

Certified by:



NEPCon OU
Filosoofi 31
50108 Tartu
Estonia

www.preferredbynature.org

Certification managed by:

Preferred by Nature
Contact person: Carolyn Loeb
Email:
cloeb@preferredbynature.org

Ver 11 February 2022

**FSC Forest Management
Certification
Reassessment
Report for:
Downeast Lakes Land Trust
in
Grand Lake Stream, Maine, USA**

Report Finalized:

Audit Dates:

Audit Team: Charles Levesque, Lead Auditor

Type of certificate: Multiple FMU

Certificate code: NC-FM/CoC-002682

Certificate issue/expiry: PENDING

Organization Contact: Ernest Carle

Contact details: 4 Water Street
Grand Lake Stream
Maine, 04668
United States

TABLE of CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	3
1 AUDIT CONCLUSIONS	4
2. AUDIT PROCESS	15
3. COMPANY DETAILS.....	19
4. Certificate Scope	22
5. AUDIT AND NON-CONFORMITY FINDINGS	26
Annex I: FSC Public summary of the management plan.....	27
Annex II: FSC Certification standard conformance checklist (confidential).....	30
Annex I-A: FSC Pesticides Policy ESRA framework: Requirements of Organizations.....	102
Annex III: FSC Chain-of-Custody Conformance (confidential).....	103
Annex IV: List of all sampled sites (confidential).....	111
Annex V: Detailed list of stakeholders consulted (confidential)	113

INTRODUCTION

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

This report contains various sections of information and findings and several annexes. Sections 1 through 4 of the report plus Annex I. will become public information about the forest management operation and may be distributed by Preferred by Nature or the FSC to interested parties. The remainder of the annexes are confidential, to be reviewed only by authorized Preferred by Nature 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/>.

Dispute resolution: If Preferred by Nature clients encounter organizations or individuals having concerns or comments about Preferred by Nature and our services, these parties are strongly encouraged to contact relevant Preferred by Nature regional office. Formal complaints and concerns should be sent in writing.

Impartiality commitment: Preferred by Nature commits to using impartial auditors and our clients are encouraged to inform Preferred by Nature management if violations of this are noted. Please see our Impartiality Policy here: <http://www.preferredbynature.org/impartiality-policy>

Standard Conversions

1 mbf = 2.4 m3
1 cord = 3.6 m3
100 tons hardwood = 97 m3
100 tons = 101 m3
1 acre = 0.404687 hectares

1. AUDIT CONCLUSIONS

1.1 Audit Recommendation and certification decision

Based on Organization's conformance with certification requirements, the following recommendation is made:

- Certification approved:
 - No NCRs issued
- Certification not approved:

Additional comments, including issues identified as controversial or hard to evaluate and explanation of the conclusion reached:

1.2 Non-conformity Reports (NCRs)

Note: NCRs describe evidence of Organisation non-conformities identified during audits. NCRs include defined timelines for the Organisation to demonstrate conformity. MAJOR NCRs issued during assessments/reassessments shall be closed prior to issuance of certificate. MAJOR NCRs issued during anual audits shall be closed within timeline or result in suspension.

- Check if no NCR(s) have been issued

1.3 Observations

Note: Observations are issued for the early stages of a problem which does not of itself constitute a non-conformance, but which the auditor considers may lead to a future non-conformance if not addressed by the organization; observations may lead to direct non-conformances if not addressed.

- No observations

1.4 Stakeholder consultation

The purpose of the stakeholder consultation strategy was threefold:

- To ensure that the public is aware of and informed about the assessment process and its objectives;
- To assist the field assessment team in identifying potential issues; and,

-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 to the maximum extent 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. Preferred by Nature 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/or mail to Preferred by Nature's general stakeholder list. Through input from DLLT an initial list of local 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 ENGOS	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Local/Regional ENGOS	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Local Community representatives	<input type="checkbox"/>	2
Government Agency representatives	<input type="checkbox"/>	1
Labor Unions	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Indigenous Peoples	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Local resource users (trappers, hunt & fish clubs, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	2
Local recreationalists (tourism, hiking, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	1
Local businesses	<input type="checkbox"/>	1
Contractors	<input type="checkbox"/>	1
Workers	<input type="checkbox"/>	

The table below summarizes the issues identified by the audit team with a brief discussion of each based upon specific interview and/or public meeting comments.

Principle/Subject Area	Stakeholder comment	Preferred by Nature response
P1: FSC Commitment and Legal Compliance	Stream erosion issue was taken care of using BMP practices by DLLT.	No response needed.
P2: Tenure & Use Rights & Responsibilities	N/A	
P3 - Indigenous Peoples' Rights	N/A	
P4: Community Relations & Workers' Rights	DLLT is a good community organization and asset	No response needed.
P5: Benefits from the Forest	DLLT is a good neighbor and provides great value to this	No response needed.

	small community from an economic perspective.
P6: Environmental Impact	N/A
P7: Management Plan	N/A
P8: Monitoring & Assessment	N/A
P9: Maintenance of High Conservation Value Forest	N/A
P10 - Plantations	N/A

1.5 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)	FME follows laws and regulations covering their operations. No violations were noted by enforcement officials. Staff have clear respect for following laws and regulations and for doing the right thing at all times.
--------------------------------	--

Criterion 1.2 Payment of legally prescribed fees, royalties, taxes and other charges

Conformance	X	Nonconformance	NCR #(s)
-------------	---	----------------	-------------

Finding (strength/weakness)	FME showed records of payment of the two required taxes for these ownerships.
--------------------------------	---

Criterion 1.3 Respect for provisions of international agreements

Conformance	X	Nonconformance	NCR #(s)
-------------	---	----------------	-------------

Finding (strength/weakness)	FME staff understand the requirements of international agreements and their applicability on the FMU.
--------------------------------	---

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 laws and regulations and the FSC P&C.
--------------------------------	--

Criterion 1.5 Protection of forests from illegal activities

Conformance	X	Nonconformance	NCR #(s)
-------------	---	----------------	-------------

Finding (strength/weakness) FME mission is to encourage the recreational use of the FMU by community members and others. There are rarely any illegal activities given the nature of the organization and its community focus. The FME has well marked boundaries to assure no timber trespass and have staff out on the property constantly as well as community members who watch over the property and report any issues. There have been no known illegal activities on the FMU since the last audit.

Criterion 1.6 Demonstration of a long-term commitment to the FSC P&C

Conformance X Nonconformance NCR #(s)

Finding (strength/weakness) The FME has a written commitment to FSC P&C on its website and interviews with staff and board indicate strong commitment to the Standard and certification.

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) FME has clear title to the FMU and other legal rights are clearly documented.

Criterion 2.2 Local communities' legal or customary tenure or use rights

Conformance X Nonconformance NCR #(s)

Finding (strength/weakness) Some public rights of access are guaranteed by several conservation easements on the FMU. Other access is customary and the public takes advantage of the opportunity since the purpose of the ownership is for public use.

Criterion 2.3 Disputes over tenure claims and use rights

Conformance X Nonconformance NCR #(s)

Finding (strength/weakness) DLLT had a title dispute several years ago which was resolved. The easement prevents donation of the building and Grand Lake Stream Historical Society. have declined to enter into a joint management agreement out of the concern for their own organization's capacity. The title is clear, and DLLT is working to engage a contractor to stabilize the structure.

PRINCIPLE 3: Indigenous peoples' rights

Criterion 3.1 Indigenous peoples' control of forest management

Conformance X Nonconformance NCR #(s)

Finding (strength/weakness) Indigenous people have no legal rights of use on the FMU except for a donated right-of-way on roads leading to a tribal property.

Criterion 3.2 Maintenance of indigenous peoples' resources or tenure rights

Conformance X Nonconformance NCR #(s)

Finding (strength/weakness) Indigenous people have no legal rights of use on the FMU except for a donated right-of-way on roads leading to a tribal property.

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) The FME has invited tribal leaders to identify sites of special significance on the FMU but none have been identified.

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 from indigenous peoples has been used by the FME.

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) All FME staff are local and all contractors working on the FMU are local companies.

Criterion 4.2 Compliance with health and safety regulations

Conformance X Nonconformance NCR #(s)

Finding (strength/weakness) FME policies and procedures and contracts with vendors working on the FMU all comply with health and safety regulations. Activities observed were consistent with health and safety regulations.

Criterion 4.3 Workers' rights to organize and negotiate with employers

Conformance X Nonconformance NCR #(s)

Finding (strength/weakness) FME staff have chosen not to organize. They are aware of their right to do so.

Criterion 4.4 Social impact evaluations and consultation

Conformance X Nonconformance NCR #(s)

Finding (strength/weakness) FME mission is dedicated to serving the community through socially and economically sensitive operations. They consult with community members and are governed by a board of mostly local residents.

Criterion 4.5 Resolution of grievances and settlement of compensation claims

Conformance	X	Nonconformance	NCR #(s)
Finding (<i>strength/weakness</i>)		There have been very few grievances against the FME since its inception. Minor issues have been addressed fairly by the FME.	
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 (<i>strength/weakness</i>)		Forestry operations on the DLLT property are planned and carried out in such a way so as to achieve specific environmental (e.g. wildlife habitat creation, focus species management [both flora and fauna]), social (e.g. promoting recreational opportunities such as ATV trails), and operational (e.g. timely road maintenance) objectives. Planned activities are reviewed by the DLLT Board of Directors and specific relevant sub-committees, and they are implemented to minimize and mitigate environmental, social and operational costs.	
Criterion 5.2 Optimal use and local processing of forest products			
Conformance	X	Nonconformance	NCR #(s)
Finding (<i>strength/weakness</i>)		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 (<i>strength/weakness</i>)		DLLT has made efforts to minimize waste created and damage caused by forestry operations. Potential for utilization of forest products is linked to the industry, and DLLT staff have demonstrated local knowledge which aids them in tackling challenges posed by dynamic demand for different forest products.	
Criterion 5.4 Forest management and the local economy			
Conformance	X	Nonconformance	NCR #(s)
Finding (<i>strength/weakness</i>)		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 (<i>strength/weakness</i>)		DLLT employs a variety of forest management strategies and techniques in order to restore, maintain and enhance the value of forest services and resources for environmental and social benefit.	
Criterion 5.6 Harvest levels			

Conformance	X	Nonconformance	NCR #(s)
Finding (<i>strength/weakness</i>)		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 (<i>strength/weakness</i>)		Environmental impact assessments were conducted as part of the revision of the DLLT forest management plan, the most recent version of which was released in 2015, and were conducted in a thorough and robust manner. Further assessments were carried out in the form of post-harvest inspection reports, which further informed staff on their activities' environmental impacts.	

Criterion 6.2 Protection of rare, threatened and endangered species

Conformance	X	Nonconformance	NCR #(s)
Finding (<i>strength/weakness</i>)		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. There are areas with active management, and others with passive or no management, but 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 (<i>strength/weakness</i>)		DLLT has classified their property under different categories to specify the level of and approach to management necessary to achieve their objectives. This includes areas that are actively managed for different timber species, as well as others that are habitat or special management areas. Further, there are areas designated as 'ecological reserves', where management activities are more hands-off, in order to restore, maintain and enhance ecological functions and values identified by the FME and consulted stakeholders.	

Criterion 6.4 Protection of representative samples of existing ecosystems

Conformance	X	Nonconformance	NCR #(s)
Finding (<i>strength/weakness</i>)		DLLT's classification of its lands 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) There has been no damage against soils, residual forest and water resources during operations. The FME has good policies and procedures to protect resources during operations and field review confirmed actions are consistent with policy and in conformance with the FSC criteria.

Criterion 6.6 Chemical pest management

Conformance X Nonconformance NCR #(s)

Finding (strength/weakness) The FME uses no chemicals as part of operations.

Criterion 6.7 Use and disposal of chemicals, containers, liquid and solid non-organic wastes

Conformance X Nonconformance NCR #(s)

Finding (strength/weakness) The FME uses no chemicals and does not store them. Contractors follow strict contracts to assure against chemical spills.

Criterion 6.8 Use of biological control agents and genetically modified organisms

Conformance X Nonconformance NCR #(s)

Finding (strength/weakness) The FME uses no biological agents as part of its operations in the forest.

Criterion 6.9 The use of exotic species

Conformance X Nonconformance NCR #(s)

Finding (strength/weakness) No exotic species are used in the management of the FME.

Criterion 6.10 Forest conversion to plantations or non-forest land uses

Conformance X Nonconformance NCR #(s)

Finding (strength/weakness) No lands have been converted to plantation or non-forest-land use.

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 <i>(strength/weakness)</i>		The DLLT forest management planning documents were fully revised and updated in 2015 and prior to this reassessment.		
Criterion 7.3 Training and supervision of forest workers				
Conformance	X	Nonconformance	NCR #(s)	
Finding <i>(strength/weakness)</i>		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 and consistent with the FSC Standard.		
Criterion 7.4 Public availability of the management plan elements				
Conformance	X	Nonconformance	NCR #(s)	
Finding <i>(strength/weakness)</i>		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 <i>(strength/weakness)</i>		DLLT outlines its monitoring protocol in its management plan. The protocol calls for regular monitoring of operations and environmental conditions during and after activity implementation, carried out by staff, contractors and community volunteers.		
Criterion 8.2 Research and data collection for monitoring				
Conformance	X	Nonconformance	NCR #(s)	OBS 01/17
Finding <i>(strength/weakness)</i>		<p>DLLT regularly monitors forest products yield, forest growth rates and other conditions, composition and changes in flora and fauna, impacts from harvesting, and the costs and associated metrics from forest management.</p> <p>There are various NTFPs that DLLT allows community members to harvest, including firewood and fir tips to make holiday wreaths. DLLT registers each individual involved in NTFP harvests, and requests that they report back the amount of each type of NTFP collected. DLLT maintains records of community reporting on NTFP collection, though community members are not always reporting harvested amounts as requested, specifically for the fir tips. OBS 01/17</p>		
Criterion 8.3 Chain of custody				
Conformance	X	Nonconformance	NCR #(s)	

Finding (strength/weakness) DLLT implements an effective and cohesive Chain of Custody system documented through policies and procedures for all relevant personnel.

Criterion 8.4 Incorporation of monitoring results into the management plan

Conformance X Nonconformance NCR #(s)

Finding (strength/weakness) The management plan was last updated in 2015 and incorporated monitoring results in the revisions made.

Criterion 8.5 Publicly available summary of monitoring

Conformance X Nonconformance NCR OBS 02/17 #(s)

Finding (strength/weakness) DLLT maintains comprehensive annual monitoring reports that it posts to its website in March. Monitoring for the 2016 period occurred, and the summarized results of the monitoring indicators were communicated through public meetings and outreach, such as distributed newsletters, email messages and workshops. People who participate regularly in DLLT activities and read the newsletters would in theory have received all information that would go in to a public summary. However, the public summary of monitoring results was not posted to the DLLT website as it typically is. OBS 02/17

PRINCIPLE 9: High Conservation Value Forests

Criterion 9.1 Evaluation to determine high conservation value attributes

Conformance X Nonconformance NCR #(s)

Finding (strength/weakness) DLLT has undertaken several evaluations to determine HCVF attributes on the property, including in 2008, 2010, 2013, among other years, resulting in approximately 2,725 hectares of special management areas and ecological reserves.

Criterion 9.2 Consultation process

Conformance X Nonconformance NCR #(s)

Finding (strength/weakness) DLLT conducts ongoing stakeholder consultation, particularly when identifying HCVs, which informs planning processes and activity implementation.

Criterion 9.3 Measures to maintain and enhance high conservation value attributes

Conformance X Nonconformance NCR #(s)

Finding (strength/weakness) DLLT fine-tunes its management of HCVFs to either be specially tailored active management or as a no-management area, as in the case of the ecological reserves. DLLT has demonstrated through documentation, and the audit team confirmed through document review, interview, and direct field observations that DLLT has implemented specific measures to maintain and enhance HCV attributes.

Criterion 9.4 Monitoring to assess effectiveness

Conformance	X	Nonconformance	NCR # (s)
Finding (<i>strength/weakness</i>)		Monitoring procedures are carried out annually on HCVF lands regardless of whether operations are located nearby. These are reported as part of the annual monitoring report published on the organization web-site, and communicated through public meetings and newsletters.	
PRINCIPLE 10:		Plantations	
Finding (<i>strength/weakness</i>)		Not applicable. DLLT does not manage forests that meet the FSC-US definition of a plantation.	

1.6 Actions taken by Organisation Prior to Report Finalization

There have been no actions taken by the organization prior to report finalization to address NCRs as none were issued.

2. AUDIT PROCESS

2.1 Certification Standard Used

Standards Used: FSC-US Forest Management Standard (v1.1); Preferred by Nature CoC Standard for FME 12Sept19 (including FSC-STD-50-001 V2-0, Trademarks)

Local Adaptation: (if applicable) Not applicable

2.2 Audit Team and accompanying persons

Name	Role and qualifications
Charles Levesque	Lead Auditor 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: past RABQSA – Lead EMS Auditor – Environmental; Society of American Foresters Certified Forester and Certified Forest Auditor; New Hampshire Licensed Forester #281. Over 43 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 15 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 200 chain-of-custody under SFI, FSC and the Programme for the Endorsement of Forest Certification.

2.3 Audit Overview

Note: The table below provides an overview of the audit scope and auditors. See standard checklist annex for specific details on people interviewed and audit findings per site audited.

Site(s)	Date(s)	Main activities	Auditor(s)
Off-site	4/22/22	Stakeholder Notification	By Preferred by Nature staff
Off-site	6/9, 10, 13/22	Review of evidence	Charles Levesque
DLLT office	6/15/22	Opening meeting/document review	Charles Levesque
DLLT lands ME	6/16-17/22	Field Visits	Charles Levesque
DLLT offices	6/17/22	Closing meeting	Charles Levesque
DLLT offices/off-site	6/9, 6/15-17, 6/20/22	Staff and Stakeholder interviews	Charles Levesque
Total auditing time used (number in person days based on 8 hour working days): 6.25 days			

2.4 Description of Overall Audit Process

Both DLLT FMUs were sampled in this reassessment. Within each FMU field sites were chosen to include the following: sensitive sites; road work; harvested areas; areas with tree planting; areas adjacent to camps or other high user sites; trails; riparian zones; lake buffers; gated roads; other important areas.

Description of Subset	# FMUs In subset	Minimum # FMUs to sample	Actual # FMUs sampled	Notes/Comments
Existing large	1	1	1	DLLT Community Forest
New small	1	1	1	Lakeville Community Forest

Note: FSC sampling formulas from FSC-STD-20-007 v3.0 (Forest management evaluations) were used to determine minimum FMUs to sample.¹

2.4.1 Changes in FMEs' forest management and associated effects on conformance to standard requirements

DLLT added a natural resource manager who works with the DLLT forest manager on management of the two FMUs.

¹ Sampling formulas (y is #FMUs; x is minimum FMUs to sample)
 FMUs >10,000 hectares: new FMUs (x=y); existing FMUs (x=0.8*y)
 FMUs >1,001-10,000 hectares: new FMUs (x=0.3*y); existing FMUs (x=0.2*y)
 FMUs <1,000 hectares: new FMUs (x=0.6*√y); existing FMUs (x=0.3*√y)
 Multiple FMU: new FMUs (x=0.8*√y); existing FMUs (x=(0.8*√y)/2)

DLLT added a new FMU – Lakeville – of 815 ha to the certificate since the last annual audit.

2.4.2 List of FMUs selected for evaluation

Both FMUs were sampled during this re-assessment. On both FMUs, field sites were chosen that included: recent harvest activity; recent road work; recent bridge work, sensitive sites; site of stakeholder complaint re: BMPs; tree planting site; other sites that included recent activities.

FMU Name	Rationale for Selection
DLLT Community Forest	Existing large FMU
Lakeville Community Forest	New small FMU to be added to the scope of the certificate during reassessment

2.4.3 Review of FME Documentation and required records

a) All certificate types

Required Records	Reviewed
Complaints received by FME from stakeholders, actions taken, follow up communication Comments: One complaint was received and documented. DLLT followed up by inviting State of Maine enforcement personnel on site to review planned updates to BMP implementation for the site.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Accident records Comments: There were no accidents since the last annual audit.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Training records Comments: Training records were provided by DLLT staff.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Operational plan(s) for next twelve months Comments: Formal operational plans for upcoming activities were provided and reviewed.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Inventory records Comments: Inventory records within the forest management plans and monitoring report were viewed as well as data contained within the GIS system.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Sales and shipping documents Comments: All of the COC trip tickets were provided. A small sample of the hundreds of tickets were viewed in detail.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Harvesting records Comments: Harvesting records were viewed for all 5 harvests that occurred since the annual audit in 2021.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>

2.4.4 List of management aspects reviewed by assessment team

Type of site	Sites sampled	Type of site	Sites sampled
Road construction	X	Illegal settlement	
Soil drainage	X	Bridges/stream crossing	X
Workshop		Chemical storage	
Tree nursery		Wetland	X
Planned Harvest site	X	Steep slope/erosion	X
Ongoing Harvest site		Riparian zone	X
Completed logging	X	Planting	X

Soil scarification		Direct seeding	X
Planting site	X	Weed control	
Felling by harvester	X	Natural regeneration	X
Felling by forest worker		Endangered species	
Skidding/Forwarding	X	Wildlife management	X
Clearfelling/Clearcut	X	Nature Reserve	
Shelterwood management	X	Key Biotope	
Selective felling	X	Special management area	X
Sanitation cutting		Historical site	
Pre-commercial thinning		Recreational site	X
Commercial thinning	X	Buffer zone	X
Logging camp		Local community	X

3. COMPANY DETAILS

3.1 Client specific background information

Ownership and land tenure description (legal and customary)

The natural resources surrounding the town of Grand Lake Stream have attracted guides, lodge owners, and seasonal residents for over a century. However, throughout much of this time, the landscape was owned primarily by paper companies and other commercial entities.

As it became less profitable to own the land that fiber came from, the paper companies sold their lands, and the industrial landscape changed dramatically. Being very dependent on the natural resources the forest provides, the community saw the potential for subdivision, development, and the loss of public access following changes in land ownership.

DLLT was formed in 2001 as a Maine nonprofit corporation with a plan to conserve 370,000 acres of forests and lake shore directly surrounding Grand Lake Stream. These 370,000 conserved acres have guaranteed public access for recreation, the working forests that would remain working forests, and the likelihood and ability to subdivide parcels would be greatly reduced. The corporation has achieved IRS 501 (c) designation. In addition to conserving the Downeast Lakes landscape, DLLT had a desire to acquire land in fee for management as a community forest. By 2010 DLLT had acquired more than 33,000 contiguous acres for this purpose. This management plan also includes an additional 22,000 acres DLLT purchased in 2016, and which DLLT successfully placed under conservation easement in 2012. The Lakeville Forest Tract added 2015 acres in 2021 and was also placed under conservation easement.

Legislative and government regulatory context

The Maine Forest Service (MFS) enjoys a long history of protecting Maine's forests from wildfires, insect and disease outbreaks, poor forest practices and providing timely information to help foster informed decisions. These various MFS activities focus on having Maine's forests more enjoyable, productive, healthy and well managed. One of the most visible MFS activities is the prevention and suppression of forest fires. Some folks still remember the widespread devastation resulting from the fall 1947 fires, which brought about significant and positive change to the MFS that have continued over the ensuing decades. Through upgraded training, improved field communications and the reliance on an air fleet to knock down fires quickly, acreage lost to wildfires has been reduced to about 400 acres annually. This success is extraordinary in light of the significant reductions in manpower and expanded duties of the Rangers into regulating forest practices. Probably not well known, but a vital component of training, is the use of Maine's Forest Rangers throughout the United States and Canada to fight fires. The MFS also has staff dedicated to assisting the public and landowners with forest related issues and education. Ten District Foresters located across the state are available to help woodland owners make good choices about their land, including referring them to private sector professionals for more extensive assistance if needed. The MFS receives funding from several federal agencies to assist this work. MFS Foresters also review timber harvest activities to assess the implementation and effectiveness of efforts to protect water quality and other resources. We have found that woodland managers have really taken water quality protection to heart, with steadily improving performance during the decade since regular monitoring began. Over the years, the MFS has taken on an increased role in forestry regulation. The introduction of the state's forest practices rules and harvest notification requirements in 1991 were major factors in this changing role. Enforcement of timber theft and trespass laws still requires a good deal of time in spite of significant penalties. MFS's regulatory philosophy is three-tiered: we seek to prevent violations from happening in the first place through education and outreach; we

intervene where we see potential problems and help people comply; and, as a last resort, we take enforcement action. We believe this approach has contributed to a very positive trend towards increased land stewardship and regulatory compliance.

Part of the MFS website overview provided by Patty Cormier - Director
Environmental Context

Covered by extensive tracts of forest and dotted with more than 60 lakes, the Downeast Lakes region of eastern Maine hosts a wide array of wildlife, from moose, white-tailed deer and black bears to loons, black ducks, spotted sandpipers, black terns and about 180 other species of birds.

The area also is home to many communities where natural resources have long served as the bedrock of the local economy. The woods and waters of eastern Maine have provided livelihoods for generations of sporting camp owners, craftsmen, forest industry workers and fishing guides.

This culture of outdoor recreation has been supported by relatively stable land-use practices by well-established forestry managers. But over the past few decades, this pattern of land use has been changing. More than half of the Maine Woods has changed ownership in the last two decades, and natural landscapes are threatened with conversion to small private landholdings.

In response to these threats, local community leaders and conservation organizations had begun forming partnerships aimed at protecting these landscapes on a massive scale.

The new Downeast Lakes Land Trust joined with the New England Forestry Foundation in a plan to permanently conserve more than 300,000 acres of forestland strategically positioned between more than 600,000 acres of conserved lands in neighbouring Canada and 200,000 acres of state, federal and Native American lands in Maine. This effort would go on to attract a wide array of public and private conservation partners.

In May 2005, The Conservation Fund, in partnership with the New England Forestry Foundation, paid about \$12.3 million to acquire a permanent conservation easement designed to promote sustainable forestry practices and prevent forest fragmentation across 312,000 acres. The easement also ensures perpetual public access for fishing, hunting, hiking, birding and boating.
Habitat in Downeast Maine”
from NFWF “Protecting

Socioeconomic Context

The Downeast Lakes region has a long and rich history as a destination for outdoor recreation and local industry based on the natural resources of the forests and lakes. The Passamaquoddy and Penobscot Indians are descendants of the Native American people of Maine and western New Brunswick and have a heritage that dates back many centuries. Indian Township, along the St. Croix River, was formally conveyed to the Passamaquoddy Tribe in the Treaty of 1794, along with Pleasant Point on Passamaquoddy Bay. The Maine Indian Land Claims settlement in 1980 allowed the Tribe to obtain substantial additional acreage, much of which is to the northwest of the Downeast Lakes Community Forest.

Grand Lake Stream was first known as Township 3, Range 1, then in 1811 was purchased by Samuel Hinckley and became Hinckley Township, until it was renamed Grand Lake Stream Plantation in 1897. Moses Bonney was Princeton's first settler in 1815, and David Cass became one of the first Hinckley Plantation settlers in 1820. The first industry was lumbering, supporting log drives down the Saint Croix and Machias Rivers. Princeton was incorporated in 1832, and its first lumber mill was built by Put Rolfe in 1852. Steamships began towing booms of logs across Big Lake in 1854.

The first railroad reached Princeton in 1854, and that year William Gould built a landing near the mouth of Grand Lake Stream, providing access to Grand Lake Stream for sportsmen who tented along the stream while fishing for salmon, guided by Passamaquoddy Indians. By the 1890s boarding houses and cottages in Grand Lake Stream catered to sportsmen, while Princeton was a busy town. Many residents used their expert knowledge of the woods to serve as Guides for visiting sportsmen. Canoe builders learned to design boats that could handle the Grand Lakes, and when outboard motors became available, adapted by adding a square stern, creating the modern Grand Lake Canoe. The high concentration of hemlock in the surrounding forests led the Shaw brothers to purchase the Township in 1870 and establish a tannery. The natural tannins in hemlock bark were the essential resource needed to cure hides. The tannery became the largest in the world, but failed and was bankrupt by 1898. The St. Croix Paper Company opened their Woodland Mill in Baileyville in 1906, which is now owned and operated by Woodland Pulp, LLC as a pulp mill and remains the region's largest employer.

Before the turn of the century, the railroad brought many travellers and supported more sporting camps in Princeton and Grand Lake Stream. Many of these camps and lodges are still in business today, with remarkably few ownership changes over the decades.

-from website "Before Downeast lakes Land Trust"

also see <https://downeastlakes.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/Grand-Lake-Stream-Case-Study.pdf>

Workers

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

Total workers		workers (provide detail below)
Local employees	3 Male	3 Female
Non - Local employees	Male	Female
Local Part time workers	Male	Female
Non-local part time workers	Male	Female
Worker access to potable water on the work site	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	
<u>Full time employees making more than \$2 a day</u>	<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	

4. Certificate Scope

4.1.1. General Overview of the Organization

Reporting period: Previous 12 month period **Dates**

July 1, 2021 – June 30, 2022

A. Scope of Forest Area

Type of certificate: FMU SLIMF Certificate not applicable

Number of group members (if applicable):

Total number of Forest Management Units FMUs: 2
(if applicable, list each below):

FMU size classification within the scope:

Group or Multiple FMU	FMU size classification	# of FMUs	total forest area of FMU's (ha)
	< 100 ha		
	100 – 1000 ha	1	815
	1000 – 10 000 ha		
	> 10 000 ha	1	22,537
	SLIMF FMUs		

New FMUs added since previous evaluation? Yes No NA

Group Certificate: List of FMUs included in the certificate scope provided in Annex V-a:

Single/Multi-FMU Certificate: List of each FMU included in the certificate scope:

FMU Name/Description	Area (ha)	Forest Type	Location Latitude/Longitude
Lakeville Forest Tract	815		N: 45.23444 W: -67.99655
Downeast Lakes Community Forest	22,537		N: 45.22311 W: -67.87808

B. FSC Product categories included in the FM/CoC scope

No changes since previous report

Level 1	Level 2	Species
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> W1 Rough wood	W1.1 Roundwood (logs) W1.2 Fuelwood	Hemlock, Spruce, fir Pine, Birch Beech, Maple, Ash
<input type="checkbox"/> W2 Wood charcoal		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> W3 Wood in chips or particles	W3.1 Wood chips	Mixed Species
<input type="checkbox"/> W5 Solid wood (sawn, chipped, sliced or peeled)	W5.1 Fitches and boules	Mixed species
<input type="checkbox"/> Non Wood Forest Products		
<input type="checkbox"/> N6 Plants and parts of plants		
<input type="checkbox"/> Other		

C. Species and Sustainable Rate of Harvest (AAC)

Latin name	Common trade name	Annual allowable cut (m3)	Actual harvest (m3) 2021	Projected harvest for next year (m3)
Tsuga Candensis	Hemlock		30,729	
Mixed Species	Mixed Hardwood		6,250	
Mixed Species	Spruce Fir		7,018	
Picea	Pine		3,998	
Total AAC		43,500	47,995	14,500
Total annual estimated log production (m3):			25,000	
Total annual estimates production of certified NTFP: (list all certified NTFP by product type):			0 m3	

D. Forest Area Classification

1. Total certified area (land base)		23,352 ha
2. Total forested area		21,530 ha
3. Total production forest area (where harvesting occurs)	17,457 ha	
4. Total non-productive forest area (no harvesting)	4,073 ha	
4.a Protected forest area (strict reserves)	4,073 ha	
4.b Areas protected from timber harvesting and managed only for NTFPs or services	0 ha	
4.c Remaining non-productive forest (other uses)	0 ha	
5. Total non-forested area (e.g., water bodies, wetlands, fields, rocky outcrops, etc.)		1,822 ha

Forest zone Temperate

Certified Area (ha) under Forest Type

Natural	23,352
Semi-Natural	
Plantation	

Stream sides and water bodies (Linear Kilometers) 285 Linear Kilometers plus Lakeville to be measured Kilometers)

E. FME Information

Ownership Tenure

Private Ownership

Please indicate the type of entity that owns the lands covered by the certificate. Please choose from the following categories in the drop-down list.

Management tenure:

Non-profit community Land Trust

Forest area that is:

Privately managed 23,352 ha
State/Public managed

Community managed

F. Forest Regeneration

Area or share of the total production forest area regenerated naturally 23,351

Area or share of the total production forest area regenerated by planting or seeding

Area or share of the total production forest are regenerated by other or mixed methods (describe) 1 ha enhancement planting

G. High Conservation Values Identified via formal HCV assessment by the FME and respective areas

Code	HCV TYPES ²	Description:	Area (ha)
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	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	0 ha
HCV3	Forest areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems.	FCCF SMANF#16 – 16 ac FCCF SMANF#18–209 ac Wabassus SMA #1 – 2 ac	92 ha
HCV4	Forest areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g. watershed protection, erosion control).	None	0 ha
HCV5	Forest areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g. subsistence, health).	None	0 ha
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	0 ha
TOTAL HCVF AREA			2087

Number of sites significant to indigenous people and communities

H. Pesticide Use

FME does not use pesticides.

FME does use pesticides.

FSC Prohibited, Highly Restricted and Restricted pesticides used in last calendar year

Name	Quantity	Reason for use	# of ha treated
------	----------	----------------	-----------------

² The 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>.

Other pesticides used in last calendar year

Name	Quantity	Reason for use	# of ha treated
------	----------	----------------	-----------------

4.2.3. Exclusion of areas from the scope of certificate

- X** **Applicability of FSC partial certification**
- All forest land owned or managed by the FME is included in the scope of this evaluation. *Note: Does not include 100 acre non-forestry tract purchased for recreation only use in 2014 in Talmadge, ME. This parcel is not contiguous with the DLLT main forest properties.*
- FME owns and/or has management involvement in other forest land/properties (forest management units) not being evaluated. **If yes, complete section A below.**

A. AREAS EXCLUDED FROM SCOPE OF CERTIFICATE

Comments /
Explanation for
exclusion:
Control measures
to prevent
contamination

Other Forest area	Location	Size (ha)
-------------------	----------	-----------

- X** **Applicability of FSC excision policy**
- All forest land owned or managed by the FME is included in the scope of this evaluation. *Note above re: 100 acre recreation property.*
- Is any portion of the forest management unit (s) under evaluation for certification being removed or excised from the scope of the evaluation, or have been excised in the past? **If yes, complete section below. Conformance with FSC-POL-20-003 The excision of areas from the scope of certification shall be documented.**