



RA-Cert Division Headquarters
65 Millet St. Suite 201
Richmond, VT 05477 USA
Tel: 802-434-5491
Fax: 802-434-3116
www.rainforest-alliance.org

Audit Managed by:
United States Regional Office
19 Bridge Square
Northfield, MN 55057 USA
Tel: (507)-663-1115
Fax: (507)-663-7771
Contact person: Lawson
Henderson
Email: lhenderson@ra.org



ACCREDITED
FSC-ACC-004

FM-02 -19 April2012



Forest Management
Certification Reassessment
Report for:

Downeast Lakes Land Trust
In
Grand Lake Stream, Maine USA

Report Finalized: September 10, 2012
Audit Dates: June 26-28, 2012
Audit Team: Charles Levesque

Certificate code: RA-FM/COC-002682
Certificate issued: October 16, 2012
Certificate expiration: October 15, 2017

Organization Contact: Mark Berry,
Executive Director
Address: 3 Water St. PMB 75
Grand Lake Stream,
ME 04637

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----------|
| INTRODUCTION..... | 3 |
| 1. SCOPE OF THE CERTIFICATE | 4 |
| 1.1. Scope of the certificate | 4 |
| 1.2. Exclusion and/or Excision of areas from the scope of certificate | 7 |
| 2. ASSESSMENT PROCESS | 8 |
| 2.1. Certification Standard Used..... | 8 |
| 2.2. Assessment team and qualifications | 8 |
| 2.3. Assessment schedule (including pre-assessment and stakeholder consultation) | 8 |
| 2.4. Evaluation strategy..... | 8 |
| 2.5. Stakeholder consultation process..... | 9 |
| 3. ASSESSMENT FINDINGS AND OBSERVATIONS..... | 11 |
| 3.1. Stakeholder comments received | 11 |
| 3.2. Summary of Evaluation Findings for FSC Forest Criteria..... | 12 |
| 3.3. Identified nonconformances and Nonconformity Reports (NCRs)..... | 19 |
| 3.4. Conformance with applicable nonconformity reports(Reassessments Only)..... | 19 |
| 3.5. Observations..... | 19 |
| 3.6. Certification Recommendation | 22 |
| 4. CLIENT SPECIFIC BACKGROUND INFORMATION | 23 |
| APPENDIX I: Public summary of the management plan..... | 27 |
| APPENDIX II: Certification standard conformance checklist (confidential) | 30 |
| Principle 2: Tenure and Use Rights and Responsibilities | 33 |
| Principle 3: Indigenous Peoples' Rights | 35 |
| Principle 4: Community Relations and Worker's Rights..... | 37 |
| Principle 5: Benefits from the Forest | 42 |
| Principle 6: Environmental Impact..... | 47 |
| Principle 7: Management Plan | 64 |
| Principle 8: Monitoring and Assessment | 68 |
| Principle 9: Maintenance of High Conservation Value Forests | 72 |
| Principle 10: Plantation management..... | 75 |
| APPENDIX III: Chain-of-Custody Conformance (confidential) | 76 |
| APPENDIX V: List of all visited sites(confidential) | 81 |
| APPENDIX VI: Detailed list of stakeholders consulted (confidential) | 84 |
| APPENDIX IX: FME map(optional)..... | 86 |

INTRODUCTION

This report presents the findings of an independent certification assessment conducted by a team of specialists representing the Rainforest Alliance. The purpose of the assessment was to evaluate the ecological, economic and social performance of Downeast Lakes Land Trust (DLLT) forest management as defined by the Principles and Criteria established by the Forest Stewardship Council™(FSC®).

The Rainforest Alliance founded its previous SmartWood program in 1989 to certify responsible forestry practices and has grown to provide a variety of auditing services. Rainforest Alliance certification and auditing services are managed and implemented within its RA-Cert Division. All related personnel responsible for audit design, evaluation, and certification/verification/validation decisions are under the purview of the RA-Cert Division, hereafter referred to as Rainforest Alliance or RA.

This report contains four main sections of information and findings and several appendices. Sections 1 through 4 of the report plus appendix I will become public information about the forest management operation and comprise a public summary of the full report that may be distributed by Rainforest Alliance or the FSC to interested parties. The remainder of the appendices are confidential, to be reviewed only by authorized Rainforest Alliance and FSC personnel bound by confidentiality agreements. A copy of the public summary of this report can be obtained on the FSC website at <http://info.fsc.org/>.

A key purpose of the Rainforest Alliance auditing is to recognize conscientious land stewardship through independent evaluation and certification of forestry practices. Forestry operations that attain FSC certification may use Rainforest Alliance and FSC trademarks for public marketing and advertising.

Standard Conversions

1 mbf = 5.1 m³
1 cord = 2.55 m³
1 gallon (US) = 3.78541 liters

1 inch = 2.54 cm
1 foot = 0.3048 m
1 yard = 0.9144 m
1 mile = 1.60934 km
1 acre = 0.404687 hectares

1 pound = 0.4536 kg
1 US ton = 907.185 kg
1 UK ton = 1016.047 kg

1. SCOPE OF THE CERTIFICATE

1.1. Scope of the certificate

| | | | |
|--|--|--------------|----------------------|
| Forest management enterprise (FME) information: | | | |
| FME legal name: | Downeast Lakes Land Trust | | |
| FME legal jurisdiction: | Washington County, Maine | | |
| Type of legal entity | 501(c)3 nonprofit corporation | | |
| Contact person (public): | Mark Berry | | |
| Address: | 3 Water Street. PMB 75, Grand Lake Stream, 04637 | | |
| Tel/FAX/email: | 207-796-2100 / mberry@downeastlakes.org | | |
| Website: | Downeastlakes.org | | |
| Reporting period: | Previous Jan-Dec Calendar year | Dates | Jan. 2011- Dec. 2011 |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| A. Scope of Forest Area | | | |
| Type of certificate: single FMU | | SLIMF Certificate not applicable | |
| Group or Multiple FMU | Number of group members (if applicable): | | N/A |
| | Total number of Forest Management Units FMUs: (if applicable, list each below): | | N/A |
| | FMU size classification within the scope: | | |
| | | # of FMUs | total forest area of FMU's |
| | < 100 ha | | ha |
| | 100 – 1000 ha | | ha |
| | 1000 – 10 000 ha | | ha |
| | > 10 000 ha | | ha |
| | SLIMF FMUs | | ha |
| Group Certificate: List of FMUs included in the certificate scope provided in Appendix IV-a: | | | |
| Single/Multi-FMU Certificate: List of each FMU included in the certificate scope: | | | |
| FMU Name/Description | Area | Forest Type | Location Latitude/Longitude ¹ |
| Farm Cove Community Forest (FCCF) | 13,652 ha | Hemlock, SpruceFir Hardwoods, lowlands | N: 45.22311 W: -67.87808 |

| | | | |
|---|----------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|
| B. FSC Product categories included in the FM/CoC scope (FSC-STD-40-004a) | | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Level 1 | Level 2 | Species |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | W1 Rough Wood | W1.1 Roundwood (logs) | <i>Tsuga Canadensis</i> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | W1 Rough Wood | W1.1 Roundwood (logs) | <i>Picea spp. and Abies balsamea</i> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | W1 Rough Wood | W1.1 Roundwood (logs) | <i>Pinus strobus</i> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | W1 Rough Wood | W1.1 Roundwood (logs) | <i>Betula papyrifera</i> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | W1 Rough Wood | W1.1 Roundwood (logs) | <i>Mixed Hardwood</i> |

¹The center point of a contiguous FMU or group of dispersed properties that together comprise a FMU in latitude and longitude decimal degrees with a maximum of 5 decimals.

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | W1 Rough Wood | W1.1 Roundwood (logs) | <i>Picea spp.</i> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | W1 Rough Wood | W1.1 Roundwood (logs) | <i>Populus spp.</i> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | W1 Rough Wood | W1.1 Roundwood (logs) | <i>Mixed species</i> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | W1 Rough Wood | W1.2 Fuel wood | <i>Mixed Species</i> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | W1 Rough Wood | W1.3 Twigs | <i>Mixed species</i> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | W2 Wood charcoal | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | W3 Wood in chips or particles | W3.1 Wood chips | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | W4 Impregnated/treated wood | W4.1 Impregnated roundwood | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | W5 Solid wood (sawn, chipped, sliced or peeled) | W5.1 Fitches and boules | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Non Wood Forest Products | [enter from FSC-STD-40-004a v2-0] | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | other | | |

C. Species and Sustainable Rate of Harvest (AAC)

| Latin name | Common trade name | Annual allowable cut | Actual harvest (2011) | Projected harvest for next year |
|--|-------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|
| <i>Tsuga Canadensis</i> | Hemlock | | 11619m3 | 12135 |
| <i>Picea spp.</i> | Spruce | | 249 m3 | 300 |
| Mixed Species | Mixed Hardwood | | 4604 m3 | 5000 |
| <i>Picea spp. and Abies balsamea</i> | Spruce Fir | | 1917 m3 | 1800 |
| <i>Pinus strobus</i> | White Pine | | 22 m3 | 20 |
| | | | m3 | |
| | | | m3 | |
| | | | m3 | |
| | | | m3 | |
| | | | m3 | |
| Total AAC | | 19,255m3 | 18411 m3 | 19,255 m3 |
| Total annual estimated log production: | | | 18411m3 | |
| Total annual estimates production of certified NTFP: | | | 0 m3 | |
| (list all certified NTFP by product type): None | | | 0 m3 | |

Planned annual harvest level is 8,000 cords for all species, measured as roundwood exclusive of biomass, and is based upon plan objectives to increase timber stocking across the ownership to target levels. Using a conversion factor of 2.4069 cubic meters per cord gives 19,255 m³. Actual harvest reported is based on roundwood, as is the AAC. Biomass volume for 2011 was 39,850 tons.

D. FMU Info

| | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Forest zone | Temperate |
| Certified Area under Forest Type | |
| • Natural | 13,652 ha |
| • Plantation | 0 ha |
| Stream sides and water bodies | 217 Linear Kilometers |

E. Forest Area Classification

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Total certified area (land base) | 13,652 ha |
| 1. Total forest area | 13,303 ha |
| a. Total production forest area | 11,512 ha |
| b. Total non-productive forest area (no harvesting) | 1442 ha |
| • Protected forest area (strict reserves) | 1442 ha |

| | | | |
|---|----------------------|-----------|--------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas protected from timber harvesting and managed only for NTFPs or services | 0 ha | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remaining non-productive forest | 0 ha | | |
| 2. Total non-forest area (e.g., water bodies, wetlands, fields, rocky outcrops, etc.) | | | 349 ha |
| F. Ownership/Management Classification | | | |
| Ownership Tenure | | | Private ownership |
| Management Tenure (list primary tenure type for group certificates) | | | Private management |
| Certified area that is: | Privately managed | 13,652 ha | |
| | State/Public managed | 0 ha | |
| | Community managed | 0 ha | |
| G. Forest Regeneration | | | |
| Area or share of the total production forest area regenerated naturally | | | 100 % |
| Area or share of the total production forest area regenerated by planting or seeding | | | 0 ha |
| Area or share of the total production forest are regenerated by other or mixed methods (describe) | | | 0 ha |

| H. High Conservation Values identified via formal HCV assessment by the FME and respective areas | | | |
|---|---|---|----------|
| Code | HCV TYPES ² | Description: | Area |
| HCV1 | Forest areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g. endemism, endangered species, refugia). | Fourth Machias Lake Focus Area – FCCF and Wabassus Tracts. | 1,995 ha |
| HCV2 | Forest 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. | None. Tracts are part of a globally significant forest landscape but do not meet this definition because previous harvest history altered natural patterns of distribution and abundance. | 0 ha |
| HCV3 | Forest areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems. | FCCF SMA NF#16 – 16 acres. FCCF SMA NF#18 - 209 acres. Wabassus SMA# 1 - 2 Acres | 92 ha |
| HCV4 | Forest areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g. watershed protection, erosion control). | None. Forest does provide basic services of nature, but not in critical or unique situations. | 0 ha |
| HCV5 | Forest areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g. subsistence, health). | None. The FCCF and Wabassus tracts are not fundamental to the basic needs of local communities, however, they are essential to the local economy, and therefore indirectly to local well-being. | 0 ha |

²The HCV classification and numbering follows the ProForest HCVF toolkit. The toolkit also provides additional explanation regarding the categories. Toolkit is available at <http://hcvnetwork.org/library/global-hcv-toolkits>.

| | | | |
|---|--|---|------|
| HCV6 | Forest areas critical to local communities' traditional cultural identity (areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in cooperation with such local communities). | None. Given the guidance provided, the FCCF and Wabassus tracts are not specifically critical to the tribe and local community's cultural identity, however, they are an important part of the broader region's natural landscape, which is essential to the local economy and tribe's cultural identity. | 0 ha |
| Number of sites significant to indigenous people and/or local communities | | | 0 |

I. Pesticide Use

FME does not use pesticides. (delete rows below)

1.2. Exclusion and/or Excision of areas from the scope of certificate

| X | Applicability of FSC partial certification and excision policy |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | All forest land owned or managed by the FME is included in the scope of this evaluation. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | FME owns and/or has management involvement in other forest land/properties (forest management units) not being evaluated. If yes, complete sections A & D below. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Is any portion of the forest management unit (s) under evaluation for certification being excised from the scope of the evaluation? If yes, complete sections B, C & D below. Conformance with FSC-POL-20-003 <i>The Excision of Areas from the Scope of Certification</i> shall be documented below. |
| A. Comments / Explanation for exclusion of FMUs from certification: | |
| Finding: N/A | |
| B. Rationale for excision of area from FMU(s) included in scope of evaluation: | |
| <i>Note: Rationale shall be consistent with one of the permitted conditions specified in FSC-POL-20-003, under which such certifications may be permitted.</i> | |
| Finding: N/A | |
| C. Summary of conformance evaluation against requirements of FSC-POL-20-003 | |
| Finding: N/A | |
| D. Control measures to prevent contamination of certified wood with wood from excluded/excised forest areas. | |
| Finding: N/A | |
| Forest Management Units Excluded From Evaluation | |
| Forest area | Location |
| Size (ha) | |

2. ASSESSMENT PROCESS

2.1. Certification Standard Used

| | |
|--|--|
| Forest Stewardship standard Used for assessment: | FSC-US Forest Management Standard Version 1.0, FM-35 - Rainforest Alliance CoC Standard for FMEs 19Apr12 |
| Local Adaptation: (if applicable) | N/A |

2.2. Assessment team and qualifications

| | | | |
|-----------------|---|--------------|------------------------|
| Auditor Name | Charles Levesque | Auditor role | Lead Auditor, Forester |
| Qualifications: | President, Innovative Natural Resource Solutions LLC (founded 1994). Education: B.S.F. in forest management from University of New Hampshire, 1979; ISO 14001 Lead Auditor Training, 2000. Certifications: RABQSA – Lead EMS Auditor – Environmental; Society of American Foresters Certified Forester and Certified Forest Auditor; New Hampshire Licensed Forester #281. Over 30 years of experience in forestry, natural resource consulting, natural resource non-profit management and environmental auditing. Co-author of “Forest Certification Auditing” published by the Society of American Foresters. Has lead or conducted sustainable forest management auditing on over 5 million acres in North American under the Sustainable Forestry Initiative, Forest Stewardship Council and American Tree Farm System since the late 1990s and has lead over 100 chain-of-custody under SFI, FSC and the Programme for the Endorsement of Forest Certification. | | |

2.3. Assessment schedule (including pre-assessment and stakeholder consultation)

| Date | Location /main sites | Main activities |
|--|--|--|
| 6/11/12 – 6/15/12 | Auditor office | Calls to stakeholders, document review and preparation for audit |
| 6/15/12 | Auditor office | Pre-audit conference call with DLLT |
| 6/26/12 | DLLT office and Farm Cove Community Forest | Opening meeting, on-site audit, document review, stakeholder consultation |
| 6/27/12 | Farm Cove Community Forest | On-site audit, document review, stakeholder consultation |
| 6/28/12 | Farm Cove Community Forest | On-site audit, document review, stakeholder consultation, preliminary findings development |
| 6/28/12 | DLLT office | Closing meeting |
| Total number of person days used for the assessment:5.5 = number of auditors participating 1X average number of days spent in preparation, on site and post site visit follow-up including stakeholder consultation 5.5 . | | |

2.4. Evaluation strategy

The DLLT Certificate is a single Forest Management Unit (FMU) Certificate containing 13,641 hectares. As a single FMU Certificate no specific sampling intensity is required.

Field audit sites were chosen to include the following sites to address issues of risk and diversity: current harvesting sites, recent harvested sites, recent past road building, current road building and planned road building, culvert replacements, shoreline and stream buffers, wildlife habitat improvement areas, ecological reserve area and boundary, ATV/snowmobile trails, old-growth area, walking trails, old harvest sites for regeneration, community firewood harvesting areas, abutting camp sites, wetland areas and boundary lines at various locations.

2.5.2 List of management aspects reviewed by assessment team:

| Type of site | Sites visited | Type of site | Sites visited |
|--------------------------|---------------|-------------------------|---------------|
| Road construction | 5 | Illegal settlement | 0 |
| Soil drainage | 10 | Bridges/stream crossing | 8 |
| Workshop | 0 | Chemical storage | 0 |
| Tree nursery | 0 | Wetland | 3 |
| Planned Harvest site | 2 | Steep slope/erosion | 4 |
| Ongoing Harvest site | 1 | Riparian zone | 6 |
| Completed logging | 5 | Planting | 2 |
| Soil scarification | 0 | Direct seeding | 4 |
| Planting site | 2 | Weed control | 0 |
| Felling by harvester | 1 | Natural regeneration | 5 |
| Felling by forest worker | 1 | Endangered species | 1 |
| Skidding/Forwarding | 1 | Wildlife management | 3 |
| Clearfelling/Clearcut | 2 | Nature Reserve | 2 |
| Shelterwood management | 0 | Key Biotope | 0 |
| Selective felling | 7 | Special management area | 5 |
| Sanitation cutting | 5 | Historical site | 1 |
| Pre-commercial thinning | 0 | Recreational site | 4 |
| Commercial thinning | 2 | Buffer zone | 3 |
| Logging camp | 0 | Local community | 1 |

2.5. Stakeholder consultation process

The purpose of the stakeholder consultation strategy for this assessment was threefold:

- 1) To ensure that the public is aware of and informed about the assessment process and its objectives;
- 2) To assist the field assessment team in identifying potential issues; and,
- 3) To provide diverse opportunities for the public to discuss and act upon the findings of the assessment.

This process is not just stakeholder notification, but wherever possible, detailed and meaningful stakeholder interaction. The process of stakeholder interaction does not stop after the field visits, or for that matter, after even a certification decision is made. Rainforest Alliance welcomes, at any time, comments on certified operations and such comments often provide a basis for field assessment.

