b>2022:</b> HCV Assessment Process</p> <p>INTERNAL TRAINING</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Our company will provide training to relevant field staff that will help them recognize species and natural community types of outstanding conservation value as well as sites that perform critical ecosystem services or contain significant cultural, archaeological, or historic significance that would be appropriate to include as a High Conservation Value Area (HCVA).</li> </ol> <p>STAKEHOLDER INPUT</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On an annual basis, the Regional Forester will petition qualified stakeholders for their knowledge of areas of outstanding conservation value. In addition, the Chief Naturalist will gather best available information from experts within the State (such as the Maine Natural Areas Program staff, Maine Inland Fish and Wildlife staff, as well as the Maine Heritage Preservation Commission) for information on areas that may contain High Conservation Values within the management unit.</li> </ol> <p>ASSESSMENT OF POTENTIAL HCVA SITES</p>

	<p>3. An assessment of any new information gathered from staff or stakeholders will be undertaken to assure they retain the qualities necessary (HCV1-6) before they are delineated in a GIS layer (Unique Areas layer) as HCVA along with a specific conservation management plan and will be flagged for monitoring at a frequency of less than or equal to 5 years. Irving Woodlands, LLC considers s rarity ranks of G1-G2 for species and natural communities for inclusion as HCV’s as well as any Old Growth (Type I or II) stands uncovered during operations or review of best available information from credible outside sources.</p>
<p><b>SCS review</b></p>	<p>Reviewed spring environmental training records (August 4, 2022), which confirms implementation of training on relevant HCV topics. Reviewed email records from stakeholders consulted on updates to HCV assessment and designations, such as Maine government agencies.</p> <p>Finally, the updated HCV assessment was reviewed. New areas were designated, including fens, bogs, rare plant sites, and RTE invertebrate species. These areas are included in GIS, along with the HCV designation and the management recommendation for its maintenance/ enhancement. All new HCV designations were already under conservation or protection via the FME’s unique areas program, as described in the FMP. It is expected that the finalized version of the FSC-US Forest Management Standard, V2-0, will have an accompanying nationally adapted FSC-US HCV Toolkit (or other similar guidance document). The current update to HCV designations may help to ensure conformance to updated HCV requirements.</p>
<p><b>Status of CAR:</b></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed  <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major  <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i></p>

#### 4.4 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations

No new findings were detected.

### 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"/> <i>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.</i>	
<b>Summary of Outreach Activities Conducted (Check all that apply):</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Face to face meetings	<input type="checkbox"/> Notice published on relevant websites
<input type="checkbox"/> Phone calls	<input type="checkbox"/> Local radio announcements
<input type="checkbox"/> Email, or letter	<input type="checkbox"/> Local customary notice boards
<input type="checkbox"/> Notice published in the national and/or local press	<input type="checkbox"/> Social media broadcast
<input type="checkbox"/> Other ( <i>describe</i> ):	
<b>Stakeholder Comment (Negative, positive, and neutral)</b>	<b>SCS Response</b>
Irving is the best to work for because they pay us every week and will help us. They listen. I’ve done work for three other companies in the region. We’ve had no work accidents.	The audit team reviewed signed contracts with all contractors interviewed, which confirms that safety and training requirements are addressed. The audit team reviewed the updated proforma, which demonstrates the base pay rate increases and that the FME is above the industry average. The
I started working for Irving in the spring. The pay is better. They also provide a fuel surcharge and mileage bonus. I attended their spring contractor training.	
Irving has a good safety net- when times are bad, they provide steady work. The working conditions are comparable to other companies in the region. There are some things that I like	

<p>better about Irving, and some things that I like better about other companies I have worked for.</p>	<p>audit team also reviewed the alignment bonus spreadsheet, which demonstrates weekly payment of bonuses. Interviews with multiple contractors demonstrate that communication with the FME is good.</p>
<p>I've worked for other landowners in the region, and the pay was decent. Irving has been good with pay and, if we struggle, we keep them informed and they will compensate us. They have a fuel surcharge, bonus system, and spring training available to us. They are good people to work with. If you have problems, they will listen.</p>	
<p>The pay is fair; we had a 4% increase in January. There are travel distance and other types of bonuses in the bonus system. There is good communication between the company and contractors. We also attend spring training. It is a good company to work with. We get to be home at the end of the workday. They like to see healthy contractors.</p>	

## 6. Certification Decision

<p>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.</p>	<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p><b>Comments:</b></p>	

