



**Rainforest
Alliance**

Rainforest Alliance Headquarters
65 Millet St. Suite 201
Richmond, VT 05477 USA
Tel: 802-434-5491
Fax: 802-434-3116
www.RainforestAlliance.org
Contact person: Jon Jickling
jjickling@RainforestAlliance.org

Certification Assessment
Performed by:
Rainforest Alliance Regional Office
19 Bridge Square
Northfield, MN 55057
Tel: 507-663-1115
Fax: 507-663-7771
Contact person: Kara Wires
Email: kwires@ra.org

**SmartLogging
Certification
Reassessment**

Report for:

**The Trust to Conserve Northeast
Forestlands
in
Augusta, Maine, USA**

Certificate code:	RA-SL-000001
Auditors:	Robert R. Bryan, M.S.
Audit Dates:	28 Feb-2 March 2017
Report Finalized:	March 27, 2017
Operation Contact:	Ted Wright
Address:	110 Sewall Street Augusta, Maine 04332

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS.....	3
INTRODUCTION	4
1. SCOPE OF THE CERTIFICATE	5
1.1. SCOPE OF THE CERTIFICATE	5
2. ASSESSMENT PROCESS	6
2.1. CERTIFICATION STANDARD USED.....	6
2.2. AUDITOR(S) AND QUALIFICATIONS	6
2.3. ASSESSMENT AUDIT SCHEDULE	6
2.4. EVALUATION STRATEGY	6
2.5. STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION PROCESS.....	7
3. ASSESSMENT FINDINGS AND OBSERVATIONS.....	8
3.1. MAIN STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES	8
3.2. IDENTIFIED NON-COMPLIANCES AND CORRECTIVE ACTIONS	9
3.3. FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS BY THE CERTIFICATION CANDIDATE TO MEET CERTIFICATION	9
3.4. OBSERVATIONS	9
3.5. CERTIFICATION RECOMMENDATION.....	11
4. CLIENT SPECIFIC BACKGROUND INFORMATION.....	12
4.1. DESCRIPTION OF HARVESTING COMPANIES AND GROUP MANAGER	12
4.2. LEGISLATIVE AND GOVERNMENT REGULATORY CONTEXT.....	12
4.3. ENVIRONMENTAL CONTEXT	13
4.4. SOCIOECONOMIC CONTEXT.....	13
APPENDIX I: Public summary of the harvesting practices	14
APPENDIX II: Certification standard conformance checklist (confidential)	15
APPENDIX III: Chain of Custody Conformance (confidential).....	35
APPENDIX IV: Group Certification Conformance (confidential).....	36
APPENDIX V: Detailed list of stakeholders consulted (confidential)	43

ACRONYMS

AAC	Annual Allowable Cut
ALC	American Logging Council
BMP	Best Management Practice
CBM	Cubic Meter
CITES	Convention on Trade in Endangered Species
CW	Controlled Wood
FMP	Forest Management Plan
FMU	Forest Management Unit
FPR	Forest Practices Regulations
GM	Group Manager
HP	Harvest Plan
H&S	Health and Safety
ILO	International Labour Organization
MBF	One thousand board feet
ML	Master Logger
NIPF	Non-Industrial Private Forest
RA	Rainforest Alliance
RT&E	Rare, Threatened and Endangered Species
SFI	Sustainable Forestry Initiative
SL	SmartLogging
SW	Rainforest Alliance
US	United States of America

INTRODUCTION

This report presents the findings of an independent SmartLogging certification assessment conducted by specialists representing the Rainforest Alliance. The purpose of the assessment was to evaluate the quality of The Trust to Conserve Northeast Forestlands, hereafter referred to as the SmartLogging Operation (SLO), or TCNEF, according to SmartLogging standards.

This report contains four main sections of information and findings and several appendixes. The main report, without confidential appendixes or annexes, will become public information about the operation that may be distributed by Rainforest Alliance to interested parties. The remainder of the appendixes are confidential, to be reviewed only by authorized Rainforest Alliance staff and reviewers bound by confidentiality agreements. Confidential appendixes may be distributed by the SLO, or Rainforest Alliance, but only upon mutual agreement.

The purpose of the SmartLogging Program is to recognize good harvesting practices through independent evaluation and certification. Logging operations that attain SmartLogging certification may use the SmartLogging name for public claims off-product (i.e. not on actual wood products), but such claims must be reviewed for accuracy and approved in writing by Rainforest Alliance prior to publication or public dissemination. A SmartLogging certification code number (e.g. RA-SL-####) can be used on product according to defined Rainforest Alliance procedures.

1. SCOPE OF THE CERTIFICATE

1.1. Scope of the certificate

The Trust to Conserve Northeast Forestlands (TCNEF) is a 501(c) 3 non-profit organization based in New Gloucester, Maine (USA). TCNEF was formed initially to administer the Maine Master Logger Certification (MLC) Program, and currently holds the Rainforest Alliance SmartLogging certificate for the MLC logging operations. TCNEF has been established with the broader goal of “Enhancing the Health of New England’s Working Forests”, with a working model of deliberate and structured collaboration among landowners, loggers and resource management professionals.

TCNEF currently holds a SmartLogging certificate and has overall responsibility for ensuring conformance with the SmartLogging certification requirements. TCNEF currently has 101 group members under this certificate. The membership of this certificate encompasses all of the New England States (ME, NH, VT, MA, CT, RI), including northern New York

See more detailed information about TCNEF and areas covered by the certificate in Appendix II and III.

2. ASSESSMENT PROCESS

2.1. Certification Standard Used

SmartLogging Generic Certification Standard, Version 6. RA Document Code SL-02

2.2. Auditor(s) and qualifications

Robert Bryan, M.S., Lead Auditor:

Mr. Bryan is a Maine forester and ecologist specializing in the integration of timber management and biodiversity. His education includes an M.S. in Forestry (University of Vermont 1984) and B.S. Botany and Environmental Studies (University of Vermont 1976). Since 2008 he has been president of Forest Synthesis LLC., which specializes in ecologically based forest management. Previously he was employed as Forest and Wetlands Habitat Ecologist/Forester at Maine Audubon (1995 – 2008) and before that worked as an ecological consultant and consulting forester. He is a licensed Maine Forester (#907) and professional member of the SAF and Forest Stewards Guild. He is an FSC Lead Auditor and has participated in over 100 FSC Forest Management certification audits and assessments throughout the US, including family forests, investment and industrial forests, managed conservation forests, and public lands. In addition, he was a member of FSC National Standards Committee 1997-2003, FSC-US national standards advisory committee (2007-2008), has been a peer reviewer of SFI industrial forest certification in Northern Maine, and served on a Maine forest certification policy committee that reported to the Maine Legislature.

2.3. Assessment audit schedule

Date	General Location* (main sites)	Main activities
Feb 15-27, 2017	Off site	Audit planning, stakeholder contacts, and document review
Feb 28, 2017	TCNEF Office, Augusta, ME	Opening meeting
Feb 28, 2017	Central ME	Field audit
March 1, 2017	Central/Western ME	Field audit
March 2, 2017	Southern ME	Field audit
March 2, 2017	TCNEF Office, Augusta, ME	Closing meeting
March 3-15, 2017	Off site	Stakeholder contacts, data review, report writing.

2.4. Evaluation strategy

There are currently 101 logging contractors in the TCNEF group. The auditor team visited eight contractors over the 2 ½ day field audit.

List of harvest practice aspects reviewed by assessment team:

Type of site	Sites visited	Type of site	Sites visited
--------------	---------------	--------------	---------------

Road construction		Commercial thinning	8
Erosion control	5	Logging camp	
Planned Harvest site		Bridges/stream crossing	4
Ongoing Harvest site	7	Chemical/Fuel storage	7
Completed logging	1	Wetland	3
Site Preparation		Stream management zones	5
Machine felling	6	Riparian zone	5
Worker felling	2	Steep slopes	1
Skidding/Forwarding	7	Endangered species	
Skid trails	8	Wildlife habitat	8
Worker safety	8	Historical sites	2
Clearfelling		Cultural or archeological sites	
Shelterwood	2	Unique environments	
Selective felling	7	Special management area	
Sanitary cutting	1	Recreational site	
Pre-commercial thinning		Local community	
Log concentration yard		Processing facility	

2.5. Stakeholder consultation process

Stakeholder consultation is carried out during a SmartLogging assessment in order to gather evidence from different parties on the harvester's conformance with the SL standard. During the certification process stakeholders consulted may include, landowners, government agencies and regulatory personnel, log purchasers, workers, mills neighbors, community members, local businesses, and logger associations.

