



**BUREAU
VERITAS**

**Bureau Veritas Certification
North America, Inc.
SFI 2010:2014 Audit Report**

390 Benmar Dr., Suite 100
Houston, TX 77060
Phone (281) 986-1300: Toll Free (800) 937-9311

Company Name	Division of Parks and Public Lands, State of Maine
Contact Person	Mr. Thomas Charles
Address	22 SHS, Augusta, ME 04333
Phone / Fax	Phone: 207.941.4412
PQC Code	E01E

Contract Number:	US.1071418	Certification Audit:		Re-Certification Audit:		Surveillance: (Indicate visit # or Pre-Assessment)	#1
------------------	-------------------	----------------------	--	-------------------------	--	---	----

Audit Summary
<p align="center">Introduction</p> <p>A first surveillance of Division of Parks and Public Lands (hereafter referred to as DPPL) SFI program for forestland management prepared for and implemented on State of Maine land holdings was conducted by Matt Tormohlen (BVNA CoC Lead auditor) on November 5-9, 2012 for the purposes of recommendation for continued certification. Mr. Brian Callaghan served as audit team member during all aspects of this audit.</p> <p align="center">Audit Scope, Objectives and Process</p> <p>The scope of the audit is “Management of Maine Public Lands”. DPPL currently manages a total of 558,240 acres throughout the state of Maine, 240,436 acres of which is contained in the western region FMU. The audit was conducted against the SFI 2010-2014 Standard. During this first surveillance audit, the following indicators were reviewed; 1.1; 1.2; 2.2; 2.3; 3; 4; 5; 7; 15; 16; 20. There was no substitution or modification of indicators. Specifically, two objectives of the SFI audit were to verify that the Program Participant’s SFI Program is in conformance with the SFI Objectives, Performance Measures and Indicators, and verify whether the Program Participant has effectively implemented its SFI Standard program requirements during it’s on the ground activities. Standard Bureau Veritas Certification protocols and forms were applied throughout the audit as provided by the most recent version of the Bureau Veritas Certification SFI Auditor Handbook available on the auditor access website.</p> <p align="center">Audit Plan</p> <p>The audit consisted of ½ day review of documented policies, GIS capabilities, research and training involvement at DPPL’s western regional office in Farmington, ME. Three and a half days were spent evaluating 10 field sites throughout DPPL’s western region FMU and additional recreational and stream crossing sights created and/or maintained by the DPPL. An additional day was spent summarizing audit results, completing final document review and holding a closing meeting to discuss audit results and “next steps” for continued certification. The audit was completed according to the following schedule:</p>

AUDIT SCHEDULE			
Person	Time	Place	Activity
Nov. 5, 2012			
Callaghan/ Tormohlen	7 :30 am	TBD	Preparation meeting of the audit team
Audit Team	8 :00 am	West Region HQ	Opening meeting of the audit; Audit Scope (State of Maine landholdings audited to above mentioned SFI Objectives and FSC Principles), audit approach, non-disclosure, appeals process. Safety.
Tom Charles	8:30 am		State of Maine to present; Land Management background, relevant resource management issues/activities from previous year's harvest activities and any complaints filed from interest groups.
Audit Team	10 :00 am		Document review, sustainable harvest level, BMP monitoring, GIS analysis & finalize site selection/travel efficiency.
Audit Team	12 :00 pm		Depart for 1 st day field visits.
Audit Team	5 :00 pm	Offices	Daily Debriefing
Nov 6, 2012			
Audit Team	7 :00 am	Offices	Gather for field visits
Callaghan/ Tormohlen	8 :00 am	Field Sites	Field visits in West Region
Audit Team	5 :00 pm	Offices	Daily debriefing
Nov 7, 2012			
Audit Team	7 :00 am	Offices	Gather for field visits
Tormohlen/ Callaghan	8 :00 am	Field Sites	Field visits in West Region
Audit Team	5 :00 pm	Offices	Daily debriefing
Nov 8, 2012			
Audit Team	7 :00 am	Offices	Gather for field visits
Callaghan/ Tormohlen	8 :00 am	Field Sites	Field visits
Audit Team	5 :00 pm	Offices	Daily debriefing
Nov 9, 2012			
Audit Team	7:30 am	Offices	Final Document Review and Interviews with relevant staff.
Audit Team	1:00pm	Offices	Finalize audit results
Audit Team	2:00 pm	Offices	Closing Meeting – audit findings, discussion of CARs (if applicable), confidentiality and appeals process.
Audit Team	4:30 pm	Offices	Depart site