## 7. Annual Data Update

<p><input type="checkbox"/> No changes since previous evaluation.</p>	
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information in the following sections has changed since previous evaluation.</p>	
<p><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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Social Information</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pesticide and Other Chemical Use  <input type="checkbox"/> Production Forests  <input type="checkbox"/> FSC Product Classification  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conservation &amp; High Conservation Value Areas  <input type="checkbox"/> Areas Outside of the Scope of Certification</p>

### 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-	<b>Fax</b>	506-632-4421
	0240	<b>e-mail</b>	<a href="mailto:MacDougall.Scott@jdirving.com">MacDougall.Scott@jdirving.com</a>
	United States of America	<b>Website</b>	<a href="http://www.jdirving.com">www.jdirving.com</a>

### FSC Sales Information

<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FSC Sales contact information same as above.</p>
---



<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>		<b>Units: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac</b>	
privately managed	512,000 ha		
state managed	0		
community managed	0		
<b>Total forest area in scope of certificate</b> <i>(Is also equal to [productive area] + [conservation area])</i>	512,000 ha		
<b>Prior year total forest area in scope of certificate</b> <i>(from prior year report)</i>	512,000 ha		
<b>Has Total forest area changed from prior year?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Change from prior year <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, there was a change from prior year. Explain change:		
<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: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac</b>	
are less than 100 ha in area			
are between 100 ha and 1000 ha in area			
meet the eligibility criteria as <i>low intensity</i> SLIMF 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.			

**Social Information**

<b>Number of forest workers (including contractors) working in forest within scope of certificate (differentiated by gender):</b>		
Male workers: 522 woodlands and mills	Female workers: 34	
<b>Number of accidents in forest work since previous evaluation:</b>	Serious: 0	Fatal: 0

**Pesticide and Other Chemical Use**

<input type="checkbox"/> FME does not use pesticides.				
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 Extra	Metsulfuron-methyl	927 lbs	3709 ac	Site Prep
Roundup Pro Concentrate	Glyphosate	250 gals	333 ac	Site prep
Arsenal AC	Imazapyr	453 gals	3709 ac	Site Prep
Escort XP	Metsulfuron methyl	169 lbs	3709 ac	Site Prep
Rodeo	Glyphosate	3623 gals	7859 ac	Release
Arsenal AC	Imazapyr	1.6 gals	206 ac	Release
Oust XP	Sulfometuron methyl	1474 lbs.	7859 ac	Release
Milestone	Aminopyralid	7.5 gals	137 ac	Site Prep Test

**Production Forests**

Timber Forest Products	Units: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac
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	37,235 7.5%
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by natural regeneration, or by a combination of natural regeneration and coppicing of the naturally regenerated stems	455,565 92.5%
Silvicultural system(s)	Area under type of management
Even-aged management	5-year averages –2017 – 2021)
Clearcut (clearcut size range:        )	23%
Shelterwood	52%
Other:	6%
Uneven-aged management	

Individual tree selection	19%
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: (Scientific / Latin Name and Common / Trade Name)</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
<b>Total amount</b> 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 <b>6526.7 ha</b> 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).	Chase Bk Lakes Wiggins Bk Rare Plant Stn Fox Bk Rare Plant Stn Big Rapids Rare Plant Stn Schoolhouse Rapids Rare Plants Tomah Mayfly Site (St Croix Stream) Tomah Mayfly Site (Pratt Lake Stream) Popple Island Rapids	569.8 3.3 9.7 61.7 53.2 26.9 65.6 49.8
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.	Orchard Bog Cross Lake Fen Dead Brook Deadwater White Pine Chementicook Ribbed Fen Deer Lake Fen Smith Pond Bog Beaverbrook Fen California Bog Caswell Ribbed Fen Cross Lake Ribbed Fen	248 243.5 21.6 37.2 293.2 186.5 43.6 42.7 31.5 243.5

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	182.9 174.2
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>2558.4</b>

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

<input type="checkbox"/> <i>N/A – All forestland owned or managed by the certificate holder is included in the scope.</i>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Certificate holder owns and/or manages other FMUs not under evaluation.</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Certificate holder wishes to excise portions of the FMU(s) under evaluation from the scope of certification.</i>	
<b>Note:</b> <i>Excision cannot be applied to CW/FM certificates.</i>	
<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 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.
<b>Control measures to prevent mixing of certified and non-certified product (C8.3):</b>	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.

<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 checked="" 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