Stakeholder Type Interviewed (Government, Landowner, worker, etc.)	Number Notified	Number Interviewed
Contractors	8	8
Contractor employees	5	5
Landowner	3	3
Environmental NGO		
Forest Industry		
Forestry & Forest Products NGOs		
Government	6	3
Other		

3. ASSESSMENT FINDINGS AND OBSERVATIONS

3.1. Main strengths and weaknesses

Subject Area	Strengths	Weaknesses
1. Legal Requirements	Group members were generally aware of and followed state and local regulations.	State regulators indicated one of the group members audited had received a written warning for stream crossing compliance. See Observation (OBS) 01/17. Cleanup materials are taken to municipal transfer stations, and while the intent of the law appears to be met the legal requirements for final disposal in Maine was not clear in all cases. See OBS 02/17.
2. Harvest Planning and Monitoring	All operations had harvest plans that addressed the financial, environmental, liability and legal aspects of operations.	Not all readily available sources of information on important plant and wildlife habitat are being used. See OBS 03/17.
3. Harvest Practices	All harvest operations were well planned and conducted to minimize environmental impacts. Best Management Practices (BMPs) to protect soils and water quality are being used. Minimal impact strategies such as portable skidder bridge panels rather than temporary culverts are being routinely implemented by most group members. Landowners interviewed were very satisfied with group member performance.	The use of temporary culverts, pole fords, and/or brush for stream crossings could damage stream banks and channels. See OBS 04/17.
4. Community Values	Group members are aware of historic cultural features such as stone walls and take steps to avoid damage. Loggers and foresters modify operations to address visual impacts.	None noted
5. Occupational Health and Safety	All group members had health and safety plans, trained workers, and required health and safety equipment.	None noted
6. Business Viability	All group members sampled have been in business since before 2003 and demonstrated a long-term, viable approach to business.	None noted

7. Continuous Improvement and Innovation	Ongoing training is part of all operations audited. Group members had a variety of equipment to address different situations and developed creative ways to solve problems, such as the previously mentioned portable tree protectors for skidding and custom sideboards for a forwarder to protect trail-side trees from damage when hauling tops to a chipper.	None noted
Group Certification Requirements	TCNEF's group member system meets the SmartLogging requirements for membership commitments and monitoring of member activities.	None noted

3.2. Identified non-compliances and corrective actions

A non-compliance is a discrepancy or gap identified during the assessment audit between some aspect of the SLO operation and one or more of the requirements of the SmartLogging standard. Depending on the severity of the non-compliance the audit team differentiates between major and minor non compliances.

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

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

Each non-compliance is addressed by the audit team by issuing a corrective action request (CAR) NCRs are requirements that candidate operations must agree to, and which must be addressed, within the given timeframe of a maximum of one year period.

There were no open NCRs to evaluate as part of this reassessment. No new NCRs issued.

3.3. Follow-up actions by the certification candidate to meet certification

Not applicable; TCNEF is currently certified.

3.4. Observations

Observations are voluntary actions suggested by the audit team, but are not mandated or required.

OBS 01/17	Reference Standard & Requirement: Rainforest Alliance SmartLogging Generic Certification Standard, Version 6 (SL-02), Indicator 1.2.1
<p>Indicator 1.2.1. <i>Legal requirements are met, including, but not limited to those related to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Environmental quality (BMP manual, harvesting regulations);</i> • <i>Water or water quality (BMP manual, Water Quality Regulations);</i> • <i>Rare, threatened or endangered species (Endangered Species Act, CITES); and,</i> • <i>Non-timber forest products: hunting, fishing and other NTFPs meet applicable regulations.</i> <p>Finding. In Maine’s organized townships, the stream crossing regulations in towns that have adopted the “Statewide Standards” statewide must meet the standard of “no substantial disturbance to the bank or stream channel” (among other requirements). The Maine Forest Service enforcement coordinator reported there have been no recent findings of regulatory violations for the 8 group members audited, but one of the auditees received a warning letter in 2015 for a poor water crossing and that two district foresters reported that in general the company’s water crossings appeared to be “heavy handed.” During the current audit, one site harvested by this company with three closed stream crossings was visited. Temporary bridge panels had been utilized and it appeared that the crossings met the intent of the MFS and SmartLogging requirements. However, this was a limited sample from one winter harvest, and other sites visited had deep snow cover so that steam crossings could not be fully evaluated for this criterion. Some group members use culverts for stream crossings and closeout procedures, which can result in stream bank or channel damage with any crossing type.</p>	
<p>Observation: TCNEF should take the necessary steps to ensure that all stream crossings and other activities meet regulatory requirements.</p>	
OBS 02/17	Reference Standard & Requirement: Rainforest Alliance SmartLogging Generic Certification Standard, Version 6 (SL-02), Indicator 1.2.7
<p>Indicator 1.2.7. <i>Containment and disposal of hazardous materials (e.g., pesticides, petroleum, lubricants and chemicals) is in accordance with jurisdiction laws and regulations.</i></p> <p>Finding. All group members have spill cleanup pads on all equipment and full cleanup kits at the landing and cleanup procedures and follow the intent of the law and Best Management Practices. Cleanup materials are taken to municipal transfer stations, and while the intent of the law appears to be met, the legal requirements for final disposal in Maine was not clear in all cases.</p>	
<p>Observation: TCNEF should take the necessary steps to ensure that containment and disposal of hazardous materials (e.g., pesticides, petroleum, lubricants and chemicals) is in accordance with applicable state laws and regulations.</p>	
OBS 03/17	Reference Standard & Requirement: Rainforest Alliance SmartLogging Generic Certification Standard, Version 6 (SL-02), Indicator 2.2.1
<p>Indicator 2.2.1: <i>Harvest plan or service/logging contract includes: Protection of wildlife habitat, rare plant communities, stream zones, ... and other critical environmental or cultural features....</i></p>	

Findings. While harvest plans include protection of wildlife habitat and rare plant communities if known or identified in a forester’s management plan, group members in Maine who are developing harvest plans without forest management plan input do not consult with the applicable state agencies (i.e., Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife (MDIFW) and the Maine Natural Areas Program (MNAP). However, Maine loggers must send Forest Operations Notification (FON) form to the Maine Forest Service (MFS). MFS sends information to the logger if the site is located in a township with federal-listed Atlantic salmon or Canada lynx. MFS also forwards the FON form to the Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife, which could follow up if there were issues of concern. In the past MFS also sent the FON forms to the Maine Natural Areas program, but this practice was discontinued due to budget constraints. Thus, not all available information on RTE species and communities is in harvest plans. Group members are not using a relatively new on-line mapping program with “Beginning With Habitat” maps of important plant and wildlife habitat. See <https://webapps2.cgis-solutions.com/beginningwithhabitat/map2/>. This data source has not been widely publicized. Procedures in other states were not audited during the reassessment.

Observation: TCNEF should ensure that group members have information on important plant and wildlife habitats as required by this indicator.

OBS 04/17	Reference Standard & Requirement: Rainforest Alliance SmartLogging Generic Certification Standard, Version 6 (SL-02), Indicator 3.7.6
------------------	--

Indicator 3.7.6. *Integrity of stream channel and stream banks is maintained during installation and removal of stream crossing devices.*

Findings. Most group members use temporary bridge panels to cross streams and protect stream banks and channels, but some group members may use culverts or pole fords on small (primarily intermittent) streams. Temporary culverts and pole fords are consistent with Maine BMPs for temporary crossings, but damage to stream channels and banks is more likely with culverts and pole fords than with temporary bridge panels.

Observation: TCNEF should ensure that the Integrity of stream channel and stream banks is maintained during installation and removal of stream crossing devices.