Company Information

The DPPL is a public government organization, managing the state of Maine public land holdings. This certification is limited to its approximately 558,240 acres owned throughout Maine. The timberland discussed in this certification is composed of a variety of cover types, predominantly; 40% mixed hardwood/softwood, 31% softwoods and 29% hardwood. Mixed hardwood/softwood (northern hardwood species and balsam fir/red spruce) stands are managed according to the dominant species in the individual stands. Softwood stands (balsam fir/red spruce) are managed on an even aged basis, with emphasis towards old growth characteristics. Hardwood stands are managed using single tree selection to produce un-even aged stands of mature hardwoods. In addition, hardwood stands are also managed through creation of regeneration gaps of various sizes (1/10 – 1/3 acres) in an effort to reduce the beech component and encourage regeneration of other mid-tolerant species. Small areas of hardwood cover types are being managed to create a more suitable environment for Maple Sugar leases. This is accomplished through a modified thinning from below to create a more evenly spaced stand with a narrowed variance of stem diameters. Species composition of these cover types include sugar maple, red maple, beech, basswood, W. & Y. birch, ash and a component of red oak. The remaining cover types included in this ownership are aspen and non-productive cover.

Audit Results

This audit began with a general overview of the DPPL’s land holdings in Maine. System documentation, including documents example records illustrating conformance to all relevant performance measures and indicators was reviewed and found to be adequate. The organizations justification of its allowable cut was reviewed to ensure sustainable harvest levels. Evidence produced showed the five year average harvest volume to be approximately 75% of the five year average net growth, which equates to approximately 99% of the sustainable harvest level (five year average.) The sustainable harvest level was reached in part through over-harvesting in the over mature tolerant hardwood stand types in an attempt to liquidate diseased, unhealthy timber volume before it reached an un-merchantable condition. This harvesting schedule was in addition to normal harvesting trends in the remaining stand types (spruce-fir, pine, hemlock, cedar and intolerant hardwood.) Review of participation and funding with the SIC and other relevant local forest products associations were also reviewed and found adequate. Calculation of clear cut sizes was found to be a non-issue due to the small occurrence of clear cut harvests without established regeneration present. The following table illustrates the results of individual field site evaluations of the DPPLs forest management activities.

REGION	Location	Acres	Ha	Observations
West	Andover West Surplus	1,150		Uneven aged single tree selection; stand composition primarily HW with patches of red spruce. Excellent thinning regime including protection of residual stems. Two temporary haul bridges installed across Frye Brook (Class A trout stream), in conformance with Maine BMP requirements. Excellent incorporation of public “wild, un-managed” aesthetic concerns through buffering of portions of the Appalachian trail affected by the timber harvest. Erosion measures incorporated on steep slope haul road placement.
West	Riley	330		1,666acre total sale area with multiple 1 acre clear cuts totaling approximately 30% of the sale area. Management objective of prescription intended to reduce the component of beech regeneration. No clear criteria developed to judge success of the harvest. Adequate BMP implementation on bridge installation.

West	Rangley Plantation	300	Uneven aged single tree selection; stand composition primarily HW with patches of red spruce. Due to extreme weather events (unseasonably warm weather in March), approximately 25 loads (approx. 300 cords) of harvested hardwood pulp was stranded on the landing. In addition, several temporary stream crossing were not removed. It is the assessment of the lead auditor that the forester made the correct decision and that excessive rutting damage would have been caused attempting to retrieve all harvested wood and remove stream crossings. The organization has developed plans for completion of the sale and utilization of the harvested volume once the ground conditions are frozen (winter 2013.)
West	Richardson	80	White pine shelterwood harvest with residual stocking meeting shelterwood regeneration density guidelines. Excellent white pine regeneration noted during field visit. Moderate rutting found on site, which had been noted and remediated by district forester during active harvest. Control areas left un-harvested within the management unit to compare harvested/un-harvested regeneration conditions. Utilization of "Outcome Based Forestry" (OBF) during stand level prescription. OBF bases rotation timing off of current regeneration conditions throughout the stand instead of overall clear-cut size. The extent of the actual clear-cutting activity was very minimal and within the requirements of this standard. Several "open slat" bridges were crossed during evaluation of this unit. This is not the ideal crossing type as the open face of the bridge allows for sedimentation to enter the water body during vehicular traffic. Further investigation found that these bridges were in the process of being phased out throughout the ownership.
West	Holeb-Orien	5	7,000 acre total harvest area over the past seven years. This five acre sale included multiple 1/3 acre clear cut patches within predominantly sugar maple stand. Management objective of patch harvests was to increase component of yellow birch and sugar maple and decrease component of beech regeneration. No clear criteria developed to judge success of the harvest (ie seedling stocking/species composition, etc.) 1/10 acre patch clear cuts within red spruce stands exhibited excellent regeneration of red spruce seedlings. Excellent implementation of BMPs through use of settling ponds on steep slope road placement.
West	Holeb-Dirigo	925	Single tree selection harvest to manage selected stands for multi-storied, un-even aged structure. Harvest volume consisted of traditional un-even aged thinning techniques with the addition of multiple 1/3ac regeneration gaps to create suitable environment for acer spp., betula spp and fraxinus spp. Regeneration gap size and implementation also intended to reduce the overall component of beech (fagus spp.) within the stand.
West	Bigelow (W202)	700	Single tree selection harvest to manage selected stands for multi-storied, un-even aged structure. Selected stands consisted of sawlog size hardwood, termed "late-successional" by the organization. Post -harvest conditions conducive to productive stand conditions. Target residual stocking was 75ft ² /ac, however actual residual stocking was slightly higher (~85ft ² /ac.) Excellent single tree selection techniques removed adequate amount of risk, cull, form and quality, species and spacing candidates to improve stand productivity. A small (less than 1 acre) gravel pit had been developed for road maintenance and remediated prior to closing the timber sale. In addition, one "Exemplary Wetland" had