In the case of DLLT prior to the actual assessment process, a public consultation stakeholder document was developed and distributed by email, FAX and mail. Through input from Rainforest Alliance and DLLT an initial list of stakeholders was developed and public

announcements were distributed to them. This list also provided a basis for the assessment team to select people for interviews (in person or by telephone or through email).

| Stakeholder Type (NGO, government bodies, local inhabitant, contractor etc.) | Stakeholders Notified (#) | Stakeholders consulted directly or provided input (#) |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| National/International NGOs | 41 | 0 |
| Local/Regional NGOs | 5 | 1 |
| Local Community members | 9 | 5 |
| Govt Agency | 23 | 2 |
| Labor Union | 1 | 0 |
| FSC US and Rainforest Alliance | 13 | 1 |
| Forestry/Forest Products NGOs | 27 | 0 |
| Forest Industry | 53 | 5 |
| Academia | 27 | 0 |
| Other | 30 | 5 |

3. ASSESSMENT FINDINGS AND OBSERVATIONS

3.1. Stakeholder comments received

The stakeholder consultation activities were organized to give participants the opportunity to provide comments according to general categories of interest based upon the assessment criteria. The table below summarizes the issues identified by the assessment team with a brief discussion of each based upon specific interview and/or public meeting comments.

| FSC Principle | Stakeholder comment | Rainforest Alliance response |
|---|--|---|
| P1: FSC Commitment and Legal Compliance | <p>1 – There is no record of DLLT violations of forestry or water quality law or regulations.</p> <p>2 – DLLT is very cooperative with conservation easement monitoring and has not had a violation of the terms of the various conservation easements.</p> | <p>1 – No response necessary.</p> <p>2 – No response necessary.</p> |
| P2: Tenure & Use Rights & Responsibilities | <p>1 – Though not required, all the DLLT land is open to the public which is very helpful for business for the camp owners and lodge and other lodging facilities in Grand Lake Stream and nearby communities.</p> | <p>1 – DLLT’s mission is to manage its land as a community forest. All of its forest management is centered on this openness.</p> |
| P3 – Indigenous Peoples’ Rights | <p>1 - No comments received.</p> | <p>1 - No response necessary.</p> |
| P4: Community Relations & Workers’ Rights | <p>1 – DLLT is a great community neighbor and supporter. The land is open and DLLT holds community activities like education sessions for adults and children and fun activities like the canoe/kayak race in August on West Grand Lake.</p> <p>2 – DLLT treats its workers fairly and with respect. DLLT is a good place to work for employees and contractors.</p> | <p>1 – DLLT mission and activities are centered on its commitment to the community as a central point of its work both in forestry and recreation activities on the land.</p> <p>2 – DLLT has detailed employee policies and relies on its main forestry contractor to work directly with contractors to carry out forestry and road building/maintenance operations.</p> |
| P5: Benefits from the Forest | <p>1 – DLLT personnel provide timber to local sawmill. They are good to work with as a supplier. (Multiple wood markets replied in this fashion).</p> <p>2 – Loggers enjoy working on DLLT lands. Forester is good to work with and land trust is a supportive landowner.</p> | <p>1 – All markets used by DLLT in selling its timber are local no matter if solid wood, pulp or wood energy markets.</p> <p>2 – DLLT is careful in hiring its field personnel.</p> |
| P6: Environmental Impact | <p>1 – Forestry impacts have been minimal and consistent with conservation easement restrictions.</p> | <p>1 – DLLT management plans and operations are designed to have minimum environmental impact consistent with the conservation easements on the land.</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| P7: Management Plan | 1 – No comments received. | 1 – No response necessary. |
| P8: Monitoring & Assessment | 1 – No comments received. | 1 – No response necessary. |
| P9: Maintenance of High Conservation Value Forest | 1 – There have been no forestry activities in the ecological area as required under the conservation easement. DLLT is looking to improve areas and reduce impacts where possible such as developing plans to move boat launch to a location with less chance of water quality effects. | 1 – DLLT management plans seek to assure minimum impact on HCVF areas. A harvest being planned near the ecological reserve HCVF area was well outside the reserve area. |
| P10 - Plantations | N/A | N/A |

3.2. Summary of Evaluation Findings for FSC Forest Criteria

| PRINCIPLE 1: Compliance with law and FSC Principles | | | | | |
|---|---|----------------|--|----------|--|
| Criterion 1.1 Respect for national and local laws and administrative requirements | | | | | |
| Conformance | X | Nonconformance | | NCR #(s) | |
| Finding (strength/weakness) | The Downeast Lakes Land Trust (DLLT) staff and contractors understand the laws and administrative requirements they must work under to carry out forestry operations. They demonstrated an understanding and respect for those laws. There have been no violations. | | | | |
| Criterion 1.2 Payment of legally prescribed fees, royalties, taxes and other charges | | | | | |
| Conformance | X | Nonconformance | | NCR #(s) | |
| Finding (strength/weakness) | The only fees, royalties, taxes and other charges required of DLLT is the property tax for the unincorporated places in Maine and the excise tax for large landowners. DLLT has paid these taxes for the most recent year. | | | | |
| Criterion 1.3 Respect for provisions of international agreements | | | | | |
| Conformance | X | Nonconformance | | NCR #(s) | |
| Finding (strength/weakness) | DLLT understands the international agreements that might affect their operations in Maine. All the wood harvested goes to local markets and they are confident they are complying with the agreements though most address international trade of natural resource materials. | | | | |
| Criterion 1.4 Conflicts between laws and regulations, and the FSC P&C | | | | | |
| Conformance | X | Nonconformance | | NCR #(s) | |
| Finding (strength/weakness) | There are no conflicts between the laws and regulations that govern the DLLT operations and the FSC Principles and Criteria. | | | | |
| Criterion 1.5 Protection of forests from illegal activities | | | | | |
| Conformance | X | Nonconformance | | NCR #(s) | |
| Finding (strength/weakness) | DLLT is a community forest and, as such, there are many volunteers on the board, committees and friends in the community that watch over the activities on the forest and look for problems. This system is a strength of the DLLT management. Additionally, the state Forest Service and Fish and Wildlife agencies have enforcement personnel on the ground to assure compliance with laws. There have been no known illegal activities on the DLLT property. | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|----------------|--|----------|--|
| Criterion 1.6 Demonstration of a long-term commitment to the FSC P&C | | | | | |
| Conformance | X | Nonconformance | | NCR #(s) | |
| Finding (strength/weakness) | DLLT has a written commitment to the FSC Standard on its website and is proud of that achievement as evidenced by the staff and board members articulation of this. The work conducted in the woods is fully in conformance to the FSC Standard. | | | | |
| PRINCIPLE 2: Tenure and use rights and responsibilities | | | | | |
| Criterion 2.1 Demonstration of land tenure and forest use rights | | | | | |
| Conformance | X | Nonconformance | | NCR #(s) | |
| Finding (strength/weakness) | The DLLT property is somewhat unique in that it is entirely covered by conservation easements held by a number of public and private conservation entities. The DLLT fully complies with the requirements and restrictions of the easements. A road use agreement is also fully complied with as are a few driveway Right-of-Ways for camp owners. There are no other land tenure or forest use rights on the forest. | | | | |
| Criterion 2.2 Local communities' legal or customary tenure or use rights | | | | | |
| Conformance | X | Nonconformance | | NCR #(s) | |
| Finding (strength/weakness) | The rights that exist are described above in 2.1. Beyond these, public access to the properties is encouraged, included motorized access using the road system and through ATVs and snowmobiles on designated trails. | | | | |
| Criterion 2.3 Disputes over tenure claims and use rights | | | | | |
| Conformance | X | Nonconformance | | NCR #(s) | |
| Finding (strength/weakness) | There have been no disputes over tenure claims or use rights relative to the DLLT lands. | | | | |
| PRINCIPLE 3: Indigenous peoples' rights | | | | | |
| Criterion 3.1 Indigenous peoples' control of forest management | | | | | |
| Conformance | X | Nonconformance | | NCR #(s) | |
| Finding (strength/weakness) | There are no indigenous people's rights relative to the DLLT ownership. A voluntary agreement by DLLT allows members of the Passamaquody tribe to use the road system to cross to a tribe ownership that abuts to the north and is not accessible any other way except via water. | | | | |
| Criterion 3.2 Maintenance of indigenous peoples' resources or tenure rights | | | | | |
| Conformance | X | Nonconformance | | NCR #(s) | |
| Finding (strength/weakness) | There are no indigenous people's rights relative to the DLLT ownership. | | | | |
| Criterion 3.3 Protection of sites of special cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance to indigenous peoples | | | | | |
| Conformance | X | Nonconformance | | NCR #(s) | |
| Finding (strength/weakness) | There are no specific sites of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance to indigenous peoples on the DLLT property. DLLT has consulted with tribal leaders and confirmed that if there are any areas of potential interest, they will be immediately adjacent to water in lakes or streams. These areas are buffered so that no harvesting of timber occurs in the zone. | | | | |
| Criterion 3.4 Compensation of indigenous peoples for the application of their traditional knowledge | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|----------------|--|----------|--|
| Conformance | X | Nonconformance | | NCR #(s) | |
| Finding (strength/weakness) | No traditional knowledge of indigenous people is used in the management of the DLLT lands. | | | | |
| PRINCIPLE 4: Community relations and workers rights | | | | | |
| Criterion 4.1 Employment, training, and other services for local communities | | | | | |
| Conformance | X | Nonconformance | | NCR #(s) | |
| Finding (strength/weakness) | DLLT employs and contracts with locally based individuals and companies for all of its forestry work. | | | | |
| Criterion 4.2 Compliance with health and safety regulations | | | | | |
| Conformance | X | Nonconformance | | NCR #(s) | |
| Finding (strength/weakness) | Policies are in place that address health and safety regulations for employees and contractors. These policies are being followed. | | | | |
| Criterion 4.3 Workers' rights to organize and negotiate with employers | | | | | |
| Conformance | X | Nonconformance | | NCR #(s) | |
| Finding (strength/weakness) | Workers with DLLT are free to organize and negotiate with their employer. | | | | |
| Criterion 4.4 Social impact evaluations and consultation | | | | | |
| Conformance | X | Nonconformance | | NCR #(s) | |
| Finding (strength/weakness) | DLLT has a detailed social impact analysis and carries out practices that benefit the community as a matter of mission for the organization. The DLLT property is open to the public to use for access, hunting, fishing, snowmobiling, ATVs, hiking and other uses. The community nature of the organization makes these activities part of carrying out its mission. | | | | |
| Criterion 4.5 Resolution of grievances and settlement of compensation claims | | | | | |
| Conformance | X | Nonconformance | | NCR #(s) | |
| Finding (strength/weakness) | There is a grievance and dispute resolution policy in place for employee and contractor issues. To date there have not been grievances requiring settlement or payment of claims. | | | | |
| PRINCIPLE 5: Benefits from the forest | | | | | |
| Criterion 5.1 Economic viability taking full environmental, social, and operational costs into account | | | | | |
| Conformance | X | Nonconformance | | NCR #(s) | |
| Finding (strength/weakness) | The DLLT forestry operation uses a well-balanced approach that results in timber harvested for income and habitat improvement and these activities, along with the road building and maintenance necessary, are done according to the requirements in the FSC Standard. Each operation has a complete planning process with Board overview to assure that costs are fully anticipated and addressed. Operations on the ground are conducted with care and minimize environmental, social and operations costs. | | | | |
| Criterion 5.2 Optimal use and local processing of forest products | | | | | |
| Conformance | X | Nonconformance | | NCR #(s) | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|----------------|--|----------|--|
| Finding (strength/weakness) | All forest products harvested from the DLLT property are cut by local harvesting companies and then processed at local plants as lumber, pulp or electricity. | | | | |
| Criterion 5.3 Waste minimization and avoidance of damage to forest resources | | | | | |
| Conformance | X | Nonconformance | | NCR #(s) | |
| Finding (strength/weakness) | In the harvesting operations conducted, great care is taken to assure a minimum of damage to the residual forest. A healthy balance of wood waste minimization and the need to leave woody material on the forest floor is taking place on the DLLT forest. | | | | |
| Criterion 5.4 Forest management and the local economy | | | | | |
| Conformance | X | Nonconformance | | NCR #(s) | |
| Finding (strength/weakness) | All DLLT forest operations are conducted by companies from the local area and the timber is sold and processed at local mill facilities. | | | | |
| Criterion 5.5 Maintenance of the value of forest services and resources | | | | | |
| Conformance | X | Nonconformance | | NCR #(s) | |
| Finding (strength/weakness) | The community nature of the DLLT forest in Washington County, Maine results in the maintenance and enhancement of the value of the forest services and resources. | | | | |
| Criterion 5.6 Harvest levels | | | | | |
| Conformance | X | Nonconformance | | NCR #(s) | |
| Finding (strength/weakness) | DLLT has a calculated sustained yield harvest level that is intended to add volume to the forest over time and the actual harvesting has been accomplished in a manner consistent with the level set. | | | | |
| PRINCIPLE 6: Environmental impact | | | | | |
| Criterion 6.1 Environmental impacts evaluation | | | | | |
| Conformance | X | Nonconformance | | NCR #(s) | |
| Finding (strength/weakness) | Full and robust environmental impact analyses were conducted as part of the original development of the forest management plan. Additional analyses were conducted as part of the full revision of the plan that occurred in 2010. | | | | |
| Criterion 6.2 Protection of rare, threatened and endangered species | | | | | |
| Conformance | X | Nonconformance | | NCR #(s) | |
| Finding (strength/weakness) | DLLT has a full program for protection of RTE species that includes substantial set-asides where RTE species are likely to occur and careful practices in those areas with potential RTE. In large part, DLLT operations are not located in places where RTE species are known to exist or may exist. | | | | |
| Criterion 6.3 Maintenance of ecological functions and values | | | | | |
| Conformance | X | Nonconformance | | NCR #(s) | |
| Finding (strength/weakness) | DLLT management planning has zoned the ownership into areas available for forest operations; those with sensitive issues that may allow for operations (special management areas) and complete set-asides where no activities will occur (ecological reserve). This mix of uses provides fully for ecological functions and values. | | | | |
| Criterion 6.4 Protection of representative samples of existing ecosystems | | | | | |
| Conformance | X | Nonconformance | | NCR #(s) | |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|----------------|--|----------|--|
| Finding (strength/weakness) | The zoning approach to the management of the DLLT lands described in 6.3 results in the protection of the full range of representative ecosystems directly on the property. Conservation easements cover the entire property to assure no development will occur beyond forestry and recreation management functions. | | | | |
| Criterion 6.5 Protection against damage to soils, residual forest and water resources during operations | | | | | |
| Conformance | X | Nonconformance | | NCR #(s) | |
| Finding (strength/weakness) | DLLT has in place a full suite of policies and procedures that it follows in the field to assure protection against damage to soils, residual forest and water resources. DLLT follows state-based BMPs on all operations. | | | | |
| Criterion 6.6 Chemical pest management | | | | | |
| Conformance | X | Nonconformance | | NCR #(s) | |
| Finding (strength/weakness) | DLLT does not use chemicals in their operations. | | | | |
| Criterion 6.7 Use and disposal of chemicals, containers, liquid and solid non-organic wastes | | | | | |
| Conformance | X | Nonconformance | | NCR #(s) | |
| Finding (strength/weakness) | DLLT has policies in place to assure contractors dispose of chemicals, containers and liquid and solid non-organic waste in the proper manner. These policies are being carried out in the field. | | | | |
| Criterion 6.8 Use of biological control agents and genetically modified organisms | | | | | |
| Conformance | X | Nonconformance | | NCR #(s) | |
| Finding (strength/weakness) | DLLT does not use biological control agents or genetically modified organisms. | | | | |
| Criterion 6.9 The use of exotic species | | | | | |
| Conformance | X | Nonconformance | | NCR #(s) | |
| Finding (strength/weakness) | Exotic species are not generally used on the DLLT forest. A mix of herbaceous seeds are used to stabilize soil following road building or harvesting area close-out to assure erosion does not occur. These seed mixes include some non-native species that are routinely used in forestry in the northeast U.S. but the species are non-invasive. | | | | |
| Criterion 6.10 Forest conversion to plantations or non-forest land uses | | | | | |
| Conformance | X | Nonconformance | | NCR #(s) | |
| Finding (strength/weakness) | DLLT does not and has not converted forest to non-forest or plantation uses. | | | | |
| PRINCIPLE 7: Management plan | | | | | |
| Criterion 7.1 Management plan requirements | | | | | |
| Conformance | X | Nonconformance | | NCR #(s) | |
| Finding (strength/weakness) | The DLLT forest management plan documents fulfill the requirements of the FSC forest management Plan Criterion. | | | | |
| Criterion 7.2 Management plan revision | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|----------------|--|----------|--|
| Conformance | X | Nonconformance | | NCR #(s) | |
| Finding (strength/weakness) | The DLLT forest management planning documents were fully revised and updated in 2010 and prior to this reassessment. | | | | |
| Criterion 7.3 Training and supervision of forest workers | | | | | |
| Conformance | X | Nonconformance | | NCR #(s) | |
| Finding (strength/weakness) | Forest workers, both in-house staff members and outside contractors, are fully trained and a supervision protocol is in place and implemented to assure forest operations go according to plan consistent with the FSC Standard. | | | | |
| Criterion 7.4 Public availability of the management plan elements | | | | | |
| Conformance | X | Nonconformance | | NCR #(s) | |
| Finding (strength/weakness) | All DLLT forest management documents are available through the DLLT website. | | | | |
| PRINCIPLE 8: Monitoring and evaluation | | | | | |
| Criterion 8.1 Frequency, intensity and consistency of monitoring | | | | | |
| Conformance | X | Nonconformance | | NCR #(s) | |
| Finding (strength/weakness) | DLLT has in place a full monitoring protocol that consists of regular monitoring of operations as they occur and after complete and, additionally, ongoing monitoring as part of everyday activities of staff and contractors, as well as many volunteers, on the ground. | | | | |
| Criterion 8.2 Research and data collection for monitoring | | | | | |
| Conformance | X | Nonconformance | | NCR #(s) | |
| Finding (strength/weakness) | As part of normal operations and monitoring, data and information is collected to assist in the on-going evaluation of practices to allow for changes for improvements in order to get desired results. Additional data collection was done from public and other sources as part of the forest planning documents revision process. | | | | |
| Criterion 8.3 Chain of custody | | | | | |
| Conformance | X | Nonconformance | | NCR #(s) | |
| Finding (strength/weakness) | DLLT has a fully functioning Chain-of-Custody system in place that includes written policies and procedures for all personnel involved in the system. | | | | |
| Criterion 8.4 Incorporation of monitoring results into the management plan | | | | | |
| Conformance | X | Nonconformance | | NCR #(s) | |
| Finding (strength/weakness) | All previous monitoring activity was used in-house and by the consultant hired to develop the new forest plan documents and the revisions of the original documents. This included information gathered as part of consultation with community members that DLLT routinely does. | | | | |
| Criterion 8.5 Publicly available summary of monitoring | | | | | |
| Conformance | X | Nonconformance | | NCR #(s) | |
| Finding (strength/weakness) | The annual comprehensive monitoring reports are posted to the DLLT website. | | | | |
| PRINCIPLE 9: High Conservation Value Forests | | | | | |

| Criterion 9.1 Evaluation to determine high conservation value attributes | | | | | |
|--|---|----------------|--|----------|--|
| Conformance | X | Nonconformance | | NCR #(s) | |
| Finding (strength/weakness) | A full evaluation for HCVF was completed for the original certification and this was completely re-done as part of the forest management plan update completed in 2010. | | | | |
| Criterion 9.2 Consultation process | | | | | |
| Conformance | X | Nonconformance | | NCR #(s) | |
| Finding (strength/weakness) | Experts and local community members (as part of ongoing stakeholder input gathered) were consulted to update the forest planning documents and to complete the new analysis of the HCVF. | | | | |
| Criterion 9.3 Measures to maintain and enhance high conservation value attributes | | | | | |
| Conformance | X | Nonconformance | | NCR #(s) | |
| Finding (strength/weakness) | Specific procedures and practices are in place that address the management practices on the HCVF lands. Well over 95% of the HCVF acreage is in a no-management ecological reserve protected through a conservation easement. DLLT has operated in full compliance with the easement. The other HCVF acreage is also no harvest. Field evaluation confirmed these policies are being carried out. | | | | |
| Criterion 9.4 Monitoring to assess effectiveness | | | | | |
| Conformance | X | Nonconformance | | NCR #(s) | |
| Finding (strength/weakness) | Regular monitoring of the DLLT lands as part of the requirements of FSC Principle 8 are also carried on for the HCVF lands. The HCVF monitoring is conducted each year regardless of whether operations are located nearby. These are reported as part of the annual monitoring report published on the organization web-site. | | | | |
| PRINCIPLE 10: Plantations | | | | | |
| Finding (strength/weakness) | Non-Applicable. DLLT does not manage forests that meet the FSC-US definition of a plantation. | | | | |

3.3. Identified nonconformances and Nonconformity Reports (NCRs)

A nonconformance is a discrepancy or gap identified during the assessment between some aspect of the FME's management system and one or more of the requirements of the forest stewardship standard. Depending on the severity of the nonconformance the assessment team differentiates between major and minor nonconformances.

- **Major nonconformance** results where there is a fundamental failure to achieve the objective of the relevant FSC criterion. A number of minor nonconformances against one requirement may be considered to have a cumulative effect, and therefore be considered a major nonconformance.
- **Minor nonconformance** is a temporary, unusual or non-systematic nonconformance, for which the effects are limited.

Major nonconformances must be corrected **before** the certificate can be issued. While minor nonconformances do not prohibit issuing the certificate, they must be addressed within the given timeframe to maintain the certificate.

Each nonconformance is addressed by the audit team by issuing a nonconformity report (NCR). NCRs are requirements that candidate operations must agree to, and which must be addressed, within the given timeframe of a maximum of one year period.