3.5. Certification Recommendation

Based on a thorough field review, analysis and compilation of findings by this Rainforest Alliance auditor TCNEF has demonstrated that their described system of management is being implemented consistently over the whole forest areas covered by the scope of the evaluation. Rainforest Alliance concludes that TCNEF’s harvesting practices, if implemented as described, is capable of ensuring that all the requirements of the certification standards are met across the scope of the certificate. A Rainforest Alliance SmartLogging Certificate will be issued based upon agreement to the stipulated corrective action requests.

In order to maintain certification, TCNEF will be audited annually on-site and required to remain in compliance with the SmartLogging Standard as further defined by regional guidelines developed by Rainforest Alliance. TCNEF will also be required to fulfil the corrective actions as described below. Experts from Rainforest Alliance will review continued harvest practice performance and compliance with the corrective action requests described in this report, annually during scheduled and random audits.

4. CLIENT SPECIFIC BACKGROUND INFORMATION

4.1. Description of Harvesting Companies and Group Manager

The group manager, Trust to Conserve Northeast Forestlands (TCNEF), is a 501.c.3 non-profit organization that oversees all Master Logger certifications for New England. A subset of Master Loggers volunteered to enter into the SmartLogging Program. Currently there are 101 members. In addition to a SL Certificate, TCNEF also holds the following certificates through the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC):

FSC Forest Management: RA-FM/CoC-001881

FSC Chain of Custody: RA-CoC-001677

The group manager is well acquainted with SmartWood procedures and well equipped to manage a SmartLogging Group.

The group members range from small hand-felling operations to large cut to length (CTL) operations with multiple crews from Maine to New York, which encompasses a variety of ecosystems and wood products companies, which purchase roundwood, chips and biomass. Each group member has adapted to their individual set of circumstances, markets and legislative requirements.

4.2. Legislative and government regulatory context

There are logging companies from seven states included under the certificate; Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and New York. Each state has some degree of forest management regulation pertaining to harvesting as summarized below.

- The Connecticut Forest Practices Act requires that those who advertise solicit, contract, or engage in commercial forest practices within Connecticut at any time must be certified by the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) prior to doing so. Forest practitioners may be certified at one of three levels: Forester, Supervising Forest Products Harvester, and Forest Products Harvester. Each level has a specific description of what activities they are permitted to conduct under the law. Harvesting near wetlands and waterbodies is regulated by the local Inland Wetlands Agency, which must be contacted for a ruling on jurisdiction for each harvest operation.
- Maine has clearcut laws, regulations that affect harvesting near wetland and water bodies, near some important wildlife habitats, and at elevations over 2,700 feet. Harvest notifications must be posted and the Maine Forest Service inspects harvested areas.
- Massachusetts requires licensing for logging companies a state-approved cutting plan in most cases. Regulations apply to harvesting near streams, wetlands, and important wildlife habitats.
- New Hampshire has regulations that restrict cutting near water bodies and roads and requires notification of harvesting activities near streams and wetlands.
- New York regulates stream crossings and has rules related to lopping of softwood slash for fire control. There are additional regulations within the Adirondack Park related to clearcutting, wetland crossings, and harvesting near rivers and lakes.
- Rhode Island requires that woods operators be licensed and that an Intent to Cut form be filed with the Department of Environmental Management.

- Vermont regulates harvesting near water bodies and wetlands and also regulates cutting over 2,500 ft. in elevation and “heavy harvests” over 40 acres in size.

Throughout the region, the group members have adapted well to their state forest management laws and conscientiously adhere to all requirements, although in some states this is becoming increasingly onerous.

4.3. Environmental Context

The region covered by the SL Certificate contains a variety of ecosystems and forest types. These include Spruce-Fir and Beech-Birch Maple forests in the north to Oak-Pine and mixed hardwoods in central and southern New England/New York. The broad physiographic regions included are Hudson Valley, Appalachian Plateau, New England Province and Adirondack Province. There are regional harvesting considerations. The northern most areas are harvested most efficiently when the ground is frozen, further south, the periodic freezes are not as critical to environmentally sound harvesting practices. Most areas within the scope of the certificate will have a significant mud season each spring which, for all intents and purposes, halts harvesting operations for 4 to 8 weeks.

Exotic Insects of note include Emerald Ash Borer, Hemlock Woolly Adelgid, Gypsy Moth, and Winter Moth. Periodic outbreaks of Spruce Budworm and other native insects also impact forests. Exotic and native insects may result in more sanitation or salvage cuts, regardless of market conditions. Some invasive plant species are noted in the southern and central areas, especially on former agricultural lands.

4.4. Socioeconomic Context

Logging in New England has proven economically viable for many generations. Recently, however, the economic conditions in the US have altered the markets available to the group members. Papermaking has taken serious hits in the last 5 years leading to loss of mill capacity, and overall wood products markets are declining. Fewer markets translate to longer haul distances and less price negotiation which does have negative effects on individual businesses. The dynamic nature of wood markets is nothing new, and with projects on the horizon for biomass and biofuels, small increases in some markets could be realized.

APPENDIX I: Public summary of the harvesting practices

Harvesting Technique	% using this harvesting technique
Mechanical harvest (machine)	52 %
Conventional (skidder/chainsaw)	18 %
Both Mechanical and Conventional	30 %
Silvicultural System	% of forests harvested under this management
Even aged management	10 %
Clearcutting	5 %
Shelterwood/Seed tree	5 %
Uneven aged management	90 %
Individual tree selection	70 %
Group selection (group harvested of less than 1 ha in size)	20 %

Species and Log Production		
*(TCNEF maintains records of total annual production by group member, but does not maintain total annual production by species)		
Botanical name	Common trade name	Actual harvest in last year MB
N/A	Eastern white pine, red spruce, balsam fir, eastern hemlock, sugar maple, red maple, white birch, yellow birch, aspen (popple), American beech, red oak, white oak, black cherry, and others.	4,489,771 tons**

FOREST AREA CLASSIFICATION	
Total area	141,120 acres
Forest area that is:	
Privately managed	126,875 acres
State managed	13,395 acres
Community managed	250 acres
Area classified as natural or mixed forest	141,120 acres
Area classified as plantations	0 acres

APPENDIX II: Certification standard conformance checklist (confidential)

The following checklist must be completed separately for each contractor evaluated. For group certification assessments, checklists completed for each group member sampled shall demonstrate full compliance with all the requirements of the SmartLogging Standard, except those already complied with at the group level. Based on the evaluation of compliance with each indicator, a conformance determination has been assigned. Conformance with indicators is determined by the entire assessment team through a consensus process. Where noncompliance with the standard is documented by the team, corrective action requests (NCRs) are outlined. The following definitions apply, and are the basis for all certification assessments:

Precondition	Requirements that harvester must meet <u>before</u> certification by Rainforest Alliance can take place.
Minor CAR	Requirements that harvester must meet, within a defined time period (usually within one year), during the period of the certification,
Observation	Non mandatory actions or recommendations suggested by the audit team to address harvester performance.

For each indicator presented below, the audit team’s determination of conformance and relevant findings are presented. Where applicable, NCRs or observations are referenced and detailed in the note section of the applicable criterion.

Subject Area 1: Legal Requirements <i>Harvesters shall respect all applicable laws.</i>	
Criteria and Indicators	Findings
1.1: Harvester has a legal right to harvest the forest areas under consideration.	
Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance	
1.1.1: Harvester has documents that demonstrate that legal permits from the applicable government agency, where needed, are in place to harvest. These may be obtained by a dealer, landowner, and landowner’s agent, whichever is appropriate.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Required Forest Operations Notice (FON) was posted at all audit sites. One operation obtained a required town permit and posted bond to harvest in an approved subdivision. No other state or local permits were required.
1.1.2: A timber sale contract is signed by the landowner, or the landowner’s agent (e.g., forester, land manager, etc.) and wood purchaser. Timber sale boundaries and landowner’s commitment/permission are defined in the timber sale contract.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> All operations audited provided copies of signed timber sale contracts with timber sale boundaries either describe in the text or shown on a map.
NOTES: (NCRs/Observations) None	
1.2: Harvester obeys legal/regulatory requirements, and obtains necessary permits in accordance with laws.	

Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance

1.2.1: Legal requirements are met, including, but not limited to those related to:

- Environmental quality (BMP manual, harvesting regulations);
- Water or water quality (BMP manual, Water Quality Regulations);
- Rare, threatened or endangered species (Endangered Species Act, CITES); and,
- Non-timber forest products: hunting, fishing and other NTFPs meet applicable regulations.