				been identified within the stand and had been identified on the harvest map and with a painted buffer line in the woods.
West	Bigelow (W210)	760		Active timber sale involving HW/SW mix stands. Harvesting crew given clear diameter, species and quality criteria for volume removal. Initial harvesting appeared to be in conformance with harvesting criteria provided by the forester. During this inspection, the harvesting crew was installing a temporary stream crossing of an intermittent waterbody. Proper implementation of BMPs utilized during crossing placement. Good utilization of harvested product.
WEST	Bigelow (W231)	135		Species discrimination harvest: removal of all populus spp., betula papyrifera, fagus spp. and picea glauca. Residual stand consisted of well-spaced northern hardwood species with stocking ranging from 60-90ft ² /ac. Excellent implementation of harvest criteria. Contractor completed rutting remediation along several skid trails. In addition, a portion of the main haul road was constructed along an excessively steep slope. The organization did an excellent job implementing BMPs to ensure adequate water drainage and erosion control. Incorporation of public visual concerns during harvesting planning with high visibility areas being identified on the harvest map.
WEST	Sandy Bay	235	53	Thinning from below to create ideal stocking and diameter distribution for sugar bush leases. Due to extreme weather events (unseasonably warm weather in March), approximately 20 loads (approx. 200 cords) of harvested hardwood pulp was stranded in the woods. It is the assessment of the lead auditor that the forester made the correct decision and that excessive rutting damage would have been caused attempting to retrieve all harvested wood and remove stream crossings. The organization has developed plans for completion of the sale and utilization of the harvested volume once the ground conditions are frozen (winter 2013.)

The field site visits consisted of an inspection of 10 harvest sites (full site descriptions listed above.) Harvest sites reviewed included marked and operator select single tree selection harvests, aspen CC harvests, mixed hardwood/softwood and softwood harvests. All field sites visited exhibited excellent implementation of sound forestry practices, BMPs and minimal impact to soil productivity.

The organization has not completed artificial regeneration activities on any parcels and relies on natural regeneration for all harvests, where stand regeneration is the planned objective. The organization has used 2.36 gallons of Garlan 4 Ultra in the past year for various management activities.

Wildlife habitat considerations were evident on most field sites, including expansion of SMZs when appropriate, maintenance of snag and mast trees in all harvest types and creation of irregular harvest boundaries during clear cut and release harvests.

Findings

Previous non-conformances: There were three minor non-conformances issued during the previous audit:

1. PM 2.1 Ind. 3: The organization has not developed criteria for adequate regeneration stocking levels/species composition and does not have a process in place to determine if those criteria have been met.

Follow up

The organization took no action in regard this minor CAR and it has been elevated to major CAR 01-2012 (attached.)

2. PM 3.1 Ind. 4 : The organization does not implement consistent harvest inspections reports of ALL management operations; some units are not completing any harvest inspection forms, some are completing only final contractor evaluation forms, some inspection forms contain different scoring techniques.

Follow up

The organization has reviewed harvest inspection completion and maintenance requirements with all regional foresters. In addition, a consistent rating system has been adopted. This minor CAR has been adequately addressed by the organization.

3. PM16.1 Ind.1: No evidence of a written statement of commitment to the SFI 2010 – 2014 Standard was observed during the audit.

Follow up

The organization has added a commitment statement to its policies and procedures manual.

Non-conformances: One minor CAR from last year was elevated to a major CAR and a new major CAR was also issued during this surveillance audit (see attached SF02s.)

Opportunities for Improvement:

N/A

Notable Practices:

N/A

Logo/label use:

The organization does not intend to use the certification body logo and has proper procedures in place to utilize the SFI logo. No inappropriate use in the past year.

SFI reporting:

The 2011 renewal audit report for the State of Maine ownership was listed on the SFI website.

Conclusions

DPPL, State of Maine continues to implement and manage an SFI program on their land holdings in Maine which meets the requirements of the SFI 2010-2014 standard for Land Management. A recommendation for immediate continuation of the organizations SFI certification was issued at the closing meeting, subject to the clearance of all issued major CAR within 90 days.

Surveillance Audit Schedule

The next audit will be a surveillance audit and should be scheduled during the November timeframe.

SEE SF61 FOR AUDIT NOTES

Summary of Audit Findings:						
Audit Date(s):	From: 11.5.2012			To: 11.9.2012		
Number of SF02's Raised:			Major:	2	Minor:	0
Is a follow up visit required:	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Date(s) of follow up visit:	
Follow-up visit remarks:						
Team Leader Recommendation:						
Corrective Action Plan (s) Accepted	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Date:	
Proceed to/Continue Certification	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	Date:	Subject to suspension of certificate if major CARs not addressed within 90 days.
All NCR's Cleared	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Date:	
Standard audit conducted against:						
1)	SFI 2010-2014	3)				
2)		4)				
Team Leader (1):	Team Members (2,3,4...)					
Matt Tormohlen	2) Brian Callaghan					
	3)					
	4)					
	5)					
Scope of Supply: (scope statement must be verified and appear in the space below)						
Management of Maine Public Lands						
Accreditation's	ANAB					
Number of Certificates	1					
Proposed Date for Next Audit Event						
Date	November, 2013					
Audit Report Distribution						
Client: Thomas Charles (Certification Representative) tom.t.charles@maine.gov						
BVC - Customer Service Representative – Melani Potts (melani.potts@us.bureauveritas.com)						

Clause	Audit Report
Opening Meeting	<p>Participants: Matt Tormohlen (Lead Auditor) Brian Callaghan (Audit team member) Tom Charles – Certification Representative Pete Smith – Western Region manager</p> <p>Discussions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Introductions ➤ Scope of the audit ➤ Audit schedule/plan ➤ Nonconformance types – Major / Minor ➤ Review of previous nonconformances – 3 ➤ Process approach to auditing and audit sampling ➤ Confidentiality agreement ➤ Termination of the audit ➤ Appeals process ➤ Closing meeting timing </p>
Closing Meeting	<p>Participants: Matt Tormohlen (Lead Auditor) Brian Callaghan (Audit team member) Tom Charles – Certification Representative Pete Smith – Western Region manager</p> <p>Discussions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Appreciation for selecting Bureau Veritas Certification. ➤ Review of audit process - process approach and sampling. ➤ Review of OFIs and System Strengths – 0 ➤ Nonconformances - 2 ➤ Date for next audit: November, 2013 ➤ Reporting protocol and timing ➤ Questions/Comments? </p>



SF02/NA NONCONFORMITY REPORT

Company Name and Site:		SF02#:	
Dept. of Agriculture Conservation and Forestry, Division of Parks and Public Lands		01	
Contract #:	Type of audit (e.g., initial,	Team Leader:	
US.1071418	SV#1 (SFI)	Matt Tormohlen	
Date:	Standard and Clause #:	Team Member:	
9 Nov., 2012	SFI 2010-2014; 2.1, Indicator 3	N/A	
Major	Minor	Other Documents (if applicable):	Company Representative:
X			Tom Charles
REQUIREMENT OF AUDITED STANDARD:			
Measure 2.1: Program Participants shall promptly reforest after final harvest.			
Indicator 3: Clear criteria to judge adequate regeneration and appropriate actions to correct under-stocked areas and achieve acceptable species composition and stocking rates for both planting and natural regeneration.			
OBSERVED NONCONFORMITY AND, for FSC only, CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST:			
Observed N/C: The organization has not developed criteria for adequate regeneration stocking levels/species composition and does not have a process in place to determine if those criteria have been met. This issue was addressed as a minor CAR during last year renewal audit and no corrective action implementation has occurred. This minor CAR has been re-issued as a major CAR.			
ROOT CAUSE ANALYSIS AND CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN (To be completed by the Company. Plan to be submitted in 30 days)			
Corrective Action Plan Date:		Company Representative:	
Root Cause Analysis and Corrective Action			
Root Cause:			
Corrective Action Plan:			
ROOT CAUSE AND CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN ACCEPTANCE REPORT (To be completed by Bureau Veritas Certification – Verify effective identification of Root Cause and acceptance of Corrective Action Plan)			
Root Cause:			
Corrective Action Plan:			
Plan Accepted:	Ye	No	Comments
	s		:
Auditor:			Date:
CORRECTIVE ACTION IMPLEMENTATION			
To be completed by Company – Provide objective evidence. Not to exceed: 90 Days SFI, PEFC <input type="checkbox"/> ; 1 year FSC <input type="checkbox"/> ; other <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Days			
Corrective Action Completion Date:		Company Representative:	

Corrective Action Implementation:							
Method used to verify effectiveness of action taken:							
CORRECTIVE ACTION IMPLEMENTATION ACCEPTANCE REPORT (To be completed by Bureau Veritas Certification – Acceptance of Corrective Action taken)							
Accepted:	Yes		No		Nonconformance Closed:	Yes	No
Follow Up Comments:							
Auditor:					Date:		

		SF02/NA NONCONFORMITY REPORT			
Company Name and Site:					<u>SF02#:</u>
Dept. of Agriculture Conservation and Forestry, Division of Parks and Public Lands					02
Contract #:		Type of audit (e.g., initial,		Team Leader:	
US.1071418		SV#1 (SFI)		Matt Tormohlen	
Date:		Standard and Clause #:		Team Member:	
9 Nov., 2012		SFI 2010-2014; 16.2, Indicator 2		N/A	
Major	Minor	Other Documents (if applicable):		Company Representative:	
X				Tom Charles	
REQUIREMENT OF AUDITED STANDARD:					
<p>Measure 16.2: Program Participants shall work individually and/or with SFI implementation committees, logging or forestry associations, or appropriate agencies or others in the forestry community, to foster improvement in the professionalism of wood producers.</p> <p>Indicator 2: Participation in or support of SFI Implementation Committees to establish criteria for recognition of logger certification programs, where they exist, that include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Completion of SFI implementation committee recognized logger training programs and meeting continuing education requirements of the training program; Independent in-the-forest verification of conformance with the logger certification program standards; Compliance with all applicable laws and regulations including responsibilities under the U.S. Endangered Species Act, the Canadian Species at Risk Act and other measures to protect wildlife habitat; Use of best management practices to protect water quality; Logging safety; Compliance with acceptable silviculture and utilization standards; Aesthetic management techniques employed where applicable; and <p>Adherence to a management or harvest plan that is site specific and agreed to by the forest landowner.</p>					
OBSERVED NONCONFORMITY AND, for FSC only, CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST:					
Observed N/C: The organization did not have specific requirements for contractor safety and professional qualifications included in harvesting contracts. This issue was addressed as a minor CAR during last year renewal audit in the FSC standard and no corrective action implementation has occurred. This Minor CAR has been issued as a major CAR in both FSC and SFI standards.					
ROOT CAUSE ANALYSIS AND CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN (To be completed by the Company. Plan to be submitted in 30 days)					

Corrective Action Plan Date:				Company Representative:			
Root Cause Analysis and Corrective Action							
Root Cause:							
Corrective Action Plan:							
ROOT CAUSE AND CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN ACCEPTANCE REPORT (To be completed by Bureau Veritas Certification – Verify effective identification of Root Cause and acceptance of Corrective Action Plan)							
Root Cause:							
Corrective Action Plan:							
Plan Accepted:	Ye s		No		Comments		
Auditor:						Date:	
CORRECTIVE ACTION IMPLEMENTATION To be completed by Company – Provide objective evidence. Not to exceed: 90 Days SFI, PEFC <input type="checkbox"/> ; 1 year FSC <input type="checkbox"/> ; other <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Days							
Corrective Action Completion Date:				Company Representative:			
Corrective Action Implementation:							
Method used to verify effectiveness of action taken:							
CORRECTIVE ACTION IMPLEMENTATION ACCEPTANCE REPORT (To be completed by Bureau Veritas Certification – Acceptance of Corrective Action taken)							
Accepted:	Yes		No		Nonconformance Closed:	Yes	No
Follow Up Comments:							
Auditor:						Date:	