No NCRs were issued during this re-assessment.

3.4. Conformance with applicable nonconformity reports(Reassessments Only)

The section below describes the activities of the certificate holder to address each applicable nonconformity report (NCR) issued during previous evaluations. For each NCR a finding is presented along with a description of its current status using the following categories. Failure to meet NCRs will result in nonconformances being upgraded from minor to major status with conformance required within 3 months with risk of suspension or termination of the Rainforest Alliance certificate if Major NCRs are not met. The following classification is used to indicate the status of the NCR:

| Status Categories | Explanation |
|-------------------|--|
| Closed | Operation has successfully met the NCR. |
| Open | Operation has either <u>not met</u> or has <u>partially met</u> the NCR. |

Check if N/A (there are no open NCRs to review)

3.5. Observations

Observations can be raised when issues or the early stages of a problem are identified which does not of itself constitute a nonconformance, but which the auditor considers may lead to a future nonconformance if not addressed by the client. An observation may be a warning signal on a particular issue that, if not addressed, could turn into a NCR in the future (or a pre-condition or NCR during a 5 year re-assessment).

| | |
|---|---|
| OBS 01/12 | Reference Standard & Requirement: FSC-US Forest Management Standard, Indicator 2.1.c |
| <p>Boundaries of land ownership and use rights need to be clearly identified on the ground and on maps according to this indicator to assure that forestry activities do not stray over boundaries to other ownerships. In viewing boundary markings on the DLLT ownership, which are all a combination of tree blazes and various vintages of paint on those blazed areas, it was observed that some boundaries are easily seen in passing and others are more difficult to find through the woods because blazes and paint are old and not easily seen. DLLT managers said that before any forestry operation near a boundary, a field identification of the boundary is made and flagging is hung before the boundary line to assure harvesting does not cross the boundary. At this time, there is not a specific plan to refresh boundary paint or upgrade boundary lines.</p> | |
| <p>Observation: DLLT should develop a plan and timeline for boundary line restoration to assure that all boundaries are clearly identified on the ground and on maps prior to commencing management activities in the vicinity of the boundaries.</p> | |

| | |
|--|---|
| OBS 02/12 | Reference Standard & Requirement: FSC-US Forest Management Standard, Indicator 5.1.a |
| <p>The indicator states that “The forest owner or manager is financially able to implement core management activities, including all those environmental, social and operating costs, required to meet this Standard, and investment and reinvestment in forest management.” DLLT has demonstrated that it has hired skilled staff and a forest management contractor with a great deal of experience and expertise that has a skilled forester assigned to oversee harvest operations on the DLLT lands. It was noted that the work that was observed during the audit was completed with consistent conformance to the FSC Standard.</p> <p>However, during the audit, questions were asked of the on-the-ground forester about harvest layout preparation work not being done completely for harvests expected to begin within a few weeks. The forester acknowledged that he prefers to have layout work done earlier, but that other work commitments had interfered, and that he would nevertheless get the work done on time.</p> | |
| <p>Observation: DLLT should communicate with the contractor forester and the forestry contract company to assure that adequate personnel resources are available to properly to implement core management activities, including all those environmental, social, and operating costs, required to meet this standard, and investment and reinvestment in forest management.</p> | |

| | |
|--|---|
| OBS 03/12 | Reference Standard & Requirement: FSC-US Forest Management Standard, Indicator 6.5.b |
| <p>The indicator states that forest operations must meet or exceed Best Management Practices (BMPs). During the field audit, exemplary application of BMPs was viewed on the great majority of recent DLLT road maintenance and aquatic habitat projects. Two specific concerns were noted, however. At the end of the Fourth Lake Road ATV/Snowmobile trail close to the DLLT property boundary, the drainage ditch designed to assure rain run-off does not erode the road surface failed in one location and water from the ditch was running down the road and causing erosion to occur. At another location on Fourth Lake Road west of the Third Lake Road a recently replaced culvert had inadequate rock rip-rap around the installation and the seeding that was done to stabilize the soil on the bank had not taken, resulting in some soil material entering the water immediately adjacent to the culvert ends on both sides of the road.</p> | |

Observation:

DLLT should regularly view roads, side-roads and trails soon after significant rain event to assure forest operations meet or exceed Best Management Practices (BMPs) and no erosion or siltation is occurring.

OBS 04/12

Reference Standard & Requirement: FSC-US Forest Management Standard, Indicator 6.7.a

Under this indicator, contractors are required to have the equipment and training necessary to respond to hazardous spills. A road rehabilitation sub-contractor working on re-building a section of spur road for an upcoming harvesting operation was using an excavator to accomplish the re-build. The contractor had the excavator and pick-up truck at the site. Hazardous spill equipment was not found on the site in either vehicle because, according to the excavator operator, he had just used the equipment on another job when there was a hydraulic fluid leak and the equipment had not been replenished. When asked the following day whether the equipment had been replenished, the excavator operator said that his boss was supposed to arrive with fuel and a new spill kit. This was confirmed with a phone call to the supervisor.

Observation:

DLLT should reinforce the need to have hazardous spill equipment on site at all times with its contractors in order to assure that sub-contractors understand this requirement, and so that in an event of a hazardous material spill, the material can be immediately contained, and qualified personnel perform the appropriate removal and remediation as required by applicable law and regulations.

3.6. Certification Recommendation

Based on a thorough review of FME performance in the field, consultation with stakeholders, analysis of management documentation or other audit evidence the Rainforest Alliance assessment team recommends the following:

| | |
|--|--|
| Certification requirements met; No NCRs issued | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Certification requirements not met | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Subject to conformance with minor NCRs (if applicable), the FME has demonstrated that their described system of management is being implemented consistently over the whole forest areas covered by the scope of the evaluation | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Comments: No NCRs were issued during this reassessment. | |
| FME's management system, if implemented as described and subject to conformance with minor NCRs (if applicable), is capable of ensuring that all the requirements of the certification standards are met across the scope of the certificate | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Comments: No NCRs were issued during this reassessment. | |
| Issues identified as controversial or hard to evaluate. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Comments: There were no issues identified as controversial or hard to evaluate. | |
| Description of activities taken by the FME prior to the certification decision to correct major or minor nonconformity(s) identified during the assessment. | |
| There were no NCRs outstanding from the previous audit. | |
| Certificate type recommended: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Forest management and Chain of custody <input type="checkbox"/> Forest management only (no CoC) |

Once certified, the FME will be audited annually on-site and required to remain in conformance with the FSC principles and criteria as further defined by regional guidelines developed by Rainforest Alliance or the FSC in order to maintain certification. The FME will also be required to fulfill the corrective actions as described below. Experts from Rainforest Alliance will review continued forest management performance and conformance with the corrective action requests described in this report, annually during scheduled and/or random audits.

4. CLIENT SPECIFIC BACKGROUND INFORMATION

4.1 Ownership and land tenure description (legal and customary)

The description below is taken partly from the DLLT forest planning documents:

The Downeast Lakes Land Trust (DLLT) was formed in 2001 for the express purpose of acquiring and protecting in perpetuity lands adjacent to the community of Grand Lake Stream, Maine, in T5 & T6ND. The trust is a 501(c)3 non-profit organization based in Grand Lake Stream.

The 27,080-acre property of the initial acquisition had previously been owned and managed by Georgia-Pacific Corporation until 1999, when the property was purchased by a group of investors. The lands were managed for the investor group by Wagner Timberlands. Local concerns regarding the direction of the investor's management practices and the potential for significant lakeshore development led to the establishment of DLLT.

On May 25, 2005 the Downeast Lakes Land Trust completed acquisition of 27,080 acres on and around West Grand Lake in Washington County, Maine. The land trust worked in cooperation with the New England Forestry Foundation and Wagner Timberlands to negotiate the acquisition of the property and to place a conservation easement on the tract.

The DLLT ownership consists of the Farm Cove Community Forest, which is covered by the 2004 Conservation Easement (8,188 acres) and the 2005 Farm Cove Conservation Easement (15,332 acres), both held by the New England Forestry Foundation, Inc. These easements require managing the property as a working, community forest, while protecting the conservation values of the property. The Fourth Machias Lake Ecological Reserve exists as part of the Farm Cove Community Forest. The 3,560 acres of the Reserve are covered by a Conservation Easement, initially held by the New England Forestry Foundation, Inc., but assigned in September 2006 to Sweet Water Trust. This easement maintains the Reserve lands as "forever wild", without human manipulation, with a few exceptions. The Reserve lands remain open to non-motorized access and legal hunting, fishing, and trapping activities.

In 2008, the 6,628 acre area immediately to the south of the original purchase in T43 & T42 MD, the Wabassus Lake Tract, was added to the Farm Cove Community Forest by DLLT. All the DLLT lands are contiguous. There are several small, private lakeshore properties scattered within the boundaries of the DLLT property. All DLLT lands are open to public access and to all legal hunting, fishing, and gathering activities.

DLLT contracts with Orion Timberlands, LLC, for technical forest management services, with DLLT oversight. Orion Timberlands also purchases most of the timber sold on the DLLT ownership. DLLT initiated forest management activities in summer 2005.

4.2 Legislative and government regulatory context

The State of Maine is among the most environmental conscious and regulated states in the United States. There exists in Maine a broad spectrum of statutes and regulations dealing with all aspects of forestland management, some Federal in origin. These include:

- Protection of water quality
- Development of shore land zones
- Streamside management zones – buffer strip widths
- Critical wildlife habitat management

- High mountain areas
- Steep slopes
- Gravel extraction
- Forester licensing
- Road construction standards
- Rare, Threatened & Endangered Species
- Zoning of unincorporated places (such as most of the DLLT property)

Rules and regulations intended to protect the environment are promulgated and enforced by a broad array of state, local and federal agencies. Agencies having jurisdiction over the management of commercial forestland in Maine are:

| | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Maine Forest Service | Maine Inland Fisheries & Wildlife |
| Land Use Regulation Commission | Board of Pesticide Control |
| U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service | Maine Warden Service |
| U.S. Corps of Engineers | Board of Forester Licensing |
| Dept. of Environmental Protection | Municipalities |
| U.S. Environmental Protection Agency | |

Land Use Regulation Commission (LURC) – The Downeast Lakes Land Trust property is within the regulatory area of the Land Use Regulation Commission.

4.3 Environmental Context

DLLT's Farm Cove Community Forest is located within the Downeast Lakes region of Maine, which encompasses more than 1 million acres of forested lands. The Community Forest is part of the eastern lowlands biophysical region and located within two watersheds: the St. Croix River, which is the international boundary between Maine and New Brunswick, Canada, and the Machias River, which is designated as important habitat to the Atlantic salmon, a federally threatened species.

The Community Forest includes over 70 miles of shoreline on seven lakes. The topography of the Community Forest is gently rolling, with elevations ranging from 240 to 800 feet. Soils consist generally of three series formed from glacial till. The overall condition of the forest is good and recovering after a period of heavy harvesting by Georgia Pacific during its ownership tenure that ended in the late 1990s. As a result of past forest management practices, the current tree species composition is heavily skewed towards hemlock (38.2%), followed by spruce (19.9%), white pine (12.2%), and cedar (8.9%). Softwoods account for approximately 80% of the composition, and hardwoods account for less than 20%.

The Community Forest provides habitat to a diversity of fish and wildlife. The area has a long history of hunting, trapping, and fishing, and these activities continue to play an important role in the region's economy. The region maintains excellent water quality and a thriving fishery. The Community Forest contains cold-water streams that support native brook trout as well as lakes that contain land-locked salmon. The Community Forest also provides habitat for many big game species, including moose, white-tailed deer, and black bear. Other species that occur in the Community Forest include mink, pine marten, fisher, and beaver. The Forest supports a diverse avian fauna, and has been designated as part of a Globally Important Bird Area by the American Bird Conservancy.

Currently, no federally-listed rare, threatened, or endangered (RTE) species are known to be present on the Farm Cove Community Forest. Federally endangered animal species that are known to occur in the region include the golden eagle, peregrine falcon, Atlantic salmon and Clayton's copper (a butterfly). Federally endangered plant species in the region include arctic

sandwort, smooth rockcress, pale jewel-weed, giant rattlesnake-plantain, white adder's-mouth, and Furbish's lousewort. Species listed as federally threatened that are known to occur in the region include: bald eagle, Canada lynx, northern bog lemming, slender cliffbrake, mountain sweet-cicely, wild coffee, wild ginger, Lapland buttercup, and small round-leaved orchis.

4.4 Socioeconomic Context

Envisioned as a community based, working forest, the 33,708 acre Farm Cove Community Forest provides a range of ecological and social values that have long supported the people and communities of the region. The Downeast Lakes Land Trust, through the implementation of its management plan, seeks to ensure the perpetuation of this recreation- and forest-based economy.

The history of DLLT lands is linked to the village of Grand Lake Stream, once the site of the world's largest tannery. Logging and hemlock bark collection were central to the economy of the area. The Downeast Lakes Region has been a mecca for the sport fishing and game since the turn of the 20th century. A strong guiding industry developed to provide services to this clientele. The forestlands of the region served the local timber and pulp industry since the advent of the paper industry in the early 1900's. DLLT lands were part of the St. Croix Paper Company lands until they were purchased by Georgia-Pacific Corporation. This area was part of a nearly 1-million-acre ownership that stretched across the U.S.-Canadian border. For years the mill required spruce and fir to run until the early 1970's when the pulping process was converted to hardwood. The area continues to be within the wood procurement circle of the Woodland Pulp (formerly Georgia-Pacific, then Domtar) facility in Woodland.

The hardwood resource on DLLT lands has been significantly reduced and degraded because of past management, which in the past was driven by markets. In a forest type such as this, this harvesting ensured the perpetual presence of a forest cover because market specifications demanded larger sized timber. The small (5–10 inch diameter), lower quality trees generally remained to grow. As market conditions changed, so did harvest methods and the amount of timber harvested from each acre. In the early 1970's, Georgia-Pacific's whole tree chipping had a dramatic impact on harvesting. Clearcutting increased. This technology affected the future DLLT lands. Hardwood areas were essentially commercially clearcut in the early 1980's. In the mid-1980's and early 1990's, markets for hemlock logs developed in Asia. Georgia-Pacific used the abundant and ever-increasing hemlock resource on their lands to supply this market out of Eastport, Maine. Much of the mature hemlock was harvested at that time. In 1999, Georgia-Pacific sold all of its Maine and New Brunswick timberlands to an investor group. Wagner Forest Management assumed management of the lands and a limited harvest was conducted in 2001.

About 90% of Maine's total land area is forested (17.7 million acres), and 95% of this area (16.9 million acres) is considered productive forestland. The percentage of forestlands in private ownership is 95%. Small, non-industrial private forest landowners manage 37% of the productive land, mostly in the southern and central portions of the state, whereas large private forest landowners manage about 59%, mainly in the north and northeast regions of the state. State and County governments own approximately 4% of the productive forestland. The forests of Maine and neighboring states and Canadian provinces support the forest products industry and a wide variety of recreational activities, which generate 18% of the gross state product.

Maine's northern and eastern communities face economic challenges. Compounding the economic problems in northern Maine is the realignment of several Maine pulp mills, which have changed ownership in recent years with some of these transfers resulting in separate owners for mills and forestlands. Many Maine residents are concerned about public access on these recently sold lands, which have a long history of public recreational use.

Maine is home to four federally recognized Native American peoples. These are the Penobscot, Passamaquoddy, Maliseet, and Micmac. In 1980 the Maine Indian Claims Settlement Act was signed into law and included provisions for the reacquisition of tribal lands. Under the terms of the Settlement, the Penobscots and Passamaquoddies gave up future claims to their aboriginal lands in exchange for Federal trust fund and land acquisition monies. Passamaquoddy lands abut DLLT lands.

The Farm Cove Community Forest lands are now held in trust by the Downeast Lakes Land Trust as a core for the local economy based on forestry and the land and water-based recreation economies.

4.5 Workers

Number of workers including employees, part-time and seasonal workers:

| | | |
|--|---|-----------------------------|
| Total workers | 3 workers (provide detail below) | |
| • Local Full time employees (a:b) | 1 Male | 1 Female |
| • Non - Local Full time employees (c:d) | 0 Male | 0 Female |
| • Local Part time workers (e:f) | 1 Male | 0 Female |
| • Non- local part time workers (g:h) | 0 Male | 0 Female |
| Worker access to potable water on the work site | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES | <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
| Full time employees making more than \$2 a day | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES | <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
| Number of serious accidents (past 12 month period) | 0 | |
| Number of fatalities (past 12 month period) | 0 | |

APPENDIX I: Public summary of the management plan

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. Main objectives of the forest management are: | |
| Primary priority: | Wildlife Habitat, Public Recreation, and a Sustainable Timber Economy |
| Secondary priority: | Protect, maintain, and enhance the quality and diversity of fish and wildlife habitats. Maintain and support traditional uses and values that are important to the identity and well-being of Grand Lake Stream and the Downeast Lakes region. |
| Other priorities: | Protect ecological integrity, Protect Aesthetic quality; Maintain and Enhance Forest Health and Productivity, Provide the economic and social benefits of a commercial timber enterprise; Integrate timber, wildlife, water, and recreation objectives. |
| Forest composition: | |
| 42% softwood (Hemlock, Spruce, White Pine, Cedar, Fir), 13% hardwood (Yellow birch, white birch, red maple, american beech, and poplar), and 45% mixedwood | |
| Description of Silvicultural system(s) used: | |
| Single Tree Selection- Selecting single trees, providing continuous forest cover. Regeneration occurs continuously. | |
| Group Selection- Removing small groups of trees, in patches smaller than 75ft in diameter. Mixed regeneration results in openings. | |
| Shelterwood- Regeneration is established by removing overstory trees, allowing light to reach the forest floor, while still providing favorable sheltered conditions for seedlings. This treatment can be repeated more than once if necessary (extended shelterwood). The remaining overstory trees are then removed (often leaving permanent reserve trees) allowing the regeneration to grow freely. | |
| Liberation- The removal of undesirable overstory trees for the benefit of a desirable understory. | |
| Clearcuts- The removal all stems in the harvest area, exposing the forest floor. Usually less than 2 acres in size and rarely exceeding 20 acres. | |
| 2. Silvicultural system | % of forest under this management |
| Natural regeneration and a variety of silvicultural systems dependent upon current forest condition and desired future conditions. Strong general preference and management for uneven aged conditions. Estimated percentages are based on harvest activity from 2008-2012. | |
| Even aged management | 1% |
| Clearcut (.20- 8.09 ha) | <1% |
| Shelterwood | <1% |
| Uneven aged management | 99% |
| Individual tree selection | 64% |
| Group selection (group harvested of less than 1 ha in size) | 35% |
| Other types of management (explain) | |
| 3. Forest Operations | |
| 3.1 Harvest methods and equipment used: | Mechanical Harvesting, Feller Buncher, Grapple Skidder, Stroke delimeter, and slasher; or Cut-to length Processor and Forwarder. |
| 3.2 Estimate of maximum sustainable yield for main commercial species: | 0.28 cd/ac/year |

3.3 Explanation of the assumptions (e.g. silvicultural) upon which estimates are based and reference to the source of data (e.g. inventory data, permanent sample plots, yield tables) upon which estimates are based.

Maine Forest Service, FIA Washington County tree growth method, as cited in FCCF Mgmt plan pdf - pg 277. Our own measurements suggest a growth rate of 0.34 cd/ac/year based upon inventory updated in 2010.

3.4 FME organizational structure and management responsibilities from senior management to operational level (how is management organized, who controls and takes decisions, use of contractors, provisions for training, etc.).

1. **Downeast Lakes Land Trust** (Forest manager)-
 - a. **Board of Directors**- Responsible for establishing organizational policies and review and approval of plans and budgets.
 - i. **Forestry Resource Committee**- Responsible for planning and recommendation of forest management plans and policies to Board of Directors. Committee includes both Directors and other community representatives.
 - ii. **Trails Committee**- Responsible for planning process and recommendation of recreational access projects and plans to Board of Directors. Committee includes both Directors and other community representatives.
 - b. **Mark Berry**- Executive Director, responsible for execution of management plans and policies adopted by the Board of Directors. Oversees management of the community forest and other aspects of the land trust's mission, including forest conservation projects and education programs.
 - i. **John Harmon**- Community Forest Program Manager, responsible for harvesting quality control, special road construction and maintenance, special forest projects and oversight, etc.
 1. **Orion Timberlands**- Operations managers, COC certified wood buyers
 - a. **John McNulty**- President of Orion Timberlands, executive decisions involving employment, contracting, and finances.
 - b. **Jason Castonguay**- Ashland office manager- budget and contract approval. Organizes company training etc.
 - i. **Kyle Burdick**- Operations forester. Implementation of harvest plans, including layout and harvest supervision. Responsible for training related to licensing, and FSC. COC primary contact.