Conformance with Indicator: Yes No N/A

The field audit was limited to Maine sites and observations and interviews indicated that that all legal requirements were met. Specific legal requirement applicable at the sites visited included local shoreland zoning harvest regulations, Maine Statewide Standards for Harvesting in Shoreland areas, and FON posting. Interviews with loggers indicated knowledge of other legal requirements (e.g. clearcutting rules, RTE species limits) and that regulations would be followed should as needed.

The Maine Statewide Standards for Harvesting in Shoreland areas (applicable to a majority of organized towns) include the requirement of “no substantial disturbance to the bank or stream channel.” The auditor consulted with Maine Forest Service regarding how the use of temporary culverts, and pole fords interpreted under this part of the regulations. MFS responded that these crossings are allowed if stream flow and fish passage are maintained, but bank damage is not allowed. Thus, in the case of temporary culverts, poles must be placed around the culvert, not gravel or soil so that there is minimal bank damage when the culvert and poles are removed. MFS looks at efforts made during closeout to determine if a reasonable effort was made to comply with the regulations. Based on this interpretation the audit found that the group members audited are meeting the Smartlogging standard requirements, but most stream crossings were covered with deep snow and ice to a full evaluation was not feasible.

The Maine Forest Service enforcement coordinator reported there have been no recent findings of regulatory violations for the 8 group members audited, one of the auditees xxxxx received a warning letter in 2015 for a poor water crossing and that two district foresters reported that in general the company’s water crossings appeared to be “heavy handed.” During the current audit one xxx site with three closed stream crossings was visited. Temporary bridge panels had been utilized and it appeared that the crossings met the intent of the MFS and SmartLogging requirements. However, this was a limited sample from one winter harvest, and other sites visited had deep snow cover so that steam

	crossings could not be fully evaluated for this criterion. Because some group members use culverts for stream crossings and closeout procedures can result in stream bank or channel damage with any crossing type. See OBS 01/17.
1.2.2 Worker and harvester occupational health and safety and labor laws are met. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Including government and ILO labor laws, and workers compensation laws. 	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> All loggers interviewed demonstrated knowledge of health and safety and labor laws and carried workman's compensation insurance. Auditor observations of equipment and documentation supported these statements.
1.2.3 Where applicable, harvester is a legally licensed professional, with required permits and license kept current.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Harvesters are not required to be licensed in Maine. Recent SmartLogging audits have confirmed that loggers are licensed where required (Connecticut, Massachusetts).
1.2.4 Logging equipment used by the harvester meets government safety requirements.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Examination of logging equipment indicated that the principle safety requirements appear to be met. The auditor specifically checked for fire extinguishers, doors where there were part of original equipment, and general condition of the equipment (e.g. cracked windows, frayed cable, loose metal, etc.).
1.2.5 Trucks meet government regulations.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Logging contractor interviews confirmed that trucks are inspected regularly by the logging company and repaired as needed. In addition, trucks are subject to random highway checks and annual state inspections.
1.2.6 Harvester has insurance in accordance with local legal requirements, which may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> General liability; Worker's comp; and Automotive liability. 	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> All loggers audited carry general liability (\$1 million minimum, generally \$2 million aggregate), workman's compensation, and vehicle insurance.
1.2.7 Containment and disposal of hazardous materials (e.g., pesticides, petroleum, lubricants and chemicals) is in accordance with jurisdiction laws and regulations.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> All loggers had spill containment, cleanup procedures, and disposal procedures in place.

	<p>Under Maine regulations, all spills of hazardous materials (e.g. diesel fuel, hydraulic fluid) must be reported to DEP, regardless of the amount spilled. If reported within two hours and cleaned up per guidelines a DEP emergency responder will not need to visit the site. This was confirmed by a the DEP web page "How do I report an oil spill?" In addition, a DEP employee stated that these materials are considered to be "special waste" and by law are required to be disposed of at a special waste landfill. Loggers interviewed were implementing best management practices for cleanup. When asked generally about waste cleanup and disposal none stated they reported spills to the DEP. Five loggers were interviewed specifically on waste disposal practices. One reported taking oil-soaked pads to the special waste area at his local transfer station, two reported that oil-soaked cleanup materials were put in a garbage bag and placed in their shop dumpster. Two reported that pads are hung on racks to allow the fluids to drip out, after which the fluids are burned in a waste oil furnace and the pads are then put in the regular trash.</p> <p>In sum, reporting to DEP is not specifically addressed by the indicator. All group members have spill cleanup pads on all equipment and full cleanup kits at the landing and cleanup procedures follow the intent of the law and Best Management Practices. Cleanup materials are taken to municipal transfer stations, and while the intent of the law appears to be met, the legal requirement for final disposal in Maine was not clear in all cases. See OBS 02/17.</p>
--	--

NOTES: (NCRs/Observations) See OBS 01/17, OBS 02/17
1.3 Any legal outcomes from dispute resolution processes are respected.
Criterion Level Remarks: No disputes were reported by loggers or landowners interviewed.

Subject Area 2: Harvest Planning and Monitoring	
<i>Harvester completes adequate planning prior to harvest to assure an understanding of landowner harvest objectives and site-specific environmental concerns. Harvester monitors progress of harvest to see that environmental and landowner harvest objectives are met, and does a post-harvest assessment to determine if follow-up actions are necessary.</i>	
<u>Criteria and Indicators</u>	<u>Findings</u>
2.1: A written harvest plan or service/logging contract (see 1.1.3) is in place prior to harvest, based on site-specific conditions, and in agreement with the landowner's land use and harvest objectives.	
Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance	

<p>2.1.1: If the landowner has a forest management plan and/or management and harvesting objectives, as described in or related to the written harvest plan, they are discussed with the landowner prior to harvest.</p>	<p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Three of the eight operations audited had forest management plans. Operations plans were found to be consistent with the forest management plans. Where there were no forest management plans landowner objectives were clearly stated in the harvest plans, and interviews with landowners confirmed that harvests were consistent with their objectives. Interviews confirmed that harvests plans and objectives were discussed on site with landowners prior to harvest.</p>
<p>2.1.2: Any major changes to the harvest plan or service/logging contract are approved prior to implementation by the landowner or the landowner's agent.</p>	<p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No major changes were noted, but in all case loggers maintain close communication with landowners throughout the harvesting process so any needed changes would be readily communicated.</p>
<p>NOTES: (NCRs/Observations) None</p>	
<p>2.2: Harvest plan and/or logging contract has been approved by landowner, landowner's agent or authorized state or other jurisdictional institution where applicable. (Note: Harvest plan/service/logging contract can be prepared by landowner, purchaser or harvester who buys timber, and then signed by landowner).</p>	
<p>Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance</p>	
<p>2.2.1: Harvest plan or service/logging contract includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landowner's harvest prescriptions; • Silviculture; • Harvesting restrictions; • Protection of wildlife habitat, rare plant communities, stream zones, historical or personal sites and other critical environmental or cultural features; • Penalty clauses for unauthorized cutting, excessive damage to residual stand, roads, bridges or other infrastructure; • Infrastructure improvements/construction (e.g., roads, skid trails, landings); • Harvesting close-out measures (e.g., waterbars, stream crossing rehabilitation, soil preparation and regeneration, etc.); and, • A clause to allow sale area to be audited for conformance with SmartLogging standards. 	<p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Harvest plans described the information necessary for the harvest. The minimal plan format observed on small operations was the "Master Logger Harvest Plan," which includes landowner objectives, road location considerations, silviculture, RTE species, cultural issues, and markets. In addition, larger operations use the full "NEMLC Harvest Integrity System" which also includes a pre-harvest checklist that addresses relationship to the forest management plan (if available), sensitive areas other than RTE sites, harvest area, aquatic buffers and other regulatory constraints, require permits, equipment, road construction, and a full closeout checklist.</p> <p>While harvest plans will include protection of wildlife habitat and rare plant communities if known or identified in a forester's management plan, group members in Maine who are developing harvest plans without forest management plan input do not consult with the applicable state agencies (i.e., Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife (MDIFW and the</p>

	<p>Maine Natural Areas Program (MNAP). However, Maine loggers must send Forest Operations Notification (FON) form to the Maine Forest Service (MFS). MFS sends information to the logger if the site is located in a township with federal-listed Atlantic salmon or Canada lynx. MFS also forwards the FON form to the Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife, which could follow up if there were issues of concern. In the past MFS also sent the FON forms to the Maine Natural Areas program, but this practice was discontinued due to budget constraints. Thus, not all available information on RTE species and communities is in harvest plans. Group members are not using a relatively new on-line mapping program with “Beginning With Habitat” maps of important plant and wildlife habitat. See https://webapps2.cgis-solutions.com/beginningwithhabitat/map2/. This data source has not been widely publicized. See OBS 03/17.</p> <p>The Master Logger Timber Harvesting Agreement template is used by some group members. This has all the indicator requirements except penalty clauses or reference to access by auditors. No contracts reviewed had penalty clauses, but because they had explicit performance standards they are enforceable without penalty clauses. No contracts had language allowing the sale area to be audited to SmartLogging standards, but the Master Logger group member agreements provide for independent auditing, and the auditor was allowed full access to all sites.</p>
<p>2.2.2 Harvest maps, or aerial photos, identify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Property boundaries; • Harvest area; • Streamside management zones and other riparian zones; • Unique historic, religious or cultural sites; • Rare, threatened or endangered species habitat; and, <p>Other unique biological or geological features.</p>	<p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>All required elements that were present were shown on maps,</p>
<p>NOTES: (NCRs/Observations) See OBS 03/17.</p>	
<p>2.3: A documented on-site pre-harvest inspection is conducted within one year of harvest.</p>	
<p>Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance</p>	
<p>2.3.1: The pre-harvest inspections are done by the harvester, preferably with the landowner or land manager.</p>	<p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>All sites audited were inspected prior to harvest by the logger with the landowner or landowner’s representative.</p>

<p>2.3.2: Pre-harvest inspections review property boundaries, harvest area boundaries, streamside management zones (SMZ) and harvesting restrictions in SMZs, special considerations for protection of special sites, and harvest “close out” procedures.</p>	<p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Logger and landowner interviews indicated that all applicable pre-harvest issues are addressed. These are also referenced in the contract signed by both parties. Close-out responsibility is discussed on site and included in contract language.</p>
<p>2.3.3: Property boundaries and limits of the harvest area are clearly marked on the ground.</p>	<p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>All harvest sites audited had clearly marked boundaries.</p>
<p>2.3.4: Harvesting infrastructure (e.g. existing roads, landings, skid trails, stream crossings) is reviewed and necessary improvements are included in the sale/service agreement.</p>	<p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Harvest agreements indicated logger responsibility for all infrastructure work.</p>
<p>NOTES: (NCRs/Observations) None</p>	
<p>2.4: A documented post-harvest assessment of harvest site is conducted at completion of harvest.</p>	
<p>Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance</p>	
<p>2.4.1: A post-harvest evaluation (i.e., checklist or close-out document) is completed by the harvester, preferably with the landowner or land manager, and follow-up actions are identified and conducted as necessary. Post-harvest inspection by jurisdiction agency is required where the service is available.</p>	<p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The Master Logger “Post-Harvest Checks” template is provided to all group members. Full closeout was documented at the one completed harvest visited. The landowner reported visiting the completed site and being fully satisfied with the work. All loggers reported that a post-harvest closeout walk is conducted with each landowner.</p>
<p>2.4.2: Post-harvest inspections review condition of streamside management zones, harvest infrastructure, sites identified for special protection, residual stand, “closeout” features, such as water bars, and other features identified in pre-harvest inspection.</p>	<p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Interviews with loggers indicate that all the required inspection elements are completed. Full closeout BMPs including stream crossings, skid trails and landings were observed at the one completed harvest site.</p>
<p>NOTES: (NCRs/Observations) None</p>	

Subject Area 3: Harvesting Practices
Harvesting practices, including equipment used, are chosen and employed based on specific site conditions and landowner harvest prescriptions for the stands and site. Protection of water quality is an increasingly important consideration in management of forest resources. Harvesters can have a significant impact in protecting water quality and soils. Harvesters follow state, provincial or regional BMPs and other recognized practices in all harvesting activities such as road construction, location of logging trails and landings, stream

<i>crossings, and protection of SMZs. In addition, harvesters work to conserve the timber resource and all forest resource values within the context of the landowners' harvest prescriptions and they protect worker health and safety and promote community economic well-being.</i>	
<u>Criteria and Indicators</u>	<u>Findings</u>
3.1: Harvesting practices meet or exceed applicable jurisdictional best management practices (BMPs), even if BMPs are voluntary.	
Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance	
3.1.1: Applicable state harvesting BMPs are being implemented.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Field audit confirmed that BMPs were being consistently implemented.
3.1.2: Logger, supervisor, or person responsible for implementing BMPs is required to have BMP training and training on the SL Standard.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> BMP training is included as component of the training taking by contractors and their employees.
3.1.3: BMP manuals are accessible to employees, contactors and employees.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> BMP manuals were available on site in vehicles or service trailers.
NOTES: (NCRs/Observations) None	
3.2: Harvesting practices are conducted when risk of impacts are low.	
Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance	
3.2.1: Harvesting, especially of identified sensitive areas, is conducted when risk is low (i.e., on dry or frozen ground).	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> The audits occurred at the beginning of spring breakup. Contractors were modifying harvest and skid trail locations, adding brush to wetter areas, trucking only in early morning with gravel roads were still frozen, and planning to shut down in the near future. Logger interviews indicated that there are wet-weather shutdowns in the summer months as well.
3.2.2: Harvesting systems are appropriate for the site.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> A variety of harvest systems was observed and all were suitable to the site conditions.
3.2.3: Appropriate equipment (e.g., low impact tires, mats) is used in wet (swamp) areas.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Timber mats were used by many contractors for stream crossings and wet trail sections, others use brush in wet trail sections. Many contractors used forwarders to minimize impacts.
NOTES: (NCRs/Observations) None	
3.3: Harvest prescriptions are followed and damage to residual vegetation is minimized.	
Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance	

3.3.1: Silvicultural prescriptions are followed.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Four of the harvests had silvicultural prescriptions prepared by a forester. In all cases the prescriptions were followed. For logger-prepared harvest plans, recommended harvesting in the plan was followed on the ground.
3.3.2: Damage to residual trees and other resources is minimized by the harvest and extraction process. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scarring on boles of residual trees is minimized; • Damage to residual tree leaders and limbs is minimized; • Coarse woody debris is left on site; and, • Damage to understory vegetation is minimized. 	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Minimal damage to trees and other residual vegetation was observed. Loggers routinely use bumper trees to minimize damage. One logger made portable plastic bumpers that can be attached to future crop trees where no bumper tree exists.
3.3.3: Harvest closeout activities are undertaken and occur as per the harvest plan.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> One site was fully closed out and met all appropriate closeout procedures. Interviews with loggers at the remaining active jobs indicated they are knowledgeable about closeout procedures.
NOTES: (NCRs/Observations) None	
3.4: Streams, lakes and wetlands are protected during harvest operations.	
Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance	
3.4.1: Riparian buffer zones and streamside management zones (SMZ) are protected as outlined in BMPs or this standard.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> All stream RMZs were flagged and met state and/or local requirements and BMP recommendations.
3.4.2: Equipment use in SMZs and wetlands is minimized.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> No wetland impacts or SMZ soil impacts were observed. Operators either reach in to SMZs with harvesting booms or only enter with equipment where soils will not be damaged.
3.4.3: Additional buffer zone management practices outlined by the landowner are respected.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> All buffer zones are identified by the contractors with the landowner prior to harvest. The field audit and landowner interviews found no issues with buffers.
NOTES: (NCRs/Observations) None	
3.5: Road and landing construction is implemented in a manner that minimizes soil erosion and does not impede water flow.	
Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance	

<p>3.5.1: The number of, and forest area affected by, roads, landings and concentration yards is based on site conditions. The total area affected by the harvesting network should be kept to a minimum.</p>	<p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The observed transportation networks were suitable to the harvest sites and kept to a minimum.</p>
<p>3.5.2: Roads and landings are constructed outside of SMZs unless the reuse of a preexisting facility is the less damaging alternative.</p>	<p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Except for unavoidable stream crossings there were no roads or skid trails, in an SMZ. One landing (Ridley) was close to a stream, but this was the only alternative based on site constraints. The landing was kept to the minimum size possible. The landing is only used in the winter and the operator had constructed a berm on the stream edge of the landing and applied a layer of chips as mulch prior to spring breakup. No resource concerns were noted by the auditor.</p>
<p>3.5.3: Layout of roads, skid trails and landings consider soil, slope stability, gradient, and weather conditions.</p>	<p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Trails and roads are kept on dry soils whenever possible. Loggers were adapting to late-winter conditions by brushing trails where the ground was beginning to thaw. In some cases trails that were suitable in midwinter were no longer used to the thaw. Overall attention to trail conditions was high.</p>
<p>3.5.4: Erosion control structures such as waterbars and rolling (broad-based) dips are properly constructed to effectively divert water from roads and skid trails.</p>	<p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Waterbars were constructed as needed. In some cases contractors plan to return after mud season to install water bars where ground had been frozen at the time of closeout. Almost all contractors had excavators and/or bulldozers to install waterbars.</p>
<p>3.5.5: Erosion control structures (e.g., waterbars, rolling dips) are constructed prior to stream crossings to divert direct water flow into buffers or filter strips.</p>	<p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Trail layout and BMPs were constructed to minimize water quality impacts at stream crossings. No potential areas of concern were noted, although at some sites deep snow/ice did not allow observation of soil conditions. However, as noted above, interviews revealed that contractors install waterbars and/or dips after mud season if needed.</p>
<p>3.5.6: Road surfaces are designed to drain water effectively: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rock and gravel is used on roads if feasible; and, Roads are out-sloped, in-sloped or crowned as appropriate.</p>	<p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The only true forest roads were in areas with deep snow (Nicols, TWP C and Grimaldi, Jay) and could not be evaluated. The other sites had</p>

	landings at roadside or a short distance from the road. No potential issues were noted.
3.5.7: Permanent culverts are adequately sized and properly situated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Placed to effectively manage water flow; • Installed so that subsequent road maintenance does not result in damage to culverts; and, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sized adequately for periods of high volume water flow. 	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> No new permanent culverts had been installed on any of the sites. Pre-existing permanent culverts could not be evaluated due to snow conditions. Most of the loggers use temporary bridge panels or, in a minority of cases temporary culverts, rather than permanent culverts.
3.5.8: Disturbed soil is stabilized to prevent soil erosion or sediment flow, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Road cut banks; • Sidecast banks; and, • Landing sites. 	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Brush in trails, straw mulch and/or chips at landings and stream crossings were observed in all cases necessary.
3.5.9: Non-invasive species are used for soil stabilization and re-vegetation of disturbed sites.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> No invasive plants are used.
NOTES: (NCRs/Observations) None	
3.6: Skid trails are designed and managed in a manner that protects and conserves soil and water resources.	
Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance	
3.6.1: Skid trails should be located and flagged before harvesting commences.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Main trails are laid out by the contractor prior to harvest. Harvester operators are trained to cut side trails without flagging. Observed trail spacing was excellent (up to 100 feet between trails) and appropriate to the site conditions and harvest objectives.
3.6.2: A reasonable effort is made to minimize disruption of soil organic layers during harvest operations including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimal skidder rutting; • Minimal blading of slash; and, • Minimal machinery use off skid trails. 	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Winter conditions resulted in virtually no off-trail soil disruption.
3.6.3: Skid trails are stabilized during and following harvesting activities, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using slash; • Seeding; • Mulching; or • Other erosion control methods 	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Slash and mulch were applied to trails as needed. In the Northeast trail revegetation from the forest seed bank is rapid and additional seeding is seldom necessary.

<p>3.6.4: Skid trails avoid sensitive sites, such as wet areas and unstable soils.</p>	<p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No damage to sensitive soils was observed. The larger wet areas are shown on harvest maps. Unmapped areas are identified during harvest layout and avoided whenever possible.</p>
<p>NOTES: (NCRs/Observations) None</p>	
<p>3.7: Stream crossings are managed to minimize negative environmental impacts during road building and harvest.</p>	
<p>Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance</p>	
<p>3.7.1: The number of road or skid trail stream crossings for all categories of streams is minimized.</p>	<p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Stream crossings were avoided whenever possible.</p>
<p>3.7.2: Log landings are placed on either side of the stream where practical to reduce multiple crossing of intermittent streams.</p>	<p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>All sites had only one log landing near or on a main road. Stream crossings were minimized.</p>
<p>3.7.3: Portable bridges, mats, or logs are used to cross streams when necessary.</p>	<p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Portable timber mats were used as temporary bridges in most cases. Two contractors use temporary culverts.</p>
<p>3.7.4: Stream crossings are placed at right angles to the stream where appropriate.</p>	<p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>All stream crossings were at or close to right angles to the stream.</p>
<p>3.7.5: Culverts are installed properly in a manner not to inhibit migration of aquatic organisms.</p>	<p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No permanent culverts were installed on any of the audit sites. Only one site had an access road with permanent culverts, but these could not be evaluated due to deep snow.</p>
<p>3.7.6: Integrity of stream channel and stream banks is maintained during installation and removal of stream crossing devices.</p>	<p>Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>One site with closed-out stream crossings was observed. Damage to the channel and banks was minimal because temporary bridge panels had been used. Active operations visited were also using temporary bridge panels. However, some group members may use culverts or pole fords on small (primarily intermittent) streams. Temporary culverts and pole fords are consistent with Maine BMPs for temporary crossings, but damage to stream channels and banks is more likely with culverts and pole fords than</p>

	with temporary bridge panels. See OBS 04/17. Practices and BMPs in other TCNEF member states were not reviewed during this audit.
NOTES: (NCRs/Observations) See OBS 04/17	
3.8: Chemicals and petroleum products are contained as to not cause environmental damage.	
Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance	
a) 3.8.1: Spills are dealt with according to state regulations and BMPs.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> All group members have spill cleanup pads on all equipment and full cleanup kits at the landing and cleanup procedures follow the intent of the law and Best Management Practices. Cleanup materials are taken to municipal transfer stations, and while the intent of the law appears to be met, the legal requirement for final disposal in Maine was not clear in all cases. See OBS 02/17.
b) 3.8.2: Spill kits are available at the worksite and operators are familiar with their use.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> All operators had full spill kits at the landings and spill pads in wood equipment. Operators were familiar with their use.
3.8.3: Chemical and petroleum product waste from equipment maintenance procedures are captured and not allowed to flow on the ground or in watercourses.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Interviews with operators indicated that spills are cleaned up immediately per recommended practices. A slasher/delimiter being repaired at one site had spill pads in place and no movement of petroleum products was observed.
3.8.4: Equipment is properly maintained to avoid hydraulic fluid, motor oil and gear oil leaks.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> All operators had well maintained equipment. Annual overhauls are common and in-woods leaks are addressed as needed. No leaking equipment was observed.
NOTES: (NCRs/Observations) See OBS 02/17	
3.9: Important habitats to wildlife, rare, threatened or endangered species, and other special or unique natural sites are conserved. If available, natural heritage programs are consulted to determine if RTE species and rare natural communities are present.	
Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance	
3.9.1: Specific wildlife habitat is protected as marked or designated in the harvest plan.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Spotted turtle habitat was referenced in one management plan. Protection was addressed via a winter harvest and avoidance of wetlands. No other harvest sites had specific wildlife areas, but harvest plans prepared

	without forester input may lack information on important plan and wildlife habitats. See Indicator 2.2.1.
3.9.2: Harvesting avoids time periods and sites that are known to be important to species that are sensitive to human activity (e.g., nesting and breeding sites, etc.).	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Spotted turtle habitat was referenced in one management plan. Protection was addressed via a winter harvest and avoidance of wetlands. No other harvest sites had specific wildlife areas, but operators are familiar with state-identified habitat information that may occur on some sites.
3.9.3: Wildlife trees, snags, and other special situations are retained in a creative and safe manner in compliance with hazardous tree regulations or procedures.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Wildlife trees and other sensitive sites were retained as indicated in management or harvest plans and in consultation with landowner.
3.9.4: Areas designated for strict conservation by the landowner (i.e. no harvesting or other activities) are protected.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> No such sites occurred in the sample, but interviews with loggers and landowners indicated that the landowner's objectives are paramount and followed during harvesting.
3.9.5: Rare, threatened or endangered species, or their habitats, that are discovered during harvest operations are protected and reported to the landowner.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> None of the group members audited have discovered any RTE species or habitats. However, the members are sensitive to wildlife issues and would report important sites identified (e.g., an eagle nest tree).
3.9.6: Unique features are protected during the harvest.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Wetlands, cultural features, and other sensitive or special sites are protected.
NOTES: (NCRs/Observations) See OBS 03/17.	

Subject Area 4: Community Values	
<i>Efforts are made to conduct harvesting operations in such a way that respects local community values so that loggers maintain a “social license to operate”. This means that loggers are mindful of working hours and avoid excess noise beyond working hours; limit the use of compression brakes in populated areas if safe to do so; take precautions to keep children and adults out of work area, such as putting up signs to mark off the work area; use extra precautions when operating near property lines, houses and power lines to avoid accidental damage to neighboring property and ensure that the protection of unique features is acceptable to the property owner, surrounding landowners, and the public.</i>	
<u>Criteria and Indicators</u>	<u>Findings</u>
4.1: Harvest planning and operations consider potential impacts to local community.	

Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance	
4.1.1: Cultural features of historic and/or archaeological value are protected in the field as identified in the harvest prescription.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural features were limited to stone walls. All were protected. Group members are observant and will protected areas not previously identified.
4.1.2: Aesthetic prescriptions as defined in the harvest prescriptions are implemented during harvest and close-out operations.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> All operators were sensitive to aesthetic considerations and modified harvests accordingly. This included views of harvested hillsides and harvesting near roads and trails, and/or as desired by the landowner.
4.1.3: Chemical containers, solid non-organic wastes and other refuse produced during harvesting are disposed of in an environmentally sound manner at off-site locations.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> All operators place any waste or cleanup materials in leak-proof bags and use on-premises dumpsters or transport the waste to local transfer facilities. One contractor with a waste-oil burner burns oil-contaminated cleanup pads.
4.1.4: Harvester actively works to resolve conflicts with neighbors when they arise.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Only one contractor had a recent conflict. In that case a landing was located on property that one survey showed belonging to the landowner, but the abutter's survey showed that the landing was on his property. The contractor met with the abutter who agreed to a temporary landing and access.
NOTES: (NCRs/Observations) None	

Subject Area 5: Occupational Health and Safety	
Recognizing that logging is a dangerous occupation, protecting the health and safety of workers is of utmost importance. Loggers should maintain constant vigilance to recognize and minimize occupational health and safety risks.	
<u>Criteria and Indicators</u>	<u>Findings</u>
5.1: Harvester has an occupational health and safety plan.	
Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance	
5.1.1: A written safety & health plan that includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An emergency response plan; • Requirements for personal safety equipment; • Policies for forest workers when working alone, including strategies for making their whereabouts known to others at prescribed times each day, 	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> All contractors had written safety plans and policies meeting the requirements of this indicator. Some use the Master Logger template and others use a custom plan tailored to their operation.

which is verified as a daily procedure when in the forest; and, • Periodic safety inspection of equipment.	
5.1.2: Harvester participates in insurance or government compensation programs.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> All contractors with employees have workman's compensation insurance.
NOTES: (NCRs/Observations) None	
5.2: Harvester ensures compliance with safety plan and related requirements in terms of protective equipment (e.g., hardhats, hearing protection, etc.), machine/tool operation, maintenance of harvesting and felling equipment, and handling of dangerous materials.	
Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance	
5.2.1: Harvesters, employees or sub-contractors have received occupational safety and health orientation/training.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> All contractor's and employees have health and safety training at least once annually.
5.2.2: Harvesters, employees and sub-contractors demonstrate safe harvesting techniques in the field, such as: • Maintaining good communication with other workers; • Maintaining safe distance from operating machinery or felling; • Wearing personal protective equipment at all times.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> All operators had the proper PPE for the job, had communication tools applicable to the site (radio or cell phone) and demonstrated safe practices near machinery.
5.2.3: Harvester evaluates and documents employee and sub-contractor safety performance.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Formal evaluation and documentation occurs on larger operations, informal evaluations is more likely on small operations.
5.2.4: Harvester's written safety plan is accessible to sub-contractors and employees.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> The safety plan was on site and available to view on request for all operations.
5.2.5: CPR, first aid training (e.g. blood lost stoppage, stabilizing broken bones, immobilization of injured worker, etc.) and transport of injured workers, is provided by the harvester.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> All workers were CPR/First Aid trained and first aid kits were in all equipment and at the landing. Group members had their own transport, emergency contact information, and Life Flight coordinates should an emergency arise.
5.2.6: Where available, communications equipment for emergencies is on-site.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>

	Radios and/or cell phones were available at all sites. Contractors working outside of cell phone coverage used radios.
NOTES: (NCRs/Observations) None	

Subject Area 6: Business Viability	
<i>Logging is a difficult business and equipment is costly. Loggers must be able to understand the true costs of doing business to have an economically sustainable business. A logger should demonstrate awareness of the need for sustainable business practices.</i>	
<u>Criteria and Indicators</u>	<u>Findings</u>
6.1: Harvester demonstrates business viability.	
Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance	
6.1.1: Harvester has a written business plan.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> All contractors audit have been in business since at least 2003, most for a longer period. Most smaller contractors have no debt and few or no employee and thus have not need for a current business plan. Larger contractors develop the appropriate plans as needed to address capital needs, number of employees, and long-term growth.
6.1.2: Harvester consults business support professionals as necessary, such as accountants and insurance professionals.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> All contractors consult with professionals appropriate to the scope of their business. The two largest contractors hire outside safety auditors for monthly inspections.
6.1.3: Harvester maintains records of harvesting activities, including: • Contracts with landowners, mills, dealers and subcontractors; and, • Load reports, and scale records and summaries. • Calculating equipment, personnel and overhead costs; and, • Calculating daily cost per production unit (e.g., ton, board foot).	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> All applicable records are kept for business records and to pay landowners per contract requirements.
6.1.5: Equipment is well maintained: • No oil or hydraulic leaks; • ROPS of machinery is in good condition; • Regular maintenance is performed and documented.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing maintenance was observed at two sites. No leaks were observed, ROPS appeared to be in good condition. Most contractors perform their own regular maintenance and repairs or hire experts as needed.

NOTES: (NCRs/Observations) None	
6.2: Harvester provides working conditions (e.g. wages, benefits and opportunities) that enhance workforce stability.	
Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance	
6.2.1: Harvester provides equal opportunities for employment and advancement.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> A variety of jobs applicable to the operation size was observed. In regards to equal employment opportunities, one contractor has a female forester and another hires a seasonal female equipment operator.
6.2.2: Employee job training is provided.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> All employees receive based health and safety training and additional training, with in a classroom setting or on-the-job, as needed.
NOTES: (NCRs/Observations) None	
6.3: Harvester maximizes utilization of harvested products.	
Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance	
6.3.1: Grading and sorting of harvested products is conducted to add or maintain commercial value where appropriate.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> All grades of wood ranging from veneer to biomass are sorted and utilized whenever possible. In addition to common market products, group members were cutting and sorting logs for specialized products such as firewood for a maple syrup evaporator and logs for timber matts
6.3.2: Harvested products are transported from harvest site to markets on a timely basis to minimize product degrade and loss.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Trucking of logs happens frequently and no large inventories of logs were observed at landings. One contractor was not cutting white pine at the rear of a lot because of the risk of stain should spring breakup occur before the logs could be hauled.
6.3.3: All merchantable materials as prescribed in the harvest contract are shipped.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> All products listed in contracts were being sorted and shipped.
NOTES: (NCRs/Observations) None	
6.4: Harvester maintains ethical business practices.	
Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance	
6.4.1: Contracts are honored.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>

	Visual inspections indicated that field performance was consistent with contract language. Landowner interviews indicated full satisfaction with contractor performance.
6.4.2: Fair market value is provided for services rendered.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Only one contractor was working on a service contract basis. This contractor has a robust business and has been working for the same family ownership for many years, indicating that both parties are satisfied with the services and payment rates.
6.4.3: Fair market value is provided for timber purchased.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Stumpage payment rates were typical for the region.
6.4.4: Required taxes, royalties and fees are paid.	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> All group members in Maine are required to pay state income tax. There are no other taxes, royalties, or fees. Business records were available for the auditor review at the member's business office.
NOTES: (NCRs/Observations) None	

Subject Area 7: Continuous Improvement and Innovation	
<i>Harvester demonstrates efforts to improve logging operations, uses best available technologies, and shows innovation in the procedures used. Observation of harvest sites, attendance of harvesters at training courses, and observations by landowners and others familiar with the harvester's work demonstrate efforts at improvement.</i>	
Criteria and Indicators	Findings
7.1: Harvester continually learns from experience and training to improve practices.	
Criterion Level Remarks: Conformance	
7.1.1: Harvester analyzes challenging harvesting situations and data from post-harvest assessments and pre-plans innovative solutions, such as <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renting or acquiring equipment appropriate for operation; • Laying out access network in a more effective manner; or • Improving tree harvesting techniques. 	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Group members had a variety of equipment to address different situations and developed creative ways to solve problems, such as the previously mentioned portable tree protectors for skidding and custom sideboards for a forwarder to protect trail-side trees from damage when hauling tops to a chipper.
7.1.2: Harvesting skills and business skills are maintained or enhanced through periodic training (e.g., continuing education courses, equipment operator training and environmental education).	Conformance with Indicator: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> All group members undergo period training and most employees receive the same training.

NOTES: (NCRs/Observations) None

Subject Area 8: Silviculture and Reforestation

This subject area applies only to harvesters who have complete control over the silviculture, reforestation and harvest volume removal on the forestland property from which they are purchasing timber.

The members of TCNEF are harvest contractors who have little to no control over silvicultural, reforestation, and harvest volume removal decisions on the forestland property from which they purchase timber from. This subject area was therefore determined to be non-applicable to the TCNEF group.

APPENDIX III: Chain of Custody Conformance (confidential)

2.5: Documentation is used and retained for monitoring the movement of forest products from forest of origin to destination.

Definition of Forest Gate: The forest gate is determined by the contract type. For group members who purchase timber deeds or cut on shares, the forest gate is the mill scale. For group members who cut and haul for a mill, the forest gate is the landing.

Chain of Custody Criteria	Conform	Explanatory notes/ NCR or OBS
2.5.1: A trip ticket, load receipt or other transportation document accompanies each load of forest products (e.g., logs, chips, biomass) delivered to the purchaser.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Each group member used load tickets for each load of wood sent to the mill. Load tickets are used to track loads back to the source.
2.5.2: Trip tickets, load receipts or other documentation mentioned above contain the harvester's SmartLogging certification code and Subcode (if applicable) number.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No TCNEF SL group members are currently using the Smartlogging certification code on trip tickets or other documentation.
2.5.3: A summary of forest products, which includes at a minimum, delivery dates, destinations, volumes and species is provided to the SmartLogging auditor during the annual audit.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	Each group member keeps a record of the volume of forest products delivered to each mill. Mill receipts are verified against trip tickets and used to summarize volumes and values for group member recordkeeping and payment to landowners. Volume and species summaries were available upon request.
2.5.4: All records are kept for at least five years.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	The group manager outlines the recordkeeping requirements for SmartLogging on the group member agreement. All group members keep records for 5 years.

APPENDIX IV: Group Certification Conformance (confidential)

Group Certification Requirements	Conform	Comments/NCRs
GC 1: The group manager is an independent legal entity or an individual acting as a legal entity.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	The group manager is an independent 501.c.3 non profit organization created for the purpose of overseeing programs such as SmartLogging Certification
GC 2: The group manager has sufficient legal and management authority and technical and human resources (e.g. qualified staff, equipment..) to implement their responsibilities	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	The auditor found the group manager has sufficient legal and management authority and the resources to implement their responsibilities based on group policies and Bylaws that specifically confer legal and administrative authority for managing the SmartLogging group.
GC 3: The responsibilities of the group manager and group members are clearly defined and documented, e.g., with respect to conforming with the SmartLogging standards and group manager policies	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The responsibilities of membership in the SL group are clearly defined in the Code of Ethics Consent form signed by each member.</p> <p>Group manger responsibilities are outlined in the Master Logger Manual that each member receives.</p>
GC 4: Group membership requirements are documented and include: i. Procedures and rules of entry and exit from the certified pool ii. Procedures for the notification of SW of changes in membership within 30 days of changes.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Group membership requirements are documented and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Procedures for entry and exit. This information is detailed in “More About the Trust to Conserve Northeast Forestlands SmartLogging Certificate”. An independent board has been established to determine who may enter the group and who should have their membership suspended. ii. Documents observed by the auditor indicate that changes to group membership will be documented and Rainforest Alliance will be notified within 30 days.
GC 5: A 'consent form' or its equivalent has been signed by each group member The consent form at a minimum: i. acknowledges and agrees to the obligations and responsibilities of group membership; ii. agrees to group membership for the full period of validity of the group certificate; and iii. authorizes the group manager to apply for certification on the member's behalf.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The “Northeast Master Logger Code of Ethics” is signed by each SL group member. The consent form is specific to Master Logger certification, but the standards and practices mimic those of the Smartlogging standard. Upon signing the consent form:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. All group members agree to the obligations and responsibilities of membership. ii. The consent form does not specifically include an agreement to remain a group member for the full period of validity of the certificate, but group members have

<p>iv. acknowledges Rainforest Alliance right to access their forest for evaluation and monitoring</p>		<p>demonstrated their commitment through long-term membership in the group.</p> <p>iii. The link between Master Logger certification and Smartlogging certification is included in the “Master Logger Readiness Packet.” The consent form does not explicitly state that TCNEF will apply for Smartlogging certification on behalf of the group member, but the link is implicit in the overall package of documents received by group members. Auditor interviews with group members demonstrated that they understand the link between Master Logger certification and Smartlogging certification.</p> <p>iv. The consent form includes a statement that the group member understands that certification includes random field audits. Rainforest Alliance and/or Smartlogging auditors are not explicitly referenced on the consent form, but the link to the Smartlogging requirements is implied as described above.</p>
<p>GC 6: Group manager has provided each group member with documentation including:</p> <p>i. The applicable SmartLogging standard</p> <p>i. An explanation of the certification process</p> <p>ii. An explanation of group membership requirements</p>	<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The SmartLogging standard, and related information on Master Logger and Smartlogging certification process are included in the “Master Logger Readiness Packet.” Other group membership requirements are described in the consent information in the “Northeast Master Logger Code of Ethics” document.</p>
<p>GC 7: Group manager has a policy and practice for monitoring harvest practices to ensure that they are meeting the SmartLogging standard and group membership requirement?</p>	<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The group manager has a clear policy for monitoring the harvests of the group members. . Each new member is audited prior to entry into the group and is audited again for recertification after 2 years. For Master Loggers who have been certified for at least two years TCNEF audits at least 25% of the group members each year at the time of recertification every 4 years. During 2016 22 of 90 loggers (24.4%) of those who were members at the beginning of 2016 were audited. The preceding figures represent audits by independent auditors who are not employed by TCNEF.</p> <p>In addition, members may be audited as a result of practices reported to the certification board by stakeholders. In some cases these reviews have</p>

		resulted in some Master Loggers having their certification revoked, which indicates that the internal auditing and control process is robust.
<p>GC 8: The group manager has a system for maintaining the following records up to date at all times:</p> <p>i List of names and addresses of group members, together with date of entry into group certification scheme;</p> <p>ii Evidence of consent of all group members, preferably in the form of a signed 'consent form'</p> <p>iii Records demonstrating the implementation of any internal control or monitoring systems. Such records shall include records of internal inspections, non-compliance identified in such inspections, actions taken to correct any such non-compliance</p> <p>iv An annual summary of production, sales and forest product purchasers of all members ; and</p> <p>v The date of leaving of any group members, and an explanation of the reason why the member left the group.</p> <p>vi Documents are kept for five years</p>	<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The group manager, provided records for each member audited and has clear policies for:</p> <p>i. Maintaining an accurate and current list of all group members.</p> <p>ii. Maintaining all consent forms.</p> <p>iii. Maintaining records of Master Logger interviews, audit findings, and recertