FSC Forest Management Audit

Public Summary Report

Audit Conducted By	SCS Global Services 2000 Powell Street, Ste. 600 Emeryville CA 94608 United States of America https://www.scsglobalservices.com/
Contact Person	Maggie Schwartz
Report last updated on	05 January 2026
Certificate Holder	Department of Agriculture, Conservation and Forestry - Bureau of Parks and Lands – Maine 22 State House Station,18 Elkins Lane Augusta Maine 04333 United States of America https://www.maine.gov/dacf/parks/about/formgmt.shtml
Contact Person	Michael Pounch
Certified Forest Areas	640480.55
FSC certificate registration code	SCS-FM/COC-008672
Certificate issue date	03 October 2025
Certificate expiry date	11 April 2027
Audit Sequence	Surveillance 4

This forest has been certified by SCS Global Services as meeting the requirements of FSC national forest standard FSC-STD-USA-1.1-2018.

Certificate Holder and Certification Body Details

Question	Inputs
Certificate Holder	
1.01 Certificate holder name *	Department of Agriculture, Conservation and Forestry - Bureau of Parks and Lands – Maine
1.01.1 Local company name	BPL
1.01.2 Trading name	BPL
1.02.1 Street Address *	22 State House Station,18 Elkins Lane
1.02.2 Address Line 2	
1.02.3 City *	Augusta
1.02.4 State or Province	Maine
1.02.5 Postal Code	04333
1.03 Country *	United States of America
1.04 Contact person full name *	Michael Pounch
1.05 Email *	michael.a.pounch@maine.gov
1.06 Telephone *	207-215-7824
1.07 Website *	https://www.maine.gov/dacf/parks/about/formgmt.shtml
Certificate Parameters	
1.08 FSC licence code *	FSC-C109865
1.09 Certificate code *	SCS-FM/COC-008672
1.10 Former certificate code (if any)	BV-FM/COC-017429
1.11 Certificate type *	FM/COC
1.12 Group certificate *	No
1.13.1 Initial certification date *	2022-04-12
1.13.2 Most recent certification date *	2025-10-03
1.13.3 Certificate expiry date *	2027-04-11
1.14 Total number of MUs in the scope of certificate *	1
1.15 Total area certified *	259 193.3 ha
1.16 Certificate scope	
1.16.2 Current certificate scope *	FM/COC
1.16.3 Change of scope since previous audit *	No
1.16.1 Nature of scope change	
1.17 Ecosystem services in scope *	No
1.26 Continuous Improvement Procedure being followed *	No
1.28 Regulatory Module in scope *	No
1.25 Name and/or location of the certified forest area(s)	Maine
1.27 Changes to database details	No

Question	Inputs
Certification Body	
1.18 Certification body name *	SCS Global Services
1.19.1 Street Address *	2000 Powell Street, Ste. 600
1.19.2 Address Line 2	
1.19.3 City *	Emeryville
1.19.4 State	CA
1.19.5 Postal Code	94608
1.20 Country *	United States of America
1.21 Contact person full name *	Maggie Schwartz
1.22 Email *	info@scsglobalservices.com
1.23 Telephone *	510-452-8000
1.24 Website *	https://www.scsglobalservices.com/

The evaluation process

Question	Inputs
Audit Parameters	
2.01 Audit type *	Surveillance
2.01.1 Audit sequence *	Surveillance 4
2.01.2 Audit location *	On-site
2.01.3 Justification for remote audit	N/A
2.01.4 Methods used for remote audit	Review of records, interviews, sit visits.
2.02 Audit start date *	2025-09-30
2.16 First stakeholder consultation date for this audit *	2025-09-30
2.03 Audit finish date *	2025-10-02
2.04 Total person days on-site *	6.0
2.04.1 Justification for audit time *	Surveillance audit duration.
2.05 Date of report *	2026-01-05
Normative Documents	
2.07 Evaluated international normative document(s) *	
2.07.1 Trademark standard FSC-STD-50-001 *	Yes
2.07.2 Group standard FSC-STD-30-005 *	No
2.07.3 CoC standard FSC-STD-40-004 *	No
2.07.4 ES procedure FSC-PRO-30-006 *	No
2.07.5 Excision Policy FSC-POL-20-003 *	No
2.07.6 Pesticides Policy FSC-POL-30-001 *	Yes
2.07.7 Applicable NTFP Standard *	No
2.07.8 CIP FSC PRO 30-011 *	No
2.08 Code(s) of NFSS or IFSS used *	FSC-STD-USA-1.1-2018
2.09 Web link to the standard used *	https://us.fsc.org/preview.fsc-std-usa-v1-1-2018.a-719.pdf
2.10 If applicable, the adaptation process of CB interim standard	N/A

The evaluation process

Question	Inputs
Certification Decision	
2.20 Conditions associated with the certification decision *	
2.20.1 No specific condition *	Yes
2.20.2 Correction of minor NCRs issued within required timelines *	Yes
2.20.3 Correction of major NCRs issued within required timelines *	No
2.20.4 Correction of the pre-conditions to certification identified *	No
2.20.5 Other	
2.32 Conditions assessed and subsequent actions taken prior to the certification decision to correct major or minor non-conformities that were identified *	None identified.
2.22 Auditor's recommendation *	
2.22.1 The organization is in conformity with the certification requirements *	Yes
2.22.2 The organization needs to take corrective actions *	Yes
2.28 Resolution of alleged non-conformities	
2.29 Potential infringements of the FSC Policy for Association *	None identified.
2.24 Other details relevant to the decision	None identified.
2.23 Certification decision *	Maintain
2.25 Decision date *	2026-01-05
2.26 Decision making entity *	SCS Global Services

Audit itinerary

4.01 Audit Itinerary Item Start Date *	4.02 Hours *	4.03 MUs or members *	4.04 Activities *	4.05 Site detail *
	16.00	Maine BPL, Northern region	Field assessment	West Forks, Johnson Mountain, Holeb
2025-10-01	16.00	Maine BPL, Western region	Field assessment	Bigelow Preserve
2025-10-02	16.00	Maine BPL, Western region	Document review, interviews	Refer to the appendix for site details

Forest management enterprise information

Question	Inputs
Forest Area	
5.02 Brief description of any area of forest over which the certificate holder has some responsibility, whether as owner (including shared or partial ownership), manager, consultant or other responsibility) which the certificate holder has chosen to exclude from the scope of the certificate, together with an explanation of the reason. *	Maine BPL's ownership is comprised of properties that range in contiguous size of 40,000 acres on the high end to 100-200 acre parcels on the low end. The state is broken down into 3 Regions: Eastern, Western, and Northern zones. Regions are further organized into Sustainable Harvest Units (SHL) serve as the basis for the organization of operations and long term planning. Each SHU has its own Sustainable Harvest Limit (aka Annual Allowable Cut; AAC), the sum of which constitutes Maine BPL's total annual harvest goals/limits. SHUs are generally organized by areas with similar ecosystems, distance to markets and logistical details. Parallel to this organizational arrangement, management
5.03 Area of forest owned/managed but excluded from MUs in the scope of certification *	
5.03.1 According to FSC-POL-20-003 *	377.6 ha
5.03.2 Other reasons	0.0 ha

Forest management enterprise information

Question	Inputs

Management Units

Area Units: ha

7.01 MU name *	7.23 Cadastral identifier *	7.02 Forest zone *	7.03 SLIMF type *	7.04 Tenure-ownership *	7.05 Tenure-management *	7.24 Recognised as Community Forest	7.25 SLIMF or Community	7.06 Centroid Latitude *	7.07 Centroid Longitude *	7.08 Total production forest area *	7.09 Total non-production forest area *	7.10 Total area of MU *
Number of Valid Entries:	**1**							**Area Totals**		**170,902.79**	**88,290.49**	**259,193.28**
State of Maine Public Reserved and	deeds on-file	Temperate	Non-SLIMF	Public/State	Public/State	No	No	45.25325700	-69.23348400	170,902.79	88,290.49	259,193.28

Commercial timber species

8.01 Species *	8.02 Product code *	8.03 Trade name *	8.04 Harvested quantity in previous calendar year *	8.06 Sold with FSC Claim in previous calendar year *
Not Applicable	W3.1 Wood chips	Mixed hardwood	10 651.1 m3	10 651.1 m3
Fraxinus americana	W1.1 Roundwood (logs)	ASH, WHITE	138.5 m3	138.5 m3
Populus tremuloides	W1.1 Roundwood (logs)	ASPEN	3 049.7 m3	3 049.7 m3
Populus grandidentata	W1.1 Roundwood (logs)	ASPEN	3 049.7 m3	3 049.7 m3
Fagus grandifolia	W1.1 Roundwood (logs)	BEECH	38.4 m3	38.4 m3
Betula papyrifera	W1.1 Roundwood (logs)	BIRCH, WHITE	1 695.2 m3	1 695.2 m3
Betula alleghaniensis	W1.1 Roundwood (logs)	BIRCH, YELLOW	4 306.7 m3	4 306.7 m3
Thuja occidentalis	W1.1 Roundwood (logs)	CEDAR	7 763.4 m3	7 763.4 m3
Prunus serotina Ehrh.	W1.1 Roundwood (logs)	CHERRY	2.9 m3	2.9 m3
Abies balsamea	W1.1 Roundwood (logs)	FIR	15 164.4 m3	15 164.4 m3
Tsuga canadensis (L.) Carr.	W1.1 Roundwood (logs)	HEMLOCK	7 360.7 m3	7 360.7 m3
Acer rubrum	W1.1 Roundwood (logs)	MAPLE, RED	1 403.4 m3	1 403.4 m3
Acer saccharum L	W1.1 Roundwood (logs)	MAPLE, SUGAR	5 867.1 m3	5 867.1 m3
Not Applicable	W1.1 Roundwood (logs)	MIXED HARDWOOD	101 818.1 m3	101 818.1 m3
Quercus rubra	W1.1 Roundwood (logs)	OAK, RED	17.0 m3	17.0 m3
Pinus strobus	W1.1 Roundwood (logs)	PINE, WHITE	3 480.3 m3	3 480.3 m3
Picea spp.	W1.1 Roundwood (logs)	SPRUCE	99 875.4 m3	99 875.4 m3

Pesticide use since previous audit/year

10.01.1 Trade name *	10.01 Active ingredient *	10.03 Applied area *	10.04 Reason for use *	10.04.1 Location used *	10.04.2 Period of use *	10.04.3 Number of applications *	10.04.4 Frequency of application *	10.05 Quantity of ingredient *	10.06 Summary of ESRA
Farmworks	Glyphosate	0.0 ha	Invasive plant control for Japanese knotweed (Fallopia japonica syn Reynoutria japonica, Polygonum cuspidatum), after one mechanical control in late June 2025	Bigelow	08/21/2025	1	1	0.1 litres	The area to be treated will be visited at least 3 times a year to monitor the effectiveness of treatment, which will include any undesirable outcomes (e.g., erosion). The goal is to minimize non-target impacts, thus retaining as much vegetation as possible in the
Farmworks	Glyphosate	0.0 ha	Invasive plant control for Tatarian honeysuckle (Lonicera spp). Applied at full strength.	Bigelow	08/21/2025	1	1	0.0 litres	The area to be treated will be visited at least 3 times a year to monitor the effectiveness of treatment, which will include any undesirable outcomes (e.g., erosion). The goal is to minimize non-target impacts, thus retaining as much vegetation as possible in the
Foray 48B	Bacillus thuringiensis kurstaki	55.8 ha	Forest tent caterpillar in sugar bush	Sandy bay	06/04/2025	1	1	175.5 litres	This memo references "Environmental and Social Risk Assessment for Bacillus thuringiensis var. kurstaki" (Pennsylvania Dept of Conservation and Natural Resources 2020), adopted by BPL. The following are potential risks identified that are possible with this
TREE-age G4	Emamectin Benzoate	0.1 ha	Emerald ash borer control via stem injection	Yankee Woodlot	07/07/2025	1	1	0.7 litres	This memo references the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation Environmental and Social Risk Assessment for emamectin benzoate, adopted by the Bureau of Parks and Lands. The current risk assessment is based on
TREE-age G4	Emamectin Benzoate	0.1 ha	Emerald ash borer control via stem injection	Kennebec Highlands	06/16/2025	1	1	1.0 litres	This memo references the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation Environmental and Social Risk Assessment for emamectin benzoate, adopted by the Bureau of Parks and Lands. The current risk assessment is based on
Mimic 2LV	Tebufenozide	103.6 ha	SBW	Fall Brook Lake	06/02/2025-06/09/2025	1	1	60.5 litres	Teb ESRA:No indications of adverse effects when used in accordance with label specifications were found for values associated with the following: soil, ground water, atmosphere, non-timber products, high quality conservation values, landscapes
Mimic 2LV	Tebufenozide	606.7 ha	SBW	Square Lake	06/02/2025-06/09/2025	1	1	354.7 litres	Teb ESRA:No indications of adverse effects when used in accordance with label specifications were found for values associated with the following: soil, ground water, atmosphere, non-timber products, high quality conservation values, landscapes
Mimic 2LV	Tebufenozide	170.5 ha	SBW	Fall Brook Lake / Allagash NE public lot	06/02/2025-06/09/2025	1	1	99.6 litres	Teb ESRA:No indications of adverse effects when used in accordance with label specifications were found for values associated with the following: soil, ground water, atmosphere, non-timber products, high quality conservation values, landscapes
Mimic 2LV	Tebufenozide	101.0 ha	SBW	Sinclair/Square Lake SALOs	06/02/2025-06/09/2025	1	1	147.6 litres	Teb ESRA:No indications of adverse effects when used in accordance with label specifications were found for values associated with the following: soil, ground water, atmosphere, non-timber products, high quality conservation values, landscapes
Foray 76B	Bacillus thuringiensis kurstaki	1.8 ha	SBW	Sinclair/Square Lake Rotary Mimic Cleanup	06/02/2025-06/09/2025	1	1	1.1 litres	6b. Btk ESRA: No indications of adverse effects when used in accordance with label specifications were found for values associated with the
Mimic 2LV	Tebufenozide	508.5 ha	SBW	Square Lake	06/02/2025-06/09/2025	1	1	297.2 litres	Teb ESRA:No indications of adverse effects when used in accordance with label specifications were found for values associated with the following: soil, ground water, atmosphere, non-timber products, high quality conservation values, landscapes
Mimic 2LV	Tebufenozide	79.6 ha	SBW	Sinclair	06/02/2025-06/09/2025	1	1	46.6 litres	Teb ESRA:No indications of adverse effects when used in accordance with label specifications were found for values associated with the following: soil, ground water, atmosphere, non-timber products, high quality conservation values, landscapes
Foray 76B	Bacillus thuringiensis kurstaki	94.0 ha	SBW	Sinclair	06/02/2025-06/09/2025	1	1	137.4 litres	6b. Btk ESRA: No indications of adverse effects when used in accordance with label specifications were found for values associated with the
Garlon 4A	triclopyr	0.8 ha	Diseased beech control	Kennebec Highlands	01/10/2025	1	1	9.3 litres	Triclopyr is not considered a highly hazardous pesticide (HHP) per the FSC Pesticides Policy (FSC-POL-30-001 V3-0 EN) and the FSC Lists of Highly Hazardous Pesticides (FSC-POL-30-001a EN). Triclopyr BEE has been found to be much more toxic than triclopyr
Arbortect	Thiabenzadole	0.1 ha	Beech leaf disease	Donnell/Tunk	08/13/2025	1	1	1.3 litres	The main risks associated with all of these chemicals was to water resources and human health. All chemicals can cause health and safety issues to humans (all 3 chemicals had minor to moderate risks associated with human/applicator health, namely skin and eye
Phiticide	Mono- and dibasic sodium, potassium, and ammonium phosphites	0.1 ha	Beech leaf disease	Donnell/Tunk	08/13/2025	1	1	3.8 litres	The main risks associated with all of these chemicals was to water resources and human health. All chemicals can cause health and safety issues to humans (all 3 chemicals had minor to moderate risks associated with human/applicator health, namely skin and eye
Pentrabark	Alkylphenol ethoxylate, polysiloxane polyether copolymer, propylene glycol	0.1 ha	Beech leaf disease	Donnell/Tunk	08/13/2025	1	1	0.2 litres	The main risks associated with all of these chemicals was to water resources and human health. All chemicals can cause health and safety issues to humans (all 3 chemicals had minor to moderate risks associated with human/applicator health, namely skin and eye
Arbortect	Thiabenzadole	0.1 ha	Beech leaf disease	Duck Lake	08/13/2025	1	1	1.4 litres	The main risks associated with all of these chemicals was to water resources and human health. All chemicals can cause health and safety issues to humans (all 3 chemicals had minor to moderate risks associated with human/applicator health, namely skin and eye
Phiticide	Mono- and dibasic sodium, potassium, and ammonium phosphites	0.1 ha	Beech leaf disease	Duck Lake	08/13/2025	1	1	3.8 litres	The main risks associated with all of these chemicals was to water resources and human health. All chemicals can cause health and safety issues to humans (all 3 chemicals had minor to moderate risks associated with human/applicator health, namely skin and eye
Pentrabark	Alkylphenol ethoxylate, polysiloxane polyether copolymer, propylene glycol	0.1 ha	Beech leaf disease	Duck Lake	08/13/2025	1	1	0.2 litres	The main risks associated with all of these chemicals was to water resources and human health. All chemicals can cause health and safety issues to humans (all 3 chemicals had minor to moderate risks associated with human/applicator health, namely skin and eye

Stakeholder feedback

12.01 Stakeholder group *	12.02 Stakeholder description *	12.03 Stakeholder's comment	12.06 CB's follow up
Environmental interests	Environmental interests related to a specific management unit.	Concerns related to the implementation of harvest prescriptions, specifically related to the grouping of hardwood and softwood tree species during the planning of the operations.	
Environmental interests	Environmental interests related to a specific management unit.	Concerns related to the area used for calculation of the annual allowable cut (AAC) levels. Specifically, the concern is related to the inclusion of unregulated area in the total area used to determine the AAC. The impact of this would be an AAC level	Interview Silviculture Manager. Review of GIS layer on ArcGIS. Use of imagery acquired in 2013. Use of regulated amount of acres, multiplied growth rate assigned to that species group gives a growth rate per stand multiplied by the area of regulated acres for
Environmental interests	Environmental interests related to a specific management unit.	Threatened and Endangered species habitat protection on compartment W209.	During the prescription development process, foresters use a document entitled 'Prescription checklist' to validate, step by tstep, the occurrence/designated habitat of RT&E species. Public lands wildlife biologist was consulted and no apparent issues were
Environmental interests	Environmental interests related to a specific management unit.	Violation on the Act to establish a publilc preserve in the Bigelow Mountain Area, specifically related to public access on designated roads, as defined in the above mentioned Act.	

Nonconformities/Observations raised

14.01 Unique Finding number *	14.06 Grading *	14.07 Open / Closed *	14.08 Standard *	14.09 Clause *	14.03 Issue date *	14.04 Due date *	14.05 Close date *	14.10 Requirement *	14.11 Description of audit finding *	14.15 Corrective action requested *	14.14 MU Applicability	14.12 Corrective action taken by the auditee *	14.13 CB's review of corrective actions
2024-C109865-01	Minor	Closed	NFSS	4.2a	2025-03-03	2026-03-02	2025-10-02	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).	Applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of employees are not effectively implemented. During the field visit, an operator exited the harvesting equipment and did not wear proper PPE .	Providing a memo to staff to ensure safety protocols are implemented and monitored.	All	A memo was sent to field staff as a reminder to ensure and maintain safe working conditions on the job site. Federal and State safety standards, BPL safety policies, procedures and practices related to logger certified training certification must be followed and implemented.	Verified evidence that a memo was sent on September 29, 2025. Field assessment of active forest operations. No evidence of health and safety violations. All workers interviewed during the audit were wearing their proper PPE and implmenting proper safety procedures. This non-conformance can be closed.
2024-C109865-02	Minor	Closed	NFSS	8.2.d.1	2025-03-03	2026-03-02	2025-10-02	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.	Monitoring data does not allow to confirm if the area harvested between 2021-2023 in Compartment W209 in the Bigelow Preserve resulted in a clearcut as defined by the Chapter 20 Rule for Forest Regeneration and Clearcutting Standards. Furthermore, the Bigelow Management Plan limits the size of clearcuts in Bigelow to 10 acres.	BPL staff have observed unsatisfactory harvesting practices, namely excessively wide trails with little to no treatment off-trail. Therefore, BPL management acknowledges the overall concern with harvest implementation as credible and the allegation as plausible. BPL has identified several preliminary areas of concern in Compartment W209 using remote sensing imagery and field evaluations. One area was randomly identified. Once finalized, all areas of concern will be assessed using MFS "FPA Cruising" protocol to determine if any legal clearcuts have occurred. Notably, these focus areas will be at least 20-25 acres in size to effectively determine if any clearcuts over 10 acres occurred. The stakeholder will be asked to review the planned monitoring and provide comment on any other specific areas of concern. Random start points can also be provided by the stakeholder if they wish. BPL will conduct this analysis in-house. Although th stakeholder requested a third party to perform the analysis, BPL has the skills and staff to do this work in house and concludes that FSC and oversight by the stakeholder of this process and its outcomes will be sufficient to ensure objectivity. BPL Chief of Silviculture, West Region Manager, and West Region Forester 2 will develop the cruise program. Cruise will be performed by BPL foresters. Chief of Silviculture will perform check cruises. Below is a map of the preliminary locations for the cruise assessment. A tabloid sized georeferenced pdf map will also be provided.	Bigelow Preserve	Following the communication of the proposed corrective action plan, the stakeholder decided to lodge a complaint with the Maine Forest Service (MFS). The MFS's role is protecting Maine's forest resources so they continue to benefit current and future generations. By interview, the Field Team Leader of the Forest Policy and Management Division opened an investigation. The investigation led to an assessment during the summer of 2025 (July and August) and consisted of a cruise process as well as helicopter and drone surveys. The investigation is still open pending the completion of the report. However, by interviewee confirmed that there no violation.	Based on the interview of the MFS' Field Team Leader of the Forest Policy and Management Division and this person's assurance that there was no violation of the Chapter 20 rule for Forest Regeneration and Clearcutting Standards in Compartment W209 on the Bigelow Preserve, this non-conformance is closed.
2024-C109865-03	Obs	Closed	NFSS	8.2.d.1	2025-03-03		2025-10-02	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.	BPL could agree with the Friends of Bigelow on the field assessment protocol in relation to NC 2024-02.	Following the communication of the proposed corrective action plan, the stakeholder decided to lodge a complaint with the Maine Forest Service (MFS). Once the complaint was lodged, the Maine BPL decided to leave the investigation to the MFS. Therefore, this observation is no longer relevant and is closed.	Bigelow Preserve	Following the communication of the proposed corrective action plan, the stakeholder decided to lodge a complaint with the Maine Forest Service (MFS). Once the complaint was lodged, the Maine BPL decided to leave the investigation to the MFS. Therefore, this observation is no longer relevant and is closed.	Following the communication of the proposed corrective action plan, the stakeholder decided to lodge a complaint with the Maine Forest Service (MFS) alleging FPA violations. BPL was notified of MFS' formal investigation on January 23, 2025. MFS also advised BPL that they would not use data colelcted by BPL in their investigation. Therefore, BPL stepped away from the process to allow MFS to conduct their own independent investigation. Therefore, this observation is no longer relevant and is closed.
2024-C109865-04	Obs	Open	NFSS	4.4.b	2025-03-03			The forest owner or manager seeks and considers input in management planning from people who would likely be affected by management activities.	A document entitled 'Policy Statements and Recommendations from the 1989 Bigelow Management Plan' were brought to the attention of the 2024 surveillance audit. This document highlights certain policy statements and questions are raised wether these statements are still applicable today. These comments were brought to the attention of the Chief of Silviculture for comment. The conclusion is that the Bigelow forest management plan will be revised in the coming year, and the audit concludes that the highlighted comments should be brought to the attention of the advisory committee responsible for the revision of the forest management plan (including the concerns relating to the roles and responsibilities of the Preserve Manager.	The 15-year revision of the Flagstaff management plan is still ongoing. BPL have been in contact with the stakeholders who have brought these comments to the attention of the 2024 audit team.	Bigelow Preserve	Stakeholder consultation for the revised Bigelow Management plan is ongoing.	The work on the revision of the Bigelow Management plan is still ongoing. BPL have been in contact with the stakeholders who brought these concerns to the attention of the audit team in 2024. BPL will continue to work with these stakeholders whithin the management planning process. Therefore, this observation remains open.
2025-C109865-01	Minor	Open	NFSS	1.1.b	2026-01-05	2027-01-04		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.	There is no evidence of a procedure or SOP to monitor fuel containers and handling. Evidence: 120-gallon tank was observed on an active operation site. The contents of the container was not identified. The nozzle was left lying in the truck bed with evidence of leaking.	There is no evidence of a procedure or SOP to monitor fuel containers and handling. Evidence: 120-gallon tank was observed on an active operation site. The contents of the container was not identified. The nozzle was left lying in the truck bed with evidence of leaking.	All		
2025-C109865-02	Minor	Open	NFSS	7.1.q	2026-01-05	2027-01-04		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.	There is no evidence of a process for the determination of skid trail width during the compartment review procedure (approval process prior to the implementation of the management activity). Evidence: Harvest site on Compartment W209 on the Bigelow Preserve.	There is no evidence of a process for the determination of skid trail width during the compartment review procedure (approval process prior to the implementation of the management activity). Evidence: Harvest site on Compartment W209 on the Bigelow Preserve.	All		
2025-C109865-03	Minor	Open	NFSS	7.3.a	2026-01-05	2027-01-04		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.	A harvesting operator did not demonstrate appropriate competence to their role and responsibilities, specifically relating to the determination of their location within a harvest block. Evidence: Active harvest operation within the Bigelow Preserve.	A harvesting operator did not demonstrate appropriate competence to their role and responsibilities, specifically relating to the determination of their location within a harvest block. Evidence: Active harvest operation within the Bigelow Preserve.	All		
2025-C109865-04	Minor	Open	NFSS	1.1.a	2026-01-05	2027-01-04		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.	There is evidence that motor vehicles are not restricted to designated roads, as required in the Act to Establish a Public Preserve in the Bigelow Mountain Area. Evidence: Field visit within the Bigelow Preserve.	There is evidence that motor vehicles are not restricted to designated roads, as required in the Act to Establish a Public Preserve in the Bigelow Mountain Area. Evidence: Field visit within the Bigelow Preserve.	Bigelow Preserve		