3.5 Structure of forest management units (division of forest area into manageable units etc.).

Single FMU, but with components as follows:

By Acquisition Project, then by management units:

Farm Cove Community Forest (T5ND and T6ND, acquired 2004-2005):

- Machias-Dobsis
- McLellan Cove
- Farm Cove

Wabassus Lake Tract (T43MD and T42 MD, acquired 2008)

- Wabassus Lake

3.6 Monitoring procedures (including yield of all forest products harvested, growth rates, regeneration, and forest condition, composition/changes in flora and fauna, environmental and social impacts of forest management, costs, productivity and efficiency of forest management).

Monitoring plan is presented in the Farm Cove Community Forest Management plan, including general forest monitoring (forest inventory, regeneration, invasive and exotic species, erosion and sedimentation, unauthorized use), wildlife and habitat monitoring, and social and economic monitoring. Annual and periodic reporting data are summarized in DLLT's public Annual Monitoring Report Summary.

3.7 Management strategies for the identification and protection of rare, threatened and endangered species.

Data on rare, threatened, and endangered species, including known occurrences and potential species, has been provided by the Maine Natural Areas program and the Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife.

Downeast Lakes Land Trust contracted with wildlife and wetlands ecologist Norm Famous to conduct an ecological inventory of the original 27,080-acre Farm Cove Community Forest in 2002 and 2003, prior to acquisition. The objectives included identifying areas with high biodiversity, representative examples of natural community types, and other important natural and cultural features to be included in an ecological reserve and in special management areas to provide long-term protection of their natural features. In addition, the biological inventories were designed to provide baseline data on a number of natural resources. This inventory led to the designation of the 3,560-acre ecological reserve surrounding Fourth Machias Lake and the 3,751-acre late-successional management area (LSMA) buffering the ecological reserve. When the trust amended the Farm Cove Community Forest management plan in 2008, it designated 17 additional Special Management Areas within the original ownership. A further 14 Special Management Areas were designated within the Wabassus Lake Tract based upon recommendations of forest ecologist Rob Bryan in the 2010 plan amendment.

In addition, each member of the forest management staff, including Orion Foresters, are trained to identify any rare threatened and endangered plants that could potentially be found in the area. Prior to submitting a harvest plan, any observations of rare threatened and endangered species in the harvest area or adjacent to the harvest area are noted. If rare, threatened, or endangered species are observed after harvest plans are developed, plans will be amended as needed. If any uncertainty exists, professionals will be consulted prior to harvesting.

3.8 Environmental safeguards implemented, e.g. buffer zones for streams, riparian areas, seasonal operation, chemical storage, etc.

All LURC regulated riparian zones are managed in accordance with the law, and Best Management Practices published by the Maine Forest Service are followed. The trust has developed riparian and lakeshore buffer management guidelines that exceed regulatory requirements.

Section added by the FME: Focus Species approach to integrating timber and habitat management objectives.

DLLT integrated its timber management and wildlife habitat goals through a "Focus Species Forestry" planning process, selecting a set of focal species to represent a variety of forest habitat types and have included species of particular importance to the local community.

The DLLT list of focal species includes white-tailed deer, snowshoe hare, American marten, ruffed grouse, American woodcock, black bear, black-throated blue warbler, pileated woodpecker, beaver, brook trout, Atlantic salmon, bald eagle, spotted salamander, and wood frog.

As an example, white-tailed deer are a focal species for management of mature conifer forest, which provides necessary winter habitat. We have mapped and designated areas for management as deer wintering habitat that will provide this resource to deer and will benefit all wildlife species that use mature conifer forest.

Sections added by the FME: Additional information

Additional information about management of the Farm Cove Community Forest is available at www.downeastlakes.org/conservation/your-community-forests/, or by contacting Downeast Lakes Land Trust.

APPENDIX II: Certification standard conformance checklist (confidential)

The following checklist must be completed separately for each FMU evaluated. For group certification assessments, checklists completed for each group member sampled shall demonstrate full conformance with all the requirements of the FSC P&C, except those already complied with at the group level. Based on the evaluation of conformance with each indicator, a conformance determination has been assigned. Conformance with indicators is determined by the entire assessment team through a consensus-based process. Where nonconformance with the standard is documented by the team, nonconformity reports (NCR) are outlined. The following definitions apply, and are the basis for all certification assessments:

- Major Nonconformance** Requirements that FME must meet before certification by Rainforest Alliance can take place.
- Minor Nonconformance** Requirements that FME must meet, within a defined time period (usually within one year), during the period of the certification,
- Observation** **Observations** can be raised when issues or the early stages of a problem are identified which does not of itself constitute a nonconformance, but which the auditor considers may lead to a future nonconformance if not addressed by the client. An observation may be a warning signal on a particular issue that, if not addressed, could turn into a NCR in the future (or a pre-condition or condition during a 5 year re-assessment).

For each indicator presented below, the assessment team’s determination of conformance and relevant findings are presented. Where applicable, NCRs or observations are referenced under the indicator and detailed in the note section of the applicable criterion. Note: where comments have been received from stakeholders about the client’s conformance related to a defined criterion, please include reference to related finding under the explanatory notes.

| PRINCIPLE 1. <u>COMPLIANCE WITH LAWS AND FSC PRINCIPLES</u> - Forest management shall respect all applicable laws of the country in which they occur and international treaties and agreements to which the country is a signatory, and comply with all FSC Principles and Criteria. | |
|--|--|
| <u>Criteria and Indicators</u> | <u>Findings</u> |
| C1.1 Forest management shall respect all national and local laws and administrative requirements. | |
| Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance demonstrated. | |
| Indicator 1.1.a Forest management plans and operations demonstrate compliance with all applicable federal, state, county, municipal, and tribal laws, and administrative requirements (e.g., regulations). Violations, outstanding complaints or investigations are provided to the Certifying Body (CB) during the annual audit. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Downeast Lakes Land Trust (DLLT) operations are in compliance with applicable laws and regulation according to the local Maine Forest Service enforcement person Peter Pelletier. During the audit there were no observations of activities inconsistent with laws and regulations. No violations or outstanding complaints or investigations were provided to the CB during the audit. The on-the-ground forester Kyle Burdick in charge of management on the DLLT lands maintains a binder of forestry related |

| | |
|--|--|
| | laws in his pickup truck. He was very knowledgeable about the laws and regulations he is operating on in these unorganized towns in Maine. |
| Indicator 1.1.b To facilitate legal compliance, the forest owner or manager ensures that employees and contractors, commensurate with their responsibilities, are duly informed about applicable laws and regulations. | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>DLLT employees and contract forester have access to all the laws and regulations governing DLLT operations in either the written copy form in the office or through the maine.gov website. This source and an electronic newsletter for foresters produced and sent to Maine foresters and others in Maine which contains writings about all the new laws that are enacted relevant to forestry and logging work, are received by staff and contract forester. Loggers and other contractors (such as road contractors) all participate in the Certified Logging Professional training certification where laws and regulations are reviewed during regular training required of certified individuals.</p> <p>DLLT contract forester Kyle Burdick is required to go to regular training as part of company policy at Orion Timberlands as part of ongoing education as a forester.</p> |
| NOTES: (CARs/Observations) None. | |
| C1.2 All applicable and legally prescribed fees, royalties, taxes and other charges shall be paid. | |
| Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance demonstrated. | |
| Indicator 1.2.a The forest owner or manager provides written evidence that all applicable and legally prescribed fees, royalties, taxes and other charges are being paid in a timely manner. If payment is beyond the control of the landowner or manager, then there is evidence that every attempt at payment was made. | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Appropriate invoices and payment check stub copies for property taxes and state excise tax due from DLLT in the most recent tax year were provided by DLLT office manager Laura Hunt.</p> |
| NOTES: (CARs/Observations) None. | |
| C1.3 In signatory countries, the provisions of all binding international agreements such as CITES, ILO Conventions, ITTA, and Convention on Biological Diversity, shall be respected. | |
| Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance demonstrated. | |
| Indicator 1.3.a Forest management plans and operations comply with relevant provisions of all applicable binding international agreements. Violations, outstanding complaints or investigations are provided to the CB during the annual audit. | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>DLLT executive director Mark Berry provided the listing of International Treaties and Conventions covered under the FSC Standard. Mark Berry said in an interview that he is confident that they are not trading in endangered species. All the forest management outputs are local and the only non-timber resources harvested are balsam fir tips and these are done by small-time producers locally only. DLLT said that it had no</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | violations or outstanding complaints or investigations regarding this issue. |
| NOTES: (CARs/Observations) None. | |
| C1.4 Conflicts between laws, regulations and the FSC Principles and Criteria shall be evaluated for the purposes of certification on a case by case basis, by the certifiers and the involved or affected parties. | |
| Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance demonstrated. | |
| Indicator 1.4.a Situations in which compliance with laws or regulations conflicts with compliance with FSC Principles, Criteria or Indicators are documented and referred to the CB. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> The DLLT and its contractors are confident that there are no conflicts between the laws and regulations they operate under and the FSC Principles, Criteria and Indicators. No issues in this regard have surfaced during past audits under FSC. |
| NOTES: (CARs/Observations) None. | |
| C1.5 Forest management areas should be protected from illegal harvesting, settlement and other unauthorized activities. | |
| <u>Criteria and Indicators</u> | <u>Findings</u> |
| Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance demonstrated. | |
| Indicator 1.5.a The forest owner or manager supports or implements measures intended to prevent illegal and unauthorized activities on the Forest Management Unit (FMU). | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> The DLLT executive director believes that the nature of who DLLT, as the owner and manager of a community forest, helps in the conformance of this indicator because the lands involved are intentionally open and available to community members and others. Many eyes watch these woods because local people feel a part of the forest. This notion was confirmed with the many stakeholder interviews conducted. In addition, contract forester Kyle Burdick, contractors, DLLT employees, Board members and other community folks spend a lot of time in the DLLT woods and have not observed illegal activities. There are no gates used but they close off some winter roads with boulders to prevent damage and this is respected. The eco-reserve area also has physical limitations that make it difficult to access in many areas except by foot. No illegal activities were noted during the audit. |
| Indicator 1.5.b If illegal or unauthorized activities occur, the forest owner or manager implements actions designed to curtail such activities and correct the situation to the extent possible for meeting all land management objectives with consideration of available resources. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> DLLT has experienced very little illegal activity on DLLT lands since inception of the ownership and creation of the community forest. One recent incident of illegal activity was related during an interview with the DLLT executive director - a local guide (who is the husband of a DLLT board member) found a newly cut snowmobile trail to a lakeshore area this late winter. DLLT is in the middle of closing this issue out. Other than some small trees cut during the process, no damage was done to soil or |

| | |
|--|--|
| | other resources. |
| NOTES: (CARs/Observations) None. | |
| C1.6 Forest managers shall demonstrate a long-term commitment to adhere to the FSC Principles and Criteria. | |
| Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance demonstrated. | |
| Indicator 1.6.a The forest owner or manager demonstrates a long-term commitment to adhere to the FSC Principles and Criteria and FSC and FSC-US policies, including the FSC-US Land Sales Policy, and has a publicly available statement of commitment to manage the FMU in conformance with FSC standards and policies. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> As a result of the conformance to the FSC Standard noted during this audit, DLLT has demonstrated its commitment to the Standard, FSC polices and the Land Sales Policy. The DLLT website contains a statement demonstrating the DLLT commitment to FSC certification. |
| Indicator 1.6.b If the certificate holder does not certify their entire holdings, then they document, in brief, the reasons for seeking partial certification referencing FSC-POL-20-002 (or subsequent policy revisions), the location of other managed forest units, the natural resources found on the holdings being excluded from certification, and the management activities planned for the holdings being excluded from certification. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> All of DLLT forest landownership holdings are included in the FSC certificate. |
| Indicator 1.6.c The forest owner or manager notifies the Certifying Body of significant changes in ownership and/or significant changes in management planning within 90 days of such change. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> DLLT notified Rainforest Alliance soon after the acquisition in 2008 when the Wabassus tract was added to the ownership. |
| NOTES: (CARs/Observations) None. | |
| Principle 2: Tenure and Use Rights and Responsibilities | |
| Long-term tenure and use rights to the land and forest resources shall be clearly defined, documented and legally established. | |
| <i>Criteria and Indicators</i> | <i>Findings</i> |
| C2.1 Clear evidence of long-term forest use rights to the land (e.g. land title, customary rights, or lease agreements) shall be demonstrated. | |
| Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance demonstrated. | |
| Indicator 2.1.a The forest owner or manager provides clear evidence of long-term rights to use and manage the FMU for the purposes described in the management plan. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> DLLT has 4 bound sets of deed documents representing the purchases and ownership since inception to present. This is clear demonstration and evidence of long-term rights of ownership. |
| Indicator 2.1.b The forest owner or manager identifies and | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | |
|--|--|
| documents legally established use and access rights associated with the FMU that are held by other parties. | Four conservation easements that together cover the entire property were provided. The “Farm Cove” and “Fourth Machias” easements have the same provisions and are held by NEFF. The Ecological Reserve Easement was transferred to Sweet Water Trust. The Wabassus Lake Easement is held by Maine Department of Conservation. The Passamaquody tribe also have road access rights through a formal contract. There are no camp leases on the DLLT property. Woodland Pulp has dam access to several dams and camp owners have ROW access in a number locations. |
| Indicator 2.1.c Boundaries of land ownership and use rights are clearly identified on the ground and on maps prior to commencing management activities in the vicinity of the boundaries. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Boundaries are marked a number of ways. A lot of boundary is water, township and normal property boundaries are updated with flagging by Orion when they harvest. There is a 1,000 foot corridor on Machias Lake and Machias river held by the state. Boundaries observed are fair to good. One boundary off the end of the ATV/Snowmobile trail which is also a DLLT access road at the end of the Fourth Lake Road was difficult to follow through the woods as old blazes still exist but paint was nearly non-existent. Other boundaries viewed had blazing and painting that is more up to date. See OBS 01/12 . |
| NOTES: (CARs/Observations) OBS 01/12 | |
| C2.2 Local communities with legal or customary tenure or use rights shall maintain control, to the extent necessary to protect their rights or resources, over forest operations unless they delegate control with free and informed consent to other agencies. | |
| Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance demonstrated | |
| Indicator 2.2.a The forest owner or manager allows the exercise of <i>tenure</i> and <i>use rights</i> established by law or regulation. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Conservation easements cover the entire DLLT ownership requiring access to the properties. Clearly the DLLT lands are used by many people locally and others who come to fish, hunt and stay in the lodges. |
| Indicator 2.2.b In FMUs where tenure or use rights held by others exist, the forest owner or manager consults with groups that hold such rights so that management activities do not significantly impact the uses or benefits of such rights. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Regular consultations occur with conservation easement holders as easements are monitored. Conversations with these stakeholders indicate good consultation and communication occurs between the easement holders and DLLT. |
| NOTES: (CARs/Observations) None. | |
| C2.3 Appropriate mechanisms shall be employed to resolve disputes over tenure claims and use rights. The circumstances and | |

status of any outstanding disputes will be explicitly considered in the certification evaluation. Disputes of substantial magnitude involving a significant number of interests will normally disqualify an operation from being certified.

Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance demonstrated

Indicator 2.3.a If *disputes* arise regarding tenure claims or use rights then the forest owner or manager initially attempts to resolve them through open communication, negotiation, and/or mediation. If these good-faith efforts fail, then federal, state, and/or local laws are employed to resolve such disputes.

Conformance with Indicator: Yes No N/A
 No disputes have occurred with stakeholders or use rights users since the inception of the DLLT. One instance occurred early on when an abutter had placed a garden on the DLLT property by accident and this was moved and resolved without issue, No disputes were mentioned in any of the many contacts made with stakeholders.

Indicator 2.3.b The forest owner or manager documents any significant disputes over tenure and use rights.

Conformance with Indicator: Yes No N/A
 See above indicator. No disputes have occurred so no documentation has been needed.

NOTES: (CARs/Observations) None.

Principle 3: Indigenous Peoples' Rights

The legal and customary rights of indigenous peoples to own, use and manage their lands, territories, and resources shall be recognized and respected.

Criteria and Indicators

Findings

C3.1 Indigenous peoples shall control forest management on their lands and territories unless they delegate control with free and informed consent to other agencies.

Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance demonstrated.

Indicator 3.1.a Tribal forest management planning and implementation are carried out by authorized tribal representatives in accordance with tribal laws and customs and relevant federal laws.

Conformance with Indicator: Yes No N/A
 These lands are not part of the Indian Claims Act of 1980 in Maine. The Passamaquoddy tribe and Penobscot have no claims on the DLLT lands.

Indicator 3.1.b The manager of a tribal forest secures, in writing, informed consent regarding forest management activities from the tribe or individual forest owner prior to commencement of those activities.

Conformance with Indicator: Yes No N/A
 See above indicator. The Passamaquoddy tribe and Penobscot have no claims on the DLLT lands.

NOTES: (CARs/Observations) None.

C3.2 Forest management shall not threaten or diminish, either directly or indirectly, the resources or tenure rights of indigenous peoples.

Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance demonstrated

Indicator 3.2.a During management planning, the forest owner or manager consults with American Indian groups that have legal rights or other binding agreements to the FMU to avoid harming their resources or rights.

Conformance with Indicator: Yes No N/A
 The only legal rights any of the tribal groups have on DLLT land is the agreement that DLLT executed with the Passamaquoddy tribe that allows for road access to their adjacent properties. This road agreement was

| | |
|--|--|
| | voluntarily signed by DLLT in the good neighbor spirit and was not a requirement as part of any tribe settlement or related issue. Other than this there are no legal rights or binding agreements. For the road issue, DLLT consults with tribal representatives if there is a need to close or delay access due to road work or maintenance. |
| Indicator 3.2.b Demonstrable actions are taken so that forest management does not adversely affect tribal resources. When applicable, evidence of, and measures for, protecting tribal resources are incorporated in the management plan. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> There are no tribal effects as a result of forest management because, outside of the road agreement that allows tribal personnel to pass on DLLT lands to access tribal lands to the north, there are no tribal owned resources. |
| NOTES: (CARs/Observations) None. | |
| C3.3 Sites of special cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance to indigenous peoples shall be clearly identified in cooperation with such peoples, and recognized and protected by forest managers. | |
| Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance demonstrated | |
| Indicator 3.3.a The forest owner or manager invites consultation with tribal representatives in identifying sites of current or traditional cultural, archeological, ecological, economic or religious significance. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> The cultural resource protocol developed as part of the DLLT forest management plan was developed in consultation with Donald Soctomah, the Passamaquoddy Tribal Historic Preservation Officer. This offer to consult was also made to Bonnie Newsom of the Penobscot Tribe. The result of this consultation is that DLLT now knows the only sensitive sites that might hold historic or cultural resources are those immediately on the shorelines of the lakes, rivers and stream. As a result, there is no harvesting that goes on in these areas with a minimum of 25 foot "no-cut" buffer and no skidding out to 100 feet to assured no exposed mineral soil is exposed in that zone. |
| Indicator 3.3.b In consultation with tribal representatives, the forest owner or manager develops measures to protect or enhance areas of special significance (see also Criterion 9.1). | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> See above indicator. |
| NOTES: (CARs/Observations) None. | |
| C3.4 Indigenous peoples shall be compensated for the application of their traditional knowledge regarding the use of forest species or management systems in forest operations. This compensation shall be formally agreed upon with their free and informed consent before forest operations commence. | |
| Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance demonstrated | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Indicator 3.4.a The forest owner or manager identifies whether <i>traditional knowledge</i> in forest management is being used. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No tribal knowledge is used by DLLT. |
| Indicator 3.4.b When traditional knowledge is used, written protocols are jointly developed prior to such use and signed by local tribes or tribal members to protect and fairly compensate them for such use. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No tribal knowledge is used by DLLT. |
| Indicator 3.4.c The forest owner or manager respects the confidentiality of tribal traditional knowledge and assists in the protection of such knowledge. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No tribal knowledge is used by DLLT. |
| NOTES: (CARs/Observations) None. | |
| Principle 4: Community Relations and Worker's Rights Forest management operations shall maintain or enhance the long-term social and economic well-being of forest workers and local communities. | |
| <u>Criteria and Indicators</u> | <u>Findings</u> |
| C4.1 The communities within, or adjacent to, the forest management area should be given opportunities for employment, training, and other services. | |
| Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance demonstrated | |
| Indicator 4.1.a Employee compensation and hiring practices meet or exceed the prevailing <i>local</i> norms within the forestry industry. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Interviews with DLLT staff indicate that the employment situation is very positive and hiring practices and compensation exceed local norms. |
| Indicator 4.1.b Forest work is offered in ways that create high quality job opportunities for employees. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> DLLT is a high quality employer according to both employees and contractors interviewed. |
| Indicator 4.1.c Forest workers are provided with fair wages. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Wages are fair and within statewide norms according to employees and contractors interviewed. |
| Indicator 4.1.d Hiring practices and conditions of employment are non-discriminatory and follow applicable federal, state and local regulations. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> There is a written Employee Policy handbook with DLLT and at the major forestry contractor Orion Timberlands that cover this. Interviews with staff and contractors indicate the hiring practices and conditions of employment meet the intent and spirit of the indicator. |
| Indicator 4.1.e The forest owner or manager provides work opportunities to qualified local applicants and seeks opportunities for purchasing local goods and services of | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> All employees of DLLT and contractors are locally based. Purchase of relevant forestry related materials are usually from local vendors nearby in |

| | |
|---|--|
| equal price and quality. | Maine or New Brunswick if the material is not found in Maine. |
| Indicator 4.1.f Commensurate with the size and scale of operation, the forest owner or manager provides and/or supports learning opportunities to improve public understanding of forests and forest management. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> DLLT organizes and sponsors numerous conferences, seminars, workshops, trainings, education programs as evidence by program flyers provided and viewing of DLLT website. Connection with the public in this way is part of the DLLT mission as a non-profit organization. DLLT has held regular public meetings and recently did so in the fall of 2011 and spring of 2012 for general consultations. |
| Indicator 4.1.g The forest owner or manager participates in local economic development and/or civic activities, based on scale of operation and where such opportunities are available. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> DLLT is a community-based organization and, as such, is committed to economic and environmental well-being, broad leadership and participation in local community events. The DLLT executive director participates in the Chamber of Commerce in Grand Lakes Stream and has attended Sunrise County Economic Council meetings. He has also been part of the Keeping Maine's Forest Committee for several years. |
| NOTES: (CARs/Observations) None. | |
| C4.2 Forest management should meet or exceed all applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of employees and their families. | |
| Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance demonstrated | |
| Indicator 4.2.a The forest owner or manager meets or exceeds all applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of employees and their families (also see Criterion 1.1). | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> There have been no accidents resulting in injuries within DLLT staff or with contractors since the inception of the organization. The personnel policies of both DLLT and Orion Timberland, the forestry contractor, includes language with safety requirements. Additionally, safety practices are required in the contract with Orion Timberlands and contracts with loggers. |
| Indicator 4.2.b The forest owner or manager and their employees and contractors demonstrate a safe work environment. Contracts or other written agreements include safety requirements. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> There have been no injuries as a result of accidents on DLLT properties by employees or contractors since inception in 2004. Safety practices are required in the contract with Orion Timberlands and contracts with loggers. The only incident mentioned in interviews involved several logging contractor personnel who were leaving the job site to go home at the end of the day last winter and the pick-up truck slipped into a ditch due to slippery road conditions. A little damage on the truck occurred and no one was injured because the truck was traveling at an appropriate slow speed. |

| | |
|--|---|
| | The unsafe road condition was remedied with a grader. |
| Indicator 4.2.c The forest owner or manager hires well-qualified service providers to safely implement the management plan. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Interviews with personnel of the service providers indicate skilled and safe personnel operating on DLLT lands. |
| NOTES: (CARs/Observations) None. | |
| C4.3 The rights of workers to organize and voluntarily negotiate with their employers shall be guaranteed as outlined in Conventions 87 and 98 of the International Labor Organization (ILO). | |
| Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance demonstrated | |
| Indicator 4.3.a Forest workers are free to associate with other workers for the purpose of advocating for their own employment interests. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> DLLT says that there is no restriction on associating. Interviews with workers confirmed this. |
| Indicator 4.3.b The forest owner or manager has effective and culturally sensitive mechanisms to resolve disputes between workers and management. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Both the DLLT personnel policy manual and that of Orion Timberlands has described mechanism to resolve internal disputes. According to employees and contractors interviewed, there have been no disputes. |
| NOTES: (CARs/Observations) None. | |
| C4.4 Management planning and operations shall incorporate the results of evaluations of social impact. Consultations shall be maintained with people and groups (both men and women) directly affected by management operations. | |
| Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance demonstrated | |
| Indicator 4.4.a The forest owner or manager understands the likely social impacts of management activities, and incorporates this understanding into management planning and operations. Social impacts include effects on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Archeological sites and sites of cultural, historical and community significance (on and off the FMU; • Public resources, including air, water and food (hunting, fishing, collecting); • Aesthetics; • Community goals for forest and natural resource use and protection such as employment, subsistence, recreation and health; • Community economic opportunities; • Other people who may be affected by management operations. A summary is available to the CB | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> DLLT has a detailed social impact assessment as part of their management planning documents that covers the requirements of the indicator. This document, as with all the planning documents, is available on the DLLT website. |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Indicator 4.4.b The forest owner or manager seeks and considers input in management planning from people who would likely be affected by management activities.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>DLLT addresses the requirement to consult with parties affected by their management in several ways. The primary way that they do this is through the Board of Directors, Forest Resources Committee, and Trail Committee. They have several members of Committees who are not members of the Board of Directors. These people have significant input on all management activities on the DLLT property. Virtually every detail of forestry projects goes through the Forestry Committee before approved by the Board. DLLT also does regular community public meetings and asked for people's ideas and comments relative to the DLLT lands. They recently held community meetings in Grand Lakes Stream in November of 2011 and April of 2012.</p> <p>In addition, as evidenced during the audit, the DLLT executive director frequents the local store in Grand Lake Stream where nearly all local residents go from time to time. The auditor witnessed several conversation between the ED and local residents about land management issues at that location.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 4.4.c People who are subject to direct adverse effects of management operations are apprised of relevant activities in advance of the action so that they may express concern.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The Board of Directors and Committee, containing local residents, is a way that local people are apprised of relevant activities on the DLLT lands. Public meetings are another way this is done. Lastly, the DLLT website is very comprehensive and is kept up to date and includes items, in addition to management planning documents, harvest plans and other activities that will take place on the DLLT lands.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 4.4.d For <i>public forests</i>, consultation includes the following components:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clearly defined and accessible methods for public participation are provided in both long and short-term planning processes, including harvest plans and operational plans; 2. Public notification is sufficient to allow interested stakeholders the chance to learn of upcoming opportunities for public review and/or comment on the proposed management; 3. An accessible and affordable appeals process to planning decisions is available. | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>DLLT is a privately owned forest.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Planning decisions incorporate the results of public consultation. All draft and final planning documents, and their supporting data, are made readily available to the public.</p> | |
| <p>C4.5 Appropriate mechanisms shall be employed for resolving grievances and for providing fair compensation in the case of loss or damage affecting the legal or customary rights, property, resources, or livelihoods of local peoples. Measures shall be taken to avoid such loss or damage.</p> | |
| <p>Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance demonstrated</p> | |
| <p>Indicator 4.5.a The forest owner or manager does not engage in negligent activities that cause damage to other people.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Field interviews and observations on the DLLT property indicates conformance with this indicator.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 4.5.b The forest owner or manager provides a known and accessible means for interested stakeholders to voice grievances and have them resolved. If significant disputes arise related to resolving grievances and/or providing fair compensation, the forest owner or manager follows appropriate dispute resolution procedures. At a minimum, the forest owner or manager maintains open communications, responds to grievances in a timely manner, demonstrates ongoing good faith efforts to resolve the grievances, and maintains records of legal suites and claims.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> The DLLT is a non-profit organization that was created for the purposes of owning and managing a community forest with the mission of making this property accessible and available for public use. As such, their management and governance structure is clearly set up to provide access to comments and resolution of disputes by stakeholders. The mechanism DLLT has used to do this is several fold: First, regular public meetings are held to listen to concerns and hear ideas from people. Second, the DLLT executive director is available at the office in the heart of Grand Lake Stream to meet with anyone who comes in. This occurred several times during the audit. Third, the Board and Committees act as sounding boards for issues and they are sometimes resolved at that level. Additionally the executive director listens to people informally such as at the town store which is a gathering place for community members (P.O. Box were recently relocated there when the Post Office shut down the post office). DLLT is also accessible via its website, phone and e-mail. There have been no significant disputes. The only one that could be recalled by DLLT staff was a recent one where DLLT put rocks on a trail to make a walk in camping site pedestrian access only. This issue all went through the Board and Trail committee and it was resolved by moving rocks a bit for ATVs.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 4.5.c Fair compensation or reasonable mitigation is provided to local people, communities or adjacent landowners for substantiated damage or loss of income caused by the landowner or manager.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> According to interviewees, there have been no situations which would require mitigation of the type described in this indicator. The DLLT executive director confirmed same during an interview.</p> |

NOTES: (CARs/Observations) None.

Principle 5: Benefits from the Forest

Forest management operations shall encourage the efficient use of the forest's multiple products and services to ensure economic viability and a wide range of environmental and social benefits.

Criteria and Indicators

Findings

C5.1 Forest management should strive toward economic viability, while taking into account the full environmental, social, and operational costs of production, and ensuring the investments necessary to maintain the ecological productivity of the forest.

Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance demonstrated.

Indicator 5.1.a The forest owner or manager is financially able to implement core management activities, including all those environmental, social and operating costs, required to meet this Standard, and investment and reinvestment in forest management.

Conformance with Indicator: Yes No N/A
Financial documents for DLLT are available publicly from website. In interviews with DLLT staff and board members, it is clear that they are committed to making the investments necessary to assure the FSC Standard is being met.
While DLLT has demonstrated that it has hired skilled staff and a forest management contractor with a great deal of experience and expertise, the on-the-ground forester assigned to oversee the day to day management of the DLLT lands from its forestry contractor clearly has a significant work load with over 55,000 acres to manage both in the Grand Lake Stream area and elsewhere in Maine. During the audit, questions were asked of the forester about harvest preparation work not being done completely for harvests about to begin. The forester said that he was somewhat behind on the work to be done but that he would get the work done on time. Another interview revealed that his workload is the reason that he is somewhat behind on this work. It was noted during the audit that the work that was observed during the audit was completed with consistent conformance to the FSC Standard. See **OBS 02/12**.

Indicator 5.1.b Responses to short-term financial factors are limited to levels that are consistent with fulfillment of this Standard.

Conformance with Indicator: Yes No N/A
DLLT has not had situation(s) yet where financial issues have impacted the forestry work they are doing on the ownership according to the executive director. They are far enough along in their existence now that they have some reserves to tide them over.

NOTES: (CARs/Observations) **OBS 02/12**

C5.2 Forest management and marketing operations should encourage the optimal use and local processing of the forest's diversity of products.

| | |
|--|---|
| Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance demonstrated | |
| Indicator 5.2.a Where forest products are harvested or sold, opportunities for forest product sales and services are given to local harvesters, value-added processing and manufacturing facilities, and other operations that are able to offer services at competitive rates and levels of service. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> The two logging contractors that work on the DLLT property are from local towns. All the markets used to sell forest products and the small amount of NTFP (fir tips) are all local. One pulp market in central Maine has been used rarely but that is the most distant market that has been used for forest products harvested from DLLT forests. |
| Indicator 5.2.b The forest owner or manager takes measures to optimize the use of harvested forest products and explores product diversification where appropriate and consistent with management objectives. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> All possible markets are used for the forest products harvested. That is assured because the forestry contractor also purchases all the timber and, with a full-time forest products marketing staff, gets the most out of the many markets available for the timber products. Markets used include several pulpwood markets, several sawmill markets (various species go to various sawmills) and wood chip fuel to biomass power plants. A new wildlife harvest was viewed in the field that has just started in a very small diameter pole stand. This patch cut harvest is getting product to market that previously could not be sold because of its size. Orion Timberlands is always searching for new markets to get the best prices for the wood sold from DLLT. |
| Indicator 5.2.c On public lands where forest products are harvested and sold, some sales of forest products or contracts are scaled or structured to allow small business to bid competitively. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DLLT lands are privately owned. |
| NOTES: (CARs/Observations) None. | |
| C5.3 Forest management should minimize waste associated with harvesting and on-site processing operations and avoid damage to other forest resources. | |
| Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance demonstrated | |
| Indicator 5.3.a Management practices are employed to minimize the loss and/or waste of harvested forest products. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> In the field, it was noted that there was a good balance between full utilization of trees harvested and assuring that there was a good amount of small and larger diameter woody debris in the woods. Extra effort was being made to move the smallest diameter material, mostly unmarketable, back into the woods for wildlife habitat purposes. |
| Indicator 5.3.b Harvest practices are managed to protect residual trees and other forest resources, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> soil compaction, rutting and erosion are minimized; | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Harvest areas viewed during audit had very little residual tree damage. Soil compaction and rutting is kept to a minimum. The rainy day of one of |

| | |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> residual trees are not significantly damaged to the extent that health, growth, or values are noticeably affected; damage to NTFPs is minimized during management activities; and techniques and equipment that minimize impacts to vegetation, soil, and water are used whenever feasible. | <p>the field audit days at a current harvesting operation found that the forwarder had stopped working because the soft ground was not able to hold the machine without some initial rutting. DLLT contract forester Kyle Burdick said that the Orion contracts allow them to shut down operations for that purpose. In this case, the logging contractor made the decision on their own.</p> <p>Generally the partial harvesting techniques have done little damage to residual stand and this issue is in the mind of the forestry contractor as evidenced by the contract language and field results.</p> |
| <p>NOTES: (CARs/Observations) None.</p> | |
| <p>C5.4 Forest management should strive to strengthen and diversify the local economy, avoiding dependence on a single forest product.</p> | |
| <p>Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance demonstrated</p> | |
| <p>Indicator 5.4.a The forest owner or manager demonstrates knowledge of their operation’s effect on the local economy as it relates to existing and potential markets for a wide variety of timber and non-timber forest products and services.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>All possible markets are used for the forest products harvested. That is assured because the forestry contractor also purchases all the timber and, with a full-time forest products marketing staff, gets the most out of the many markets available for the timber products. Markets used include several pulpwood markets, several sawmill markets (various species go to various sawmills) and wood chip fuel to biomass power plants.</p> <p>As a community forest, two other products are provided for no cost. A firewood permit system allows local residents to cut and collect, on their own, up to 2 cords or wood per year. Secondly, local small wreath makers are granted permits to collect balsam fir tips on a small scale.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 5.4.b The forest owner or manager strives to diversify the economic use of the forest according to Indicator 5.4.a.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The project with Tidemill Enterprises, the wildlife harvest with cut-to-length system, is new for DLLT. The firewood policy has changed – 2 cords per year for year round residents is allowed now from 1 cord per year previously. The DLLT property also helps local guide service businesses and lodges/camp rentals by allowing full access to their lands for hunting and fishing on the many lakes and streams in the area.</p> |
| <p>NOTES: (CARs/Observations) None</p> | |
| <p>C5.5 Forest management operations shall recognize, maintain, and, where appropriate, enhance the value of forest services and resources such as watersheds and fisheries.</p> | |
| <p>Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance demonstrated</p> | |
| <p>Indicator 5.5.a In developing activities on the FMU, the</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> |

forest owner or manager identifies and defines appropriate measures for maintaining and/or enhancing forest services and resources that serve public values, including municipal watersheds, fisheries, carbon storage and sequestration, recreation and tourism.

The nature of DLLT is as a community forest. Creating the forest and maintaining it as a public recreational resource provides for significant public services in the way of hunting and fishing, snowmobile and ATV access and other recreational access. DLLT has entered into a carbon project that is near completion. This carbon project may require reduction in harvest levels. A term sheet has been signed and Climate Action Reserve (CAR) audit has occurred. This will be a 100 year commitment.

Indicator 5.5.b The forest owner or manager uses the information from Indicator 5.5.a to implement appropriate measures for maintaining and/or enhancing these services and resources.

Conformance with Indicator: Yes No N/A
 DLLT took the first 6 years of ownership up until 2012 to get all of their systems in place to fully provide the public services they hoped for as a privately held community forest. In the future DLLT may add to these services but , as described above in 5.5.a, they provide a full suite of public services to maintain and enhance the mission and vision created by the founders of the non-profit.

NOTES: (CARs/Observations) None.

C5.6 The rate of harvest of forest products shall not exceed levels which can be permanently sustained.

Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance demonstrated

Indicator 5.6.a In FMUs where products are being harvested, the landowner or manager calculates the sustained yield harvest level for each sustained yield planning unit, and provides clear rationale for determining the size and layout of the planning unit. The sustained yield harvest level calculation is documented in the Management Plan.

Conformance with Indicator: Yes No N/A
 DLLT has up to date forest inventory data and has good documentation on the sustained yield harvest level(s) and total allowed for DLLT operations. Reporting since first year of operation in 2004-5 shows harvest levels consistent with sustained yield calculated levels.

Source information includes:

- The sustained yield harvest level calculation for each planning unit is based on:
- documented growth rates for particular sites, and/or acreage of forest types, age-classes and species distributions;
 - mortality and decay and other factors that affect net growth;
 - areas reserved from harvest or subject to harvest restrictions to meet other management goals;
 - silvicultural practices that will be employed on the FMU;

FCCF Management plan (pgs. 33-45, 71-86, 275-277), 2010 Inventory review summary document, 2009 inventory letter, AAC workbook (EXCEL)

Fountains Forestry was hired to complete the new forest inventory in 2010. A new sustained yield harvest level was calculated consistent with the requirements of the indicator. The goal is to increase the stocking over time so the harvest plan is to harvest less than net growth. The newest addition (Wabassus tract) has not been harvested on yet. The stocking in this tract is less than on the original Farm Cove tract lands. The plan is to not likely enter this part of the DLLT ownership for harvesting activities for several years and, then, only for improvement

| | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> management objectives and desired future conditions. <p>The calculation is made by considering the effects of repeated prescribed harvests on the product/species and its ecosystem, as well as planned management treatments and projections of subsequent regrowth beyond single rotation and multiple re-entries.</p> | <p>work and to allow the stocking to increase as with the main tract.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 5.6.b Average annual harvest levels, over rolling periods of no more than 10 years, do not exceed the calculated sustained yield harvest level.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Data shows harvest since purchase in 2005 to be consistent with sustained yield harvest levels calculated. DLLT maintains an Excel document AAC workbook showing this.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 5.6.c Rates and methods of timber harvest lead to achieving desired conditions, and improve or maintain health and quality across the FMU. Overstocked stands and stands that have been depleted or rendered to be below productive potential due to natural events, past management, or lack of management, are returned to desired stocking levels and composition at the earliest practicable time as justified in management objectives.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Calculated data from AAC Excel file shows increasing volume levels for the large original ownership from 2005. The Wabassus tract is being looked at as separate sustained yield planning unit for initial sustained yield harvest level calculations but is not being harvested for the time being because the stocking is much lower than desired. The goal of all harvesting is to assure that the property stocking increases substantially, to a desired 20+ cords per acre.</p> <p>Field audit demonstrated the harvesting plans necessary to reach the stocking goal are being carried out.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 5.6.d For NTFPs, calculation of quantitative sustained yield harvest levels is required only in cases where products are harvested in significant commercial operations or where traditional or customary use rights may be impacted by such harvests. In other situations, the forest owner or manager utilizes available information, and new information that can be reasonably gathered, to set harvesting levels that will not result in a depletion of the non-timber growing stocks or other adverse effects to the forest ecosystem.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The only NTFP harvested is balsam fir tips for wreath making. While some of the tipping permittees sell wreaths as a business, they are all very small scale. Each tipping permittee is harvesting 200 lbs. or less of tips each year and most are harvesting much less than that. The locations of the tipping tends to be near the camps and houses of the business owners and close to roads. The field audit did not reveal any problems with this NTFP activity.</p> |
| <p>NOTES: (CARs/Observations) None.</p> | |

Principle 6: Environmental Impact

Forest management shall conserve biological diversity and its associated values, water resources, soils, and unique and fragile ecosystems and landscapes, and, by so doing, maintain the ecological functions and the integrity of the forest.

| <u>Criteria and Indicators</u> | <u>Findings</u> |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|
|--------------------------------|-----------------|

| | |
|--|--|
| C6.1 Assessment of environmental impacts shall be completed -- appropriate to the scale, intensity of forest management and the uniqueness of the affected resources -- and adequately integrated into management systems. Assessments shall include landscape level considerations as well as the impacts of on-site processing facilities. Environmental impacts shall be assessed prior to commencement of site-disturbing operations. | |
|--|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance demonstrated | |
|--|--|

Indicator 6.1.a Using the results of *credible scientific analysis, best available information* (including relevant databases), and local knowledge and experience, an assessment of conditions on the FMU is completed and includes:

- 1) Forest community types and development, size class and/or successional stages, and associated *natural disturbance regimes*;
- 2) *Rare, Threatened and Endangered (RTE) species* and *rare ecological communities* (including plant communities);
- 3) Other habitats and species of management concern;
- 4) Water resources and associated riparian habitats and hydrologic functions;
- 5) *Soil resources*; and
- 6) *Historic conditions* on the FMU related to forest community types and development, size class and/or successional stages, and a broad comparison of historic and current conditions.

Conformance with Indicator: Yes No N/A

The forest management plan includes the required information to fulfill the requirements of this indicator. The original plan, "Farm Cove Community Forest Management Plan 2005-2025" developed in 2005 by Orion Timberlands, was updated in 2010 and 2011 by Forest Synthesis, Additionally, a new plan was developed for the Wabassus tract and a "Focus Species Addendum" also by Forest Synthesis was developed. The Focus Species Addendum document fully describes natural disturbance regimes for this area of Maine.

With the new plan components, inventory in 2010 and sustained yield harvesting calculations updated, the plans are fully up to date.

Indicator 6.1.b Prior to commencing site-disturbing activities, the forest owner or manager assesses and documents the potential short and long-term impacts of planned management activities on elements 1-5 listed in Criterion 6.1.a.

The assessment must incorporate the *best available*

Conformance with Indicator: Yes No N/A

Before any timber harvesting, road work or other activities occur on the ground at DLLT, a full operational plan is developed that is reviewed, amended and approved by the DLLT Forestry Committee and DLLT Board of Directors. The timber harvest plans are developed by Orion Timberland forester, the road work is developed internally by the Community Forest Program Manager on staff. These plans include detailed description of

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>information, drawing from scientific literature and experts. The impact assessment will at minimum include identifying resources that may be impacted by management (e.g., streams, habitats of management concern, soil nutrients). Additional detail (i.e., detailed description or quantification of impacts) will vary depending on the uniqueness of the resource, potential risks, and steps that will be taken to avoid and minimize risks.</p> | <p>resources using the best available information from the plan documents and also outside sources should that be needed. The plans note the sensitive resources, no harvest areas, buffers for several reasons including water and wildlife habitat concerns or special management areas. Detail maps are also included that are later provided to feller-buncher operators or cut-to-length processor operators for their GIS systems on-board.</p> <p>Harvest inspections and reporting occur regularly once operations begin. Kyle Burdick is doing these once every week during the operations. Once the operation is complete they do a final closure inspection with the same report. A report form is used for this purpose.</p> <p>John Harmon, the Community Forest Program Manager goes out in the field with Kyle before and then after to confirm closeout.</p> <p>The Forestry Committee and Board members get a field tour property pre-harvest and after closeout. The committee gets regular written and verbal reports at the committee meetings.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 6.1.c Using the findings of the impact assessment (Indicator 6.1.b), management approaches and field prescriptions are developed and implemented that: 1) avoid or minimize negative short-term and long-term impacts; and, 2) maintain and/or enhance the long-term ecological viability of the forest.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Completed operations viewed in the field demonstrated that impacts to the land are kept to a minimum. Activities are minimized in sensitive areas, especially related to water and riparian zones and also special management areas identified in the forest management plan documents.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 6.1.d On public lands, assessments developed in Indicator 6.1.a and management approaches developed in Indicator 6.1.c are made available to the public in draft form for review and comment prior to finalization. Final assessments are also made available.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>DLLT forests are privately owned.</p> |
| <p>NOTES: (CARs/Observations) None.</p> | |
| <p>C6.2 Safeguards shall exist which protect rare, threatened and endangered species and their habitats (e.g., nesting and feeding areas). Conservation zones and protection areas shall be established, appropriate to the scale and intensity of forest management and the uniqueness of the affected resources. Inappropriate hunting, fishing, trapping and collecting shall be controlled.</p> | |
| <p>Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance demonstrated</p> | |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Indicator 6.2.a If there is a likely presence of RTE species as identified in Indicator 6.1.a then either a field survey to verify the species' presence or absence is conducted prior to site-disturbing management activities, or management occurs with the assumption that potential RTE species are present.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Forest management plan at pg. 109 and Focus Species Addendum cover RTE. As a result of the 2011 FSC audit report Observations, training of field personnel has occurred to help in field RTE species identification.</p> <p>The locations of the few RTE species on the property are now known but they are limited in this part of Maine. Andy Kutko from Maine Natural Areas Program did the training in 2011 and verified the lack of sensitive areas relative to RTE on the DLLT lands. The species identified are all related to wetland and water. Wetlands protection is happening already as part of normal operations so there are not significant concerns about RTE.</p> <p>Lastly, the Focus Species approach in that addendum to the plan further addresses RTE species through targeted species management practices.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 6.2.b When RTE species are present or assumed to be present, modifications in management are made in order to maintain, restore or enhance the extent, quality and viability of the species and their habitats. Conservation zones and/or protected areas are established for RTE species, including those S3 species that are considered rare, where they are necessary to maintain or improve the short and long-term viability of the species. Conservation measures are based on relevant science, guidelines and/or consultation with relevant, independent experts as necessary to achieve the conservation goal of the Indicator.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>All known RTE species are identified and habitats mapped in the DLLT system where they are known. The review and training completed in 2011 with the Maine Natural Areas Program resulted in the identification of all wetland areas as sensitive sites for RTE plants. DLLT plans and field practices already prohibit activities in these areas. The Ecological Reserve area, the HCVF areas and Special Management Areas are all identified in the GIS system and are designed, in part, to protect habitat for RTE species. The thorough review completed by staff and contract staff before any timber management/harvesting activities take place uses all of this information to assure practices take RTE and other important resources into account.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 6.2.c For medium and large public forests (e.g. state forests), forest management plans and operations are designed to meet species' recovery goals, as well as landscape level biodiversity conservation goals.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>DLLT forests are privately owned.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 6.2.d Within the capacity of the forest owner or manager, hunting, fishing, trapping, collecting and other activities are controlled to avoid the risk of impacts to vulnerable species and communities (See Criterion 1.5).</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>There is hunting, fishing and trapping on the DLLT property – in fact, these activities are encouraged as part of the community forest approach and mission of the organization as well as the conservation easements that</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | cover the forest. The enforcement and control of these activities are left to the state personnel who are in charge of this. The DLLT monitoring system, however, reviews those activities as a matter of course. There have been no problems with these activities since the inception of the DLLT. |
| NOTES: (CARs/Observations) None. | |
| C6.3 Ecological functions and values shall be maintained intact, enhanced, or restored, including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Forest regeneration and succession. b) Genetic, species, and ecosystem diversity. c) Natural cycles that affect the productivity of the forest ecosystem. | |
| Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance demonstrated | |
| Indicator 6.3.a.1 The forest owner or manager maintains, enhances, and/or restores under-represented successional stages in the FMU that would naturally occur on the types of sites found on the FMU. Where old growth of different community types that would naturally occur on the forest are under-represented in the landscape relative to natural conditions, a portion of the forest is managed to enhance and/or restore old growth characteristics. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Old growth, totaling just over 59 acres, has been identified in two areas on the DLLT forest and these areas have been identified as HCVF or Special Management Areas. These areas are not harvested. Since the entire property is protected with conservation easements, all the successional stages present are maintained. |
| Indicator 6.3.a.2 When a rare ecological community is present, modifications are made in both the management plan and its implementation in order to maintain, restore or enhance the viability of the community. Based on the vulnerability of the existing community, conservation zones and/or protected areas are established where warranted. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> DLLT has completed significant planning for rare communities, conservation zones and protection areas. DLLT has conservation easements on every acre of its ownership assuring long term protection. Part of that includes the Ecological Reserve area which covers most of the HCVF area identified. Additionally, the plan documents identify a series of special management areas. |
| Indicator 6.3.a.3 When they are present, management maintains the area, structure, composition, and processes of all Type 1 and Type 2 old growth . Type 1 and 2 old growth are also protected and buffered as necessary with conservation zones, unless an alternative plan is developed that provides greater overall protection of old growth values. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> There is old growth being maintained/recruited on the DLLT ownership. The old growth area on the slope of Farm Cove Mt. (SW slope) is about 57 acres and another on Wabassus Mt. adds another 2 or more acres. These areas are in the GIS system and are no-harvest zones. This is well described on pg. 226 of Forest Management Plan. There are over 209 acres is the special management areas. DLLT has also identified an area adjacent to the ecological reserve that |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>they are recruiting for old growth and managing accordingly.</p> <p>The conservation easement documents identify most of these areas.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 6.3.b To the extent feasible within the size of the ownership, particularly on larger ownerships, management maintains, enhances, or restores habitat conditions suitable for well-distributed populations of animal species that are characteristic of forest ecosystems within the landscape.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The forest management plan and the Focus Special Addendum to the plan are designed to result in a varied forest property that provide for habitat for well-distributed populations of animal species that are representative of habitats of the region.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 6.3.c Management maintains, enhances and/or restores the plant and wildlife habitat of Riparian Management Zones (RMZs) to provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) habitat for aquatic species that breed in surrounding uplands; b) habitat for predominantly terrestrial species that breed in adjacent aquatic habitats; c) habitat for species that use riparian areas for feeding, cover, and travel; d) habitat for plant species associated with riparian areas; and, e) stream shading and inputs of wood and leaf litter into the adjacent aquatic ecosystem. | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>DLLT RMZ policy in the forest management plan results in on-the-ground activities that yield the outcomes covered in this indicator. Riparian and RMZ sites viewed in the field during the audit showed protections well-beyond law and regulation requirements. In many cases, the field forester made decisions that resulted in RMZ protection beyond the DLLT policies because of circumstances identified on the ground.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 6.3.d Management practices maintain or enhance plant species composition, distribution and frequency of occurrence similar to those that would naturally occur on the site.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>DLLT plans and practices are all directed to working with the existing vegetation an habitats found and to maintain and/or change habitat vegetation to fit what naturally would be found growing on these sites.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 6.3.e When planting is required, a local source of known provenance is used when available and when the local source is equivalent in terms of quality, price and productivity. The use of non-local sources are justified, such as in situations where other management objectives (e.g. disease resistance or adapting to climate change) are best served by non-local sources. Native species suited to the site are normally selected for regeneration.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>There has been a little tree planting in the past by DLLT with American chestnut or black spruce to supplement some natural regeneration in patch cut areas. DLLT doesn't plan on tree planting in the next 5 years and likely beyond.</p> <p>There is some seeding of landings and disturbed areas such as those from road building or culvert replacement. Seed mixes tend to be non-invasive mixes with clover, timothy and other normal seed mix expected. Seed generally is provided by contractors and comes from the local source of Aroostook County Seed and Mix.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 6.3.f Management maintains, enhances, or</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> |

restores habitat components and associated stand structures, in abundance and distribution that could be expected from naturally occurring processes. These components include:

- a) large live trees, live trees with decay or declining health, **snags**, and well-distributed coarse down and dead woody material. **Legacy trees** where present are not harvested; and
- b) vertical and horizontal complexity.

Trees selected for **retention** are generally representative of the dominant species naturally found on the site.

Harvesting areas viewed during the field portion of the audit revealed a significant amount of partial cutting prescriptions looking to improve stand quality, stocking and size. In a few locations, patch cuts that are generally small (less than 5 acres) are being used for wildlife habitat purposes. In all situations snags, legacy trees are specifically identified for retention. The method of cutting being employed on most acres promotes vertical and horizontal complexity in the DLLT stands.

Indicator 6.3.g.1 In the Southeast, Appalachia, Ozark-Ouachita, Mississippi Alluvial Valley, and Pacific Coast Regions, when **even-aged systems** are employed, and during salvage harvests, live trees and other native vegetation are retained within the harvest unit as described in Appendix C for the applicable region.

Conformance with Indicator: Yes No N/A
 The DLLT Management plan (pgs. 186-188) covers this issue well and meets the Northeast Regional requirements under Appendix C in the standard. DLLT is only employing even-aged systems in small acres in the recent year's harvests otherwise the harvesting and management is general directed towards unevenaged system. Only small 2-5 acre patch cuts are being used on some small pole stands to create more diversity in these stands and provide additional wildlife habitat for early successional species.

In the Lake States Northeast, Rocky Mountain and Southwest Regions, when even-aged silvicultural systems are employed, and during salvage harvests, live trees and other native vegetation are retained within the harvest unit in a proportion and configuration that is consistent with the characteristic natural disturbance regime unless retention at a lower level is necessary for the purposes of restoration or rehabilitation. See Appendix C for additional regional requirements and guidance.

Appendix C – Northeast Region:

Indicator 6.3.g.1.a Silvicultural systems favor natural regeneration where appropriate, and forest operations are planned to protect pre-established natural regeneration of desirable species.

Indicator 6.3.g.1.a Silvicultural systems favor natural

Conformance with Indicator: Yes No N/A

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>regeneration where appropriate, and forest operations are planned to protect pre-established natural regeneration of desirable species.</p> | <p>Except for some early experimentation with a small amount of interplanting with chestnut and black spruce which hasn't been done on over 5 years, DLLT uses only natural regeneration to re-forest harvested areas.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 6.3.g.2 Under very limited situations, the landowner or manager has the option to develop a qualified plan to allow minor departure from the opening size limits described in Indicator 6.3.g.1. A qualified plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is developed by qualified experts in ecological and/or related fields (wildlife biology, hydrology, landscape ecology, forestry/silviculture). 2. Is based on the totality of the best available information including peer-reviewed science regarding natural disturbance regimes for the FMU. 3. Is spatially and temporally explicit and includes maps of proposed openings or areas. 4. Demonstrates that the variations will result in equal or greater benefit to wildlife, water quality, and other values compared to the normal opening size limits, including for sensitive and rare species. 5. Is reviewed by independent experts in wildlife biology, hydrology, and landscape ecology, to confirm the preceding findings. | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>DLLT does not conduct harvests that are beyond the FSC Standard requirements for opening sizes. The forest plan says that wildlife openings, the only reason for making small clearcuts, are to be between 2-10 acres.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 6.3.h The forest owner or manager assesses the risk of, prioritizes, and, as warranted, develops and implements a strategy to prevent or control invasive species, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. a method to determine the extent of invasive species and the degree of threat to native species and ecosystems; 2. implementation of management practices that minimize the risk of invasive establishment, growth, and spread; 3. eradication or control of established invasive populations when feasible: and, | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>After significant review as part of monitoring processes, the DLLT Farm Cove Community Forest property has no identified invasive plants as yet. The newly added Wabassus tract has several: three honeysuckles, two buckthorn species, Japanese barberry, Asiatic bittersweet, and Japanese knotweed. None of these are extensive infestations and DLLT is merely monitoring the location to assure there is no spread. Invasives tend to be an insignificant issue in the Grand Lake Stream area. The plan regarding invasives is to continue to monitor where the few known species are and to generally monitor during the normal course of work by staff and volunteers.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>4. monitoring of control measures and management practices to assess their effectiveness in preventing or controlling invasive species.</p> | |
| <p>Indicator 6.3.i In applicable situations, the forest owner or manager identifies and applies site-specific fuels management practices, based on: (1) natural fire regimes, (2) risk of wildfire, (3) potential economic losses, (4) public safety, and (5) applicable laws and regulations.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> The Grand Lake Stream area of Maine has a relatively low forest fire risk. DLLT has addressed this small threat by having a comprehensive road network in place. Local fire response teams area available should a forest fire occur.</p> |
| <p>NOTES: (CARs/Observations) None.</p> | |
| <p>C6.4 Representative samples of existing ecosystems within the landscape shall be protected in their natural state and recorded on maps, appropriate to the scale and intensity of operations and the uniqueness of the affected resources.</p> | |
| <p>Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance demonstrated</p> | |
| <p>Indicator 6.4.a The forest owner or manager documents the ecosystems that would naturally exist on the FMU, and assesses the adequacy of their representation and protection in the <i>landscape</i> (see Criterion 7.1). The assessment for medium and large forests include some or all of the following: a) GAP analyses; b) collaboration with state natural heritage programs and other public agencies; c) regional, landscape, and watershed planning efforts; d) collaboration with universities and/or local conservation groups.</p> <p>For an area that is not located on the FMU to qualify as a Representative Sample Area (RSA), it should be under permanent protection in its natural state.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> The DLLT Ecological Reserve (https://www.downeastlakes.org/conservation/your-community-forests/ecological-reserve/) and Special Management Areas created by DLLT board and surrounding area is old growth managed - Late-Successional Management Area – 3,560 and 3,751 acre areas respectively – addresses the RSA issue directly. This was one of the reasons these areas were created to begin with.</p> <p>The remaining part of the DLLT ownership is also protected with conservation easements. All RSAs in the region are found on the DLLT properties. The forest plan and Focus Species Addendum speak to this issue directly.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 6.4.b Where existing areas within the landscape, but external to the FMU, are not of adequate protection, size, and configuration to serve as representative samples of existing ecosystems, forest owners or managers, whose properties are conducive to the establishment of such areas, designate ecologically viable RSAs to serve these purposes.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> The DLLT Ecological Reserve Special Management Areas address this directly. There is no need to look beyond the DLLT boundaries to address the RSA issue because of the Ecological Reserve Special Management Areas.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Large FMUs are generally expected to establish RSAs of purpose 2 and 3 within the FMU.</p> | |
| <p>Indicator 6.4.c Management activities within RSAs are limited to low impact activities compatible with the protected RSA objectives, except under the following circumstances:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) harvesting activities only where they are necessary to restore or create conditions to meet the objectives of the protected RSA, or to mitigate conditions that interfere with achieving the RSA objectives; or b) road-building only where it is documented that it will contribute to minimizing the overall environmental impacts within the FMU and will not jeopardize the purpose for which the RSA was designated. | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The Ecological Reserve area and Special Management Areas on the DLLT ownership were created with the intention of managing them with the intent of protecting the nature of these areas. In the case of the Ecological Reserve, no new activity will occur by policy and the conservation easement itself held by Sweet Water Trust. The activities in the Special Management Areas are, likewise, appropriate with the intention of low impact activities. Viewing activities during the field audit confirmed that the practices are following the conservation easements and the forest management plan and its addenda.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 6.4.d The RSA assessment (Indicator 6.4.a) is periodically reviewed and if necessary updated (at a minimum every 10 years) in order to determine if the need for RSAs has changed; the designation of RSAs (Indicator 6.4.b) is revised accordingly.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The DLLT forest management plan was updated and an new component added for the Wabassus tract added in 2010. The Focus Species Addendum was also added at that time. The policy documents update reviewed the issue of RSAs, according to the DLLT executive director. Nothing was changed as a result of that revision because it was felt that the Ecological Reserve and Special Management Areas, including the new ones added to the Wabassus tract were adequate to address the RSA issue. The auditor agreed with this analysis.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 6.4.e Managers of large, contiguous public forests establish and maintain a network of representative protected areas sufficient in size to maintain species dependent on interior core habitats.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>DLLT forest is privately owned.</p> |
| <p>NOTES: (CARs/Observations) None</p> | |
| <p>C6.5 Written guidelines shall be prepared and implemented to: control erosion; minimize forest damage during harvesting, road construction, and all other mechanical disturbances; and protect water resources.</p> | |
| <p>Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance demonstrated</p> | |
| <p>Indicator 6.5.a The forest owner or manager has written guidelines outlining conformance with the Indicators of this Criterion.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The Forest management Plan for the DLLT property includes a policy to follow Maine BMPs in all activities to address controlling erosion, minimizing forest damage during harvesting, road construction, and all other mechanical disturbance and protecting water resources.</p> |

Indicator 6.5.b Forest operations meet or exceed Best Management Practices (BMPs) that address components of the Criterion where the operation takes place.

Conformance with Indicator: Yes No N/A
DLLT operations meet the spirit and intent of Best Management Practices in Maine in all field observations during the audit. During the field audit, at the end of the Fourth Lake Road ATV/Snowmobile trail close to the DLLT property boundary, the drainage ditch designed to assure rain run-off does not erode the road surface failed in one location and water from the ditch was running down the road and causing erosion to occur. At another location on Fourth Lake Road west of the Third Lake Road and recently replaced culvert had inadequate rock rip-rap around the installation and the seeding that was done to stabilize the soil on the bank had not taken, resulting in some soil material entering the water immediately adjacent to the culvert ends on both sides of the road. This area has no water in it during many times of the year and the soil material likely entered the area during rain events after the road was graded during dry periods of time. See **OBS 03/12**.

Indicator 6.5.c Management activities including site preparation, harvest prescriptions, techniques, timing, and equipment are selected and used to protect soil and water resources and to avoid erosion, landslides, and significant soil disturbance. Logging and other activities that significantly increase the risk of landslides are excluded in areas where risk of landslides is high. The following actions are addressed:

- Slash is concentrated only as much as necessary to achieve the goals of site preparation and the reduction of fuels to moderate or low levels of fire hazard.
- Disturbance of topsoil is limited to the minimum necessary to achieve successful regeneration of species native to the site.
- Rutting and compaction is minimized.
- Soil erosion is not accelerated.
- Burning is only done when consistent with natural disturbance regimes.
- Natural ground cover disturbance is minimized to the extent necessary to achieve regeneration objectives.

Conformance with Indicator: Yes No N/A
DLLT forest management planning for operations are completed in detail and are reviewed by staff, the Forestry Committee and also the Board. These plans seek, at every turn, to protect soil resources and assure water resources are protected during forestry operations. The field observations confirmed conformance in this regard and DLLT practices meet the requirements of this indicator.

The field audit occurred in significant rain. In the one instance where there was an active harvesting operation going on, the contractor, on his own, shut down forwarder operation to prevent significant rutting on the site.

| | |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whole tree harvesting on any site over multiple rotations is only done when research indicates soil productivity will not be harmed. • Low impact equipment and technologies is used where appropriate. | |
| <p>Indicator 6.5.d The transportation system, including design and placement of permanent and temporary haul roads, skid trails, recreational trails, water crossings and landings, is designed, constructed, maintained, and/or reconstructed to reduce short and long-term environmental impacts, habitat fragmentation, soil and water disturbance and cumulative adverse effects, while allowing for customary uses and use rights. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • access to all roads and trails (temporary and permanent), including recreational trails, and off-road travel, is controlled, as possible, to minimize ecological impacts; • road density is minimized; • erosion is minimized; • sediment discharge to streams is minimized; • there is free upstream and downstream passage for aquatic organisms; • impacts of transportation systems on wildlife habitat and migration corridors are minimized; • area converted to roads, landings and skid trails is minimized; • habitat fragmentation is minimized; • unneeded roads are closed and rehabilitated. | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Except for a few location where old, grown up roads may be re-opened as winter roads to access certain areas for forestry operations, the road system for DLLT is complete. Most of this occurred under previous owners. The forest management plan includes a section on road system issues and speaks to the maintenance requirements over time. Before the audit in 2012 the entire main road system had been re-graded and rock-raked to keep up the quality of the system. This is especially important give the community forest nature of the property and the large number members of the public that use the road system.</p> <p>The past work and the current maintenance work, including some serious maintenance that was really a road rehab or upgrade of the Third Lake Road and Dobsis Dam Road, was determined by the auditor to meet the detailed requirements of the indicator.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 6.5.e.1 In consultation with appropriate expertise, the forest owner or manager implements written Streamside Management Zone (SMZ) buffer management guidelines that are adequate for preventing environmental impact, and include protecting and restoring water quality, hydrologic conditions in rivers and stream corridors, wetlands, vernal pools, seeps and springs, lake and pond shorelines, and other hydrologically sensitive</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>A written Streamside Management Zone buffer policy is written into the Forest Management Plan and the Focus Species Addendum contains a section on Riparian areas and Lakes. These policies are implemented to prevent or limit the environmental impact of the activities – primarily timber harvesting and roads – in a consistent manner. The contract forester from Orion Timberlands has riparian zones in mind whenever planning operations. Buffers of riparian/streamside zones consistently exceeded</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>areas. The guidelines include vegetative buffer widths and protection measures that are acceptable within those buffers.</p> <p>In the Appalachia, Ozark-Ouachita, Southeast, Mississippi Alluvial Valley, Southwest, Rocky Mountain, and Pacific Coast regions, there are requirements for minimum SMZ widths and explicit limitations on the activities that can occur within those SMZs. These are outlined as requirements in Appendix E.</p> | <p>state law and DLLT policies. Appendix E of the FSC-US Standard does not have specific streamside management zone requirements for the Northeast Region.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 6.5.e.2 Minor variations from the stated minimum SMZ widths and layout for specific stream segments, wetlands and other water bodies are permitted in limited circumstances, provided the forest owner or manager demonstrates that the alternative configuration maintains the overall extent of the buffers and provides equivalent or greater environmental protection than FSC-US regional requirements for those stream segments, water quality, and aquatic species, based on site-specific conditions and the best available information. The forest owner or manager develops a written set of supporting information including a description of the riparian habitats and species addressed in the alternative configuration. The CB must verify that the variations meet these requirements, based on the input of an independent expert in aquatic ecology or closely related field.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> DLLT has not had to vary its SMZ widths from stated minimum requirements.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 6.5.f Stream and wetland crossings are avoided when possible. Unavoidable crossings are located and constructed to minimize impacts on water quality, hydrology, and fragmentation of <i>aquatic habitat</i>. Crossings do not impede the movement of aquatic species. Temporary crossings are restored to original hydrological conditions when operations are finished.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> The general policy of DLLT operations is to avoid water crossings. The logging contractor interviewed at a current operation confirmed this when ask how they deal with water and crossings. Several skid trail crossings of what were really intermittent streams were done according to BMPs and closed out properly.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 6.5.g Recreation use on the FMU is managed to avoid negative impacts to soils, water, plants, wildlife and wildlife habitats.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> The DLLT mission encourages recreation use on the Farm Cove Community Forest property but this use did not appear to be negatively</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | affecting the soils, water, plants, wildlife and habitats as viewed during the audit. The community nature of the DLLT forest lends itself to a small army of individuals in the community in addition to staff and contractors who are on the property and who regularly report issues as they are seen. One such transfer of information occurred during the audit with a culvert issue that has been repaired. |
| Indicator 6.5.h Grazing by domesticated animals is controlled to protect in-stream habitats and water quality, the species composition and viability of the riparian vegetation, and the banks of the stream channel from erosion. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No grazing of animals occurs on the DLLT property. |
| NOTES: (CARs/Observations) OBS 03/12 | |
| C6.6 Management systems shall promote the development and adoption of environmentally friendly non-chemical methods of pest management and strive to avoid the use of chemical pesticides. World Health Organization Type 1A and 1B and chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides; pesticides that are persistent, toxic or whose derivatives remain biologically active and accumulate in the food chain beyond their intended use; as well as any pesticides banned by international agreement, shall be prohibited. If chemicals are used, proper equipment and training shall be provided to minimize health and environmental risks. | |
| Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance demonstrated | |
| Indicator 6.6.a No products on the FSC list of Highly Hazardous Pesticides are used (see FSC-POL-30-001 EN FSC Pesticides policy 2005 and associated documents). | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> No pesticides are used in any of the DLLT operations. The Forest Management Plan on pgs. 51-55 state that and the personnel confirmed that this has not occurred since DLLT purchased the first tract of the property in 2004. |
| Indicator 6.6.b All toxicants used to control pests and competing vegetation, including rodenticides, insecticides, herbicides, and fungicides are used only when and where non-chemical management practices are: a) not available; b) prohibitively expensive, taking into account overall environmental and social costs, risks and benefits; c) the only effective means for controlling invasive and exotic species; or d) result in less environmental damage than non-chemical alternatives (e.g., top soil disturbance, loss of soil litter and down wood debris). If chemicals are used, the forest owner or manager uses the least environmentally damaging formulation and application method practical. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> No pesticides are used in any of the DLLT operations. The Forest Management Plan on pgs. 51-55 state that and the personnel confirmed that this has not occurred since DLLT purchased the first tract of the property in 2004. |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Written strategies are developed and implemented that justify the use of chemical pesticides. Whenever feasible, an eventual phase-out of chemical use is included in the strategy. The written strategy includes an analysis of options for, and the effects of, various chemical and non-chemical pest control strategies, with the goal of reducing or eliminating chemical use.</p> | |
| <p>Indicator 6.6.c Chemicals and application methods are selected to minimize risk tonon-target species and sites. When considering the choice between aerial and ground application, the forest owner or manager evaluates the comparative risk to non-target species and sites, the comparative risk of worker exposure, and the overall amount and type of chemicals required.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> No pesticides are used in any of the DLLT operations. The Forest Management Plan on pgs. 51-55 state that and the personnel confirmed that this has not occurred since DLLT purchased the first tract of the property in 2004.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 6.6.d Whenever chemicals are used, a written prescription is prepared that describes the site-specific hazards and environmental risks, and the precautions that workers will employ to avoid or minimize those hazards and risks, and includes a map of the treatment area. Chemicals are applied only by workers who have received proper training in application methods and safety. They are made aware of the risks, wear proper safety equipment, and are trained to minimize environmental impacts on non-target species and sites.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> No pesticides are used in any of the DLLT operations. The Forest Management Plan on pgs. 51-55 state that and the personnel confirmed that this has not occurred since DLLT purchased the first tract of the property in 2004.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 6.6.e If chemicals are used, the effects are monitored and the results are used for adaptive management. Records are kept of pest occurrences, control measures, and incidences of worker exposure to chemicals.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> No pesticides are used in any of the DLLT operations. The Forest Management Plan on pgs. 51-55 state that and the personnel confirmed that this has not occurred since DLLT purchased the first tract of the property in 2004.</p> |
| <p>NOTES: (CARs/Observations) None.</p> | |
| <p>C6.7 Chemicals, containers, liquid and solid non-organic wastes including fuel and oil shall be disposed of in an environmentally appropriate manner at off-site locations.</p> | |
| <p>Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance demonstrated</p> | |
| <p>Indicator 6.7.a The forest owner or manager, and employees and contractors, have the equipment and</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> There have been no known spills of chemicals, fuels, hydraulic fluid or</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>training necessary to respond to hazardous spills.</p> | <p>other hazardous liquids since DLLT has owned the property. Contractors are required to carry spill equipment in case one occurs. A road rehabilitation sub-contractor was working on re-building a section of spur road for an upcoming harvesting operation was using an excavator to accomplish the re-build. The contractor had the excavator and pick-up truck at the site. Hazardous spill equipment was not found on the site in either vehicle because, according to the excavator operator, he had just used the equipment on another job when there was a hydraulic fluid leak and the equipment had not been replenished. When asked the following day whether the equipment had been replenished, the excavator operator said that his boss was supposed to arrive with fuel and a new spill kit. This was confirmed with a phone call to the supervisor. See OBS 04/12.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 6.7.b In the event of a hazardous material spill, the forest owner or manager immediately contains the material and engages qualified personnel to perform the appropriate removal and remediation, as required by applicable law and regulations.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> There have been no known spills of chemicals, fuels, hydraulic fluid or other hazardous liquids since DLLT has owned the property. Contractors are required to carry spill equipment in case one occurs.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 6.7.c Hazardous materials and fuels are stored in leak-proof containers in designated storage areas, that are outside of riparian management zones and away from other ecological sensitive features, until they are used or transported to an approved off-site location for disposal. There is no evidence of persistent fluid leaks from equipment or of recent groundwater or surface water contamination.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> During the field audit one logging contractor and one road building sub-contractor were operating on the property. Both of these were audited and both operations conformed to this indicator.</p> |
| <p>NOTES: (CARs/Observations) OBS 04/12</p> | |
| <p>C6.8 Use of biological control agents shall be documented, minimized, monitored and strictly controlled in accordance with national laws and internationally accepted scientific protocols. Use of genetically modified organisms shall be prohibited.</p> | |
| <p>Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance demonstrated</p> | |
| <p>Indicator 6.8.a <i>Biological control agents</i> are used only as part of a pest management strategy for the control of invasive plants, <i>pathogens</i>, insects, or other animals when other pest control methods are ineffective, or are expected to be ineffective. Such use is contingent upon peer-reviewed scientific evidence that the agents in question are non-invasive and are safe for native species.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No biological controls are used by DLLT and there are no plans to use them in the future.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Indicator 6.8.b If biological control agents are used, they are applied by trained workers using proper equipment.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No biological controls are used by DLLT and there are no plans to use them in the future.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 6.8.c If biological control agents are used, their use is documented, monitored and strictly controlled in accordance with state and national laws and internationally accepted scientific protocols. A written plan will be developed and implemented justifying such use, describing the risks, specifying the precautions workers will employ to avoid or minimize such risks, and describing how potential impacts will be monitored.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No biological controls are used by DLLT and there are no plans to use them in the future.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 6.8.d Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) are not used for any purpose.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GMOs are not used by DLLT.</p> |
| <p>NOTES: (CARs/Observations) None.</p> | |
| <p>C6.9 The use of exotic species shall be carefully controlled and actively monitored to avoid adverse ecological impacts.</p> | |
| <p>Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance demonstrated</p> | |
| <p>Indicator 6.9.a The use of exotic species is contingent on the availability of credible scientific data indicating that any such species is non-invasive and its application does not pose a risk to native biodiversity.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Only herbaceous species in conservation seed mixes have been used by DLLT. While DLLT stated that some of the seeds of these mixes are not native they make sure that there are no invasives as part of these seed mixes.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 6.9.b If exotic species are used, their provenance and the location of their use are documented, and their ecological effects are actively monitored.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> See above indicator.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 6.9.c The forest owner or manager takes timely action to curtail or significantly reduce any adverse impacts resulting from their use of exotic species.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> See indicator 6.9.a</p> |
| <p>C6.10 Forest conversion to plantations or non-forest land uses shall not occur, except in circumstances where conversion: a) entails a very limited portion of the forest management unit; and b) does not occur on high conservation value forest areas; and c) will enable clear, substantial, additional, secure, long term conservation benefits across the forest management unit.</p> | |
| <p>Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance demonstrated</p> | |
| <p>Indicator 6.10.a Forest conversion to non-forest land uses does not occur, except in circumstances where conversion entails a very limited portion of the forest management unit</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> DLLT has not and does not covert forest to non-forest uses.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| (note that Indicators 6.10.a, b, and c are related and all need to be conformed with for conversion to be allowed). | |
| Indicator 6.10.b Forest conversion to non-forest land uses does not occur on high conservation value forest areas (note that Indicators 6.10.a, b, and c are related and all need to be conformed with for conversion to be allowed). | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> DLLT has not and does not convert forest to non-forest uses. |
| Indicator 6.10.c Forest conversion to non-forest land uses does not occur, except in circumstances where conversion will enable clear, substantial, additional, secure, long term conservation benefits across the forest management unit (note that Indicators 6.10.a, b, and c are related and all need to be conformed with for conversion to be allowed). | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> DLLT has not and does not convert forest to non-forest uses. |
| Indicator 6.10.d Natural or semi-natural stands are not converted to plantations. Degraded, semi-natural stands may be converted to restoration plantations. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> DLLT has not and does not convert forest to non-forest uses. |
| Indicator 6.10.e Justification for land-use and stand-type conversions is fully described in the long-term management plan, and meets the biodiversity conservation requirements of Criterion 6.3 (see also Criterion 7.1.I) | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> DLLT has not and does not convert forest to non-forest uses. |
| Indicator 6.10.f Areas converted to non-forest use for facilities associated with subsurface mineral and gas rights transferred by prior owners, or other conversion outside the control of the certificate holder, are identified on maps. The forest owner or manager consults with the CB to determine if removal of these areas from the scope of the certificate is warranted. To the extent allowed by these transferred rights, the forest owner or manager exercises control over the location of surface disturbances in a manner that minimizes adverse environmental and social impacts. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> DLLT has not and does not convert forest to non-forest uses. |
| If the certificate holder at one point held these rights, and then sold them, then subsequent conversion of forest to non-forest use would be subject to Indicator 6.10.a-d | |
| NOTES: (CARs/Observations) None. | |

Principle 7: Management Plan

A management plan -- appropriate to the scale and intensity of the operations -- shall be written, implemented, and kept up to date. The long term objectives of management, and the means of achieving them, shall be clearly stated.

| <u>Criteria and Indicators</u> | <u>Findings</u> |
|---|--|
| <p>C7.1 The management plan and supporting documents shall provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Management objectives. b) Description of the forest resources to be managed, environmental limitations, land use and ownership status, socio-economic conditions, and a profile of adjacent lands. c) Description of silvicultural and/or other management system, based on the ecology of the forest in question and information gathered through resource inventories. d) Rationale for rate of annual harvest and species selection. e) Provisions for monitoring of forest growth and dynamics. f) Environmental safeguards based on environmental assessments. g) Plans for the identification and protection of rare, threatened and endangered species. h) Maps describing the forest resource base including protected areas, planned management activities and land ownership. i) Description and justification of harvesting techniques and equipment to be used. | |
| <p>Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance demonstrated</p> | |
| <p>Indicator 7.1.a The management plan identifies the ownership and legal status of the FMU and its resources, including rights held by the owner and rights held by others.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> The DLLT Farm Cove Community Forest Management Plan (original Forest Management Plan developed in 2005 and updated in 2010 along with the Wabassus tract additional plan and the Focus Species Addendum make up the Plan) identifies the ownership and legal status of the ownership. Conservation easements and road access contract also defines the ownership status for DLLT.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 7.1.b The management plan describes the history of land use and past management, current forest types and associated development, size class and/or successional stages, and natural disturbance regimes that affect the FMU (see Indicator 6.1.a).</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> The forest management Plan is substantial and detailed and covers the requirements of this indicator.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 7.1.c The management plan describes: a) current conditions of the timber and non-timber forest resources being managed; b) desired future conditions; c) historical ecological conditions; and d) applicable</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> The forest management Plan is substantial and detailed and covers the requirements of this indicator.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>management objectives and activities to move the FMU toward desired future conditions.</p> | |
| <p>Indicator 7.1.d The management plan includes a description of the landscape within which the FMU is located and describes how landscape-scale habitat elements described in Criterion 6.3 will be addressed.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> The Plan documents describe the landscape in the region under which the DLLT operates and addresses how the habitat elements in Principle 6 are addressed.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 7.1.e The management plan includes a description of the following resources and outlines activities to conserve and/or protect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • rare, threatened, or endangered species and natural communities (see Criterion 6.2); • plant species and community diversity and wildlife habitats (see Criterion 6.3); • water resources (see Criterion 6.5); • soil resources (see Criterion 6.3); • Representative Sample Areas (see Criterion 6.4); • High Conservation Value Forests (see Principle 9); • Other special management areas. | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> The forest management plan is substantial and detailed and covers the requirements of this indicator. Further, the maps that are part of the Plan and are within the GIS system, cover many aspects of this indicator.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 7.1.f If invasive species are present, the management plan describes invasive species conditions, applicable management objectives, and how they will be controlled (see Indicator 6.3.j).</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> The management plan describes invasive species present on Wabbasus and says none found on Farm Cove tracts at this time. Invasive species are not a major issue for the DLLT ownership.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 7.1.g The management plan describes insects and diseases, current or anticipated outbreaks on forest conditions and management goals, and how insects and diseases will be managed (see Criteria 6.6 and 6.8).</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> The Plan describes insect and disease issues.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 7.1.h If chemicals are used, the plan describes what is being used, applications, and how the management system conforms with Criterion 6.6.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> No chemicals are used on the DLLT ownership and the Plan says that.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 7.1.i If biological controls are used, the management plan describes what is being used, applications, and how the management system conforms with Criterion 6.8.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> No biological controls are used on the DLLT property.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 7.1.j The management plan incorporates the results of the evaluation of social impacts, including:</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> The evaluation of social impacts of the Farm Cove Community Forest is</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • traditional cultural resources and rights of use (see Criterion 2.1); • potential conflicts with customary uses and use rights (see Criteria 2.2, 2.3, 3.2); • management of ceremonial, archeological, and historic sites (see Criteria 3.3 and 4.5); • management of aesthetic values (see Indicator 4.4.a); • public access to and use of the forest, and other recreation issues; • local and regional socioeconomic conditions and economic opportunities, including creation and/or maintenance of quality jobs (see Indicators 4.1.b and 4.4.a), local purchasing opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.e), and participation in local development opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.g). | <p>an addendum to the Plan. It addresses the requirements of the indicator.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 7.1.k The management plan describes the general purpose, condition and maintenance needs of the transportation network (see Indicator 6.5.e).</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Access and Road Network section at page 61 of the Plan fully describes the road system and needs.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 7.1.l The management plan describes the silvicultural and other management systems used and how they will sustain, over the long term, forest ecosystems present on the FMU.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Silvicultural systems and other management systems used on the DLLT property are fully described in the Plan.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 7.1.m The management plan describes how species selection and harvest rate calculations were developed to meet the requirements of Criterion 5.6.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> The Plan describes the information from the new inventory conducted in 2010 is the basis for the sustained yield calculations. Species selection is described as part of desired future conditions discussions in the Plan and is also addressed directly in the harvest plans developed from the management Plan and approved by the Board of Directors of DLLT.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 7.1.n The management plan includes a description of monitoring procedures necessary to address the requirements of Criterion 8.2.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Monitoring procedures are described in the plan and a very comprehensive monitoring report is produced each year and posted to the DLLT website.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 7.1.o The management plan includes maps describing the resource base, the characteristics of general</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Required maps are included in the Plan and are part of a comprehensive</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| management zones, special management areas, and protected areas at a level of detail to achieve management objectives and protect sensitive sites. | GIS system maintained by DLLT and fully accessible to the forest managers at Orion Timberlands. |
| Indicator 7.1.p The management plan describes and justifies the types and sizes of harvesting machinery and techniques employed on the FMU to minimize or limit impacts to the resource. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Harvest machinery preferred to be used for operations are described in the Plan and harvest planning documents. Most operations on DLLT occur with tracked feller-bunchers, grapple skidders, delimiters and slashers. |
| Indicator 7.1.q Plans for harvesting and other significant site-disturbing management activities required to carry out the management plan are prepared prior to implementation. Plans clearly describe the activity, the relationship to objectives, outcomes, any necessary environmental safeguards, health and safety measures, and include maps of adequate detail. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Harvest plans are developed by the Orion Timberlands contract staff prior to the season the operations will occur in and are presented to the DLLT Community Forest Manager prior to their review by the Forestry Committee and the Board of Directors. The DLLT Executive Director may review the plans prior to the Forest Committee as well. |
| Indicator 7.1.r The management plan describes the stakeholder consultation process. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> When they developed the Focus Species and Wabassus Plans,– DLLT involved agencies (IF&W, biologists etc.). In addition, they involved the community members who are part of the Forestry Committee. Regular public meetings for community members also provided fodder for plan amendments. A good example of this is deer habitat corridors – local people looked at maps before the Focus Species plan was developed. The Plan describes that DLLT will consult with experts and others as part of the planning process and also regularly as part of normal operations and to monitor progress on the forest. |
| NOTES: (CARs/Observations) None. | |
| C7.2 The management plan shall be periodically revised to incorporate the results of monitoring or new scientific and technical information, as well as to respond to changing environmental, social and economic circumstances. | |
| Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance demonstrated | |
| Indicator 7.2.a The management plan is kept up to date. It is reviewed on an ongoing basis and is updated whenever necessary to incorporate the results of monitoring or new scientific and technical information, as well as to respond to changing environmental, social and economic circumstances. At a minimum, a full revision occurs every 10 years. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> The DLLT Forest Management Plan, Wabassus tract Management Plan and Focus Species Addendum were all updated or added in 2010. |

| | |
|--|--|
| NOTES: (CARs/Observations) None. | |
| C7.3 Forest workers shall receive adequate training and supervision to ensure proper implementation of the management plan. | |
| Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance demonstrated | |
| Indicator 7.3.a Workers are qualified to properly implement the management plan; all forest workers are provided with sufficient guidance and supervision to adequately implement their respective components of the plan. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> The key forest worker associated with implementation of the DLLT management plan is Kyle Burdick from Orion Timberlands. He is fully knowledgeable about the management plan and is using it to implement management activities. |
| NOTES: (CARs/Observations) None. | |
| C7.4 While respecting the confidentiality of information, forest managers shall make publicly available a summary of the primary elements of the management plan, including those listed in Criterion 7.1. | |
| Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance demonstrated | |
| Indicator 7.4.a While respecting landowner confidentiality, the management plan or a management plan summary that outlines the elements of the plan described in Criterion 7.1 is available to the public either at no charge or a nominal fee. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Management plan documents are all available on the DLLT website. People are also reminded of that in newsletters that DLLT sends out. |
| Indicator 7.4.b Managers of public forests make draft management plans, revisions and supporting documentation easily accessible for public review and comment prior to their implementation. Managers address public comments and modify the plans to ensure compliance with this Standard. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DLLT forest is privately owned. |
| NOTES: (CARs/Observations) None. | |
| Principle 8: Monitoring and Assessment | |
| Monitoring shall be conducted -- appropriate to the scale and intensity of forest management -- to assess the condition of the forest, yields of forest products, chain of custody, management activities and their social and environmental impacts. | |
| <u>Criteria and Indicators</u> | <u>Findings</u> |
| C8.1 The frequency and intensity of monitoring should be determined by the scale and intensity of forest management operations as well as the relative complexity and fragility of the affected environment. Monitoring procedures should be consistent and replicable over time to allow comparison of results and assessment of change. | |
| Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance demonstrated. | |
| Indicator 8.1.a Consistent with the scale and intensity of management, the forest owner or manager develops and consistently implements a regular, comprehensive, and | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Monitoring protocol is now located in the Focus Species addendum of the management plan documents. It is a comprehensive protocol and the |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>replicable written monitoring protocol.</p> | <p>annual monitoring reports that are generated from it and are posted on the DLLT website are comprehensive.</p> |
| <p>C8.2 Forest management should include the research and data collection needed to monitor, at a minimum, the following indicators: a) Yield of all forest products harvested. b) Growth rates, regeneration and condition of the forest. c) Composition and observed changes in the flora and fauna. d) Environmental and social impacts of harvesting and other operations. e) Costs, productivity, and efficiency of forest management.</p> | |
| <p>Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance demonstrated.</p> | |
| <p>Indicator 8.2.a.1 For all commercially harvested products, an inventory system is maintained. The inventory system includes at a minimum: a) species, b) volumes, c) stocking, d) regeneration, and e) stand and forest composition and structure; and f) timber quality.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> A new inventory was conducted for DLLT and managed by Orion Timberlands in 2010. It covers the requirements of the indicator.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 8.2.a.2 Significant, unanticipated removal or loss or increased vulnerability of forest resources is monitored and recorded. Recorded information includes date and location of occurrence, description of disturbance, extent and severity of loss, and may be both quantitative and qualitative.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> There have been no unanticipated removal or loss or increased vulnerability of forest resources of substance since DLLT was organized. There have been some minor issues such as an insect infestation in pine during the spring of 2009, but this was only ¼ acre.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 8.2.b The forest owner or manager maintains records of harvested timber and NTFPs (volume and product and/or grade). Records must adequately ensure that the requirements under Criterion 5.6 are met.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Timber harvest records by volume and grade are maintained and were provided in an Excel spreadsheet. This data fulfills the requirements of Criterion 5.6. The only NTFP harvested are balsam tips for wreath making. 2011 records are that # permits issued = 8 with an average of under 200 lbs. each.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 8.2.c The forest owner or manager periodically obtains data needed to monitor presence on the FMU of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Rare, threatened and endangered species and/or their <i>habitats</i>; 2) Common and rare plant communities and/or habitat; 3) Location, presence and abundance of invasive species; 4) Condition of protected areas, set-asides and buffer zones; | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> As part of the preparation for the 2010 forest management plan revision work, data was obtained on the items listed in this indicator. The Focus Species plan specifically relies on RTE, plant communities and protected areas, set-asides and buffers to draw its conclusions.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| 5) High Conservation Value Forests (see Criterion 9.4). | |
| Indicator 8.2.d.1 Monitoring is conducted to ensure that site specific plans and operations are properly implemented, environmental impacts of site disturbing operations are minimized, and that harvest prescriptions and guidelines are effective. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Monitoring with written reports occurs at least once per week for operations on the DLLT property. Close-out – or final monitoring with a written report – occurs at the end of the job, after it has been closed out. The Community Forest Manager checks the job and then the job is closed out. All reports from monitoring are maintained in the DLLT files and that of Orion Timberlands. |
| Indicator 8.2.d.2 A monitoring program is in place to assess the condition and environmental impacts of the forest-road system. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Road monitoring is accomplished as part of regular forest management work and monitoring described above in 8.2.d.2. As with other monitoring of operations, these are written about in annual monitoring report. |
| Indicator 8.2.d.3 The landowner or manager monitors relevant socio-economic issues (see Indicator 4.4.a), including the social impacts of harvesting, participation in local economic opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.g), the creation and/or maintenance of quality job opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.b), and local purchasing opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.e). | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> The socio-economic monitoring is part of all overall operations of DLLT as a community forest. Constant communications with members, board members and community members are part of this monitoring. As part of normal monitoring, harvest is the first key item (employment). DLLT would like to quantify the rest of their recreational effects but have not been able to do this. They have qualitative information about use of the property but few numbers. DLLT monitors the 9 water access campsites, 3 hiking trails and access path – also hunting, snowmobiling, ATV, trapping. Water recreation on the lakes is the biggest part of the recreation that occurs and is well known but not quantified. |
| Indicator 8.2.d.4 Stakeholder responses to management activities are monitored and recorded as necessary. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> DLLT has documentation of the few issues that must go before the Forestry Committee or the Board. Results of the public meetings are reported to the board and are recorded in meetings minutes. A student intern is currently doing a survey of recreational users and business owners etc. and the results will be in writing to the Forestry Committee and Board. |
| Indicator 8.2.d.5 Where sites of cultural significance exist, the opportunity to jointly monitor sites of cultural significance is offered to tribal representatives (see Principle 3). | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> There are no known sites of cultural tribal significance. |
| Indicator 8.2.e The forest owner or manager monitors the costs and revenues of management in order to assess | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Staff, Forestry Committee & Financial Management committee review all |

| | |
|---|---|
| productivity and efficiency. | financials, as part of normal fiscal oversight by the Board. The Forestry Committee looks at the financial projections for all harvests. The Financial management committee look at monthly financials which includes all financial matters. There is an audit each year. Kyle Burdick of Orion makes regular presentations to Forestry Committee that include fiscal matters. |
| NOTES: (CARs/Observations) None. | |
| C8.3 Documentation shall be provided by the forest manager to enable monitoring and certifying organizations to trace each forest product from its origin, a process known as the "chain of custody." | |
| Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance demonstrated. See also the associated findings under Appendix III of this report. | |
| Indicator 8.3.a When forest products are being sold as FSC-certified, the forest owner or manager has a system that prevents mixing of FSC-certified and non-certified forest products prior to the point of sale. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> DLLT has a full documented system for conforming to Chain-of-Custody requirements. |
| Indicator 8.3.b The forest owner or manager maintains documentation to enable the tracing of the harvested material from each harvested product from its origin to the point of sale. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Records on COC include trip tickets from previous years. DLLT maintains these written records and all COC records for 5 years. |
| NOTES: (CARs/Observations) None. | |
| C8.4 The results of monitoring shall be incorporated into the implementation and revision of the management plan. | |
| Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance demonstrated | |
| Indicator 8.4.a The forest owner or manager monitors and documents the degree to which the objectives stated in the management plan are being fulfilled, as well as significant deviations from the plan. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> DLLT just made revisions to all components of the management plans in 2010. The connection to monitoring in this plan revision was less about new information but more about proactive look at wildlife and the habitat plan through the Focus Species Addendum. Previously they brought in consulting wildlife biologist for planned harvest. Now the Focus Species plan works better because it puts each harvest area in context. Regular monitoring allows for understanding of projections versus actual deliverables for timber, wildlife habitat acreage improved, etc. The annual monitoring plan has much detail in that regard. |
| Indicator 8.4.b Where monitoring indicates that management objectives and guidelines, including those necessary for conformance with this Standard, are not being met or if changing conditions indicate that a change in management strategy is necessary, the management plan, | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> The forest management plan revision process took into account all monitoring done in previous years. The biggest learning affecting the new plan came with the addition of the Focus Species part of the plan. This refined how DLLT looks at wildlife species in the context of forestry |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>operational plans, and/or other plan implementation measures are revised to ensure the objectives and guidelines will be met. If monitoring shows that the management objectives and guidelines themselves are not sufficient to ensure conformance with this Standard, then the objectives and guidelines are modified.</p> | <p>operations. DLLT found that before using the Focus Species approach, they were less sure whether management is affective in meeting plan targets for habitat.</p> |
| <p>NOTES: (CARs/Observations) None.</p> | |
| <p>C8.5 While respecting the confidentiality of information, forest managers shall make publicly available a summary of the results of monitoring indicators, including those listed in Criterion 8.2.</p> | |
| <p>Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance demonstrated</p> | |
| <p>Indicator 8.5.a While protecting landowner confidentiality, either full monitoring results or an up-to-date summary of the most recent monitoring information is maintained, covering the Indicators listed in Criterion 8.2, and is available to the public, free or at a nominal price, upon request.</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Full, detailed monitoring reports for all years since DLLT became certified are posted on the organization website.</p> |
| <p>NOTES: (CARs/Observations) None.</p> | |
| <p>Principle 9: Maintenance of High Conservation Value Forests Management activities in high conservation value forests shall maintain or enhance the attributes which define such forests. Decisions regarding high conservation value forests shall always be considered in the context of a precautionary approach.</p> | |
| <p><u>Criteria and Indicators</u></p> | <p><u>Findings</u></p> |
| <p>C9.1 Assessment to determine the presence of the attributes consistent with High Conservation Value Forests will be completed, appropriate to scale and intensity of forest management.</p> | |
| <p>Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance demonstrated</p> | |
| <p>Indicator 9.1.a The forest owner or manager identifies and maps the presence of High Conservation Value Forests (HCVF) within the FMU and, to the extent that data are available, adjacent to their FMU, in a manner consistent with the assessment process, definitions, data sources, and other guidance described in Appendix F.</p> <p>Given the relative rarity of old growth forests in the contiguous United States, these areas are normally designated as HCVF, and all old growth must be managed in conformance with Indicator 6.3.a.3 and requirements for</p> | <p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> HCVF areas are all fully mapped and are in the GIS system and fully available for Orion to use in the field. HCVF areas include two old growth forest area in the north and southern part of the ownership. The HCVF areas were determined as part of the initial assessment preparation for certification. This assessment involved an analysis of all the DLLT lands according to the HCVF criteria both by staff and with assistance from professional biologists and ecologists from the State of Maine and local residents who have acted as guides on this property for decades. The result of the analyses was the current mapped HCVF.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| legacy trees in Indicator 6.3.f. | |
| Indicator 9.1.b In developing the assessment, the forest owner or manager consults with qualified specialists, independent experts, and local community members who may have knowledge of areas that meet the definition of HCVs. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> The original development of the HCVF areas included professional scientists as well as lay people in the community. As part of the update to the plans and HCVF areas, new experts were consulted and a wildlife ecologist was hired to develop the Focus Species Addendum, the key part of the plan and HCVF process. Local folks were consulted with maps about special habitats such as deer habitat. General local knowledge is also constantly used as part of management. |
| Indicator 9.1.c A summary of the assessment results and management strategies (see Criterion 9.3) is included in the management plan summary that is made available to the public. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> All of the forest management plan components as well as all of the complete monitoring reports are posted on the DLLT website. |
| NOTES: (CARs/Observations) None. | |
| C9.2 The consultative portion of the certification process must place emphasis on the identified conservation attributes, and options for the maintenance thereof. | |
| Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance demonstrated | |
| Indicator 9.2.a The forest owner or manager holds consultations with stakeholders and experts to confirm that proposed HCVF locations and their attributes have been accurately identified, and that appropriate options for the maintenance of their HCV attributes have been adopted. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> The original consultations were done when the HCVFs were identified early in FSC certification for DLLT. These happened as part of research for the HCVFs as part of building the data and information for the HCVF designations. As part of the forest plan revisions and re-visit of the HCVF designations and development of the Focus Species Addendum, additional biologists and other experts were consulted, one was hired to work on the Focus Species plan (Robert Bryan). Community members were asked for comment as part of regular public meetings in town. |
| Indicator 9.2.b On public forests, a transparent and accessible public review of proposed HCV attributes and HCVF areas and management is carried out. Information from stakeholder consultations and other public review is integrated into HCVF descriptions, delineations and management. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The DLLT land is privately owned. |
| NOTES: (CARs/Observations) None. | |
| C9.3 The management plan shall include and implement specific measures that ensure the maintenance and/or enhancement of the applicable conservation attributes consistent with the precautionary approach. These measures shall be specifically included in the publicly available management plan summary. | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance demonstrated | |
| Indicator 9.3.a The management plan and relevant operational plans describe the measures necessary to ensure the maintenance and/or enhancement of all high conservation values present in all identified HCVF areas, including the precautions required to avoid risks or impacts to such values (see Principle 7). These measures are implemented. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> The management plan and addenda explain fully the management recommended for the HCVF areas. One, the Ecological Reserve area, has a no management requirement except to maintain roads and trails through the area. The two HCVFs identified have buffer areas in special management zones to provide additional protection. |
| Indicator 9.3.b All management activities in HCVFs must maintain or enhance the high conservation values and the extent of the HCVF. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> The strict adherence to sensitive or no management activities was viewed for the HCVF areas during the audit. These two areas include buffer special management areas to further protect the resources. |
| Indicator 9.3.c If HCVF attributes cross ownership boundaries and where maintenance of the HCV attributes would be improved by coordinated management, then the forest owner or manager attempts to coordinate conservation efforts with adjacent landowners. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Adjacent to the Ecological Reserve HCVF near 4 th Machias Lake is the State of Maine ownership which includes a continuation of this habitat. The original boundaries of this contiguous area was determined in consultation across boundaries and the management of state and DLLT lands is done similarly due to this consultation and communication that continues today. |
| NOTES: (CARs/Observations) None. | |
| C9.4 Annual monitoring shall be conducted to assess the effectiveness of the measures employed to maintain or enhance the applicable conservation attributes. | |
| Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance demonstrated | |
| Indicator 9.4.a The forest owner or manager monitors, or participates in a program to annually monitor, the status of the specific HCV attributes, including the effectiveness of the measures employed for their maintenance or enhancement. The monitoring program is designed and implemented consistent with the requirements of Principle 8. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Monitoring of the HCVF areas is part of the normal and regular monitoring that occurs on the DLLT property. The reporting of the results of the monitoring occurs with the regular monitoring and is contained in the report issued and put on the web each year. |
| Indicator 9.4.b When monitoring results indicate increasing risk to a specific HCV attribute, the forest owner/manager re-evaluates the measures taken to maintain or enhance that attribute, and adjusts the management measures in an effort to reverse the trend. | Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Monitoring of the HCVF areas is part of the normal and regular monitoring that occurs on the DLLT property. The reporting of the results of the monitoring occurs with the regular monitoring and is contained in the report issued and put on the web each year. Monitoring has not revealed practices that need to be changed relative to |

HCVF management but the Farm Cove Mt. area Old Growth area HCVF was not monitored directly after a harvest occurred in the area. This has since been remedied.

NOTES: (CARs/Observations) None.

Principle 10: Plantation management

Plantations shall be planned and managed in accordance with Principles and Criteria 1- 9, and Principle 10 and its Criteria. While plantations can provide an array of social and economic benefits, and can contribute to satisfying the world's needs for forest products, they should complement the management of, reduce pressures on, and promote the restoration and conservation of natural forests.

Principle Level Remarks: Principle 10 is not applicable to DLLT's FSC FM Certificate. DLLT does not manage conduct plantation forest management as confirmed through interviews and on-site observations.

APPENDIX IX: FME map(optional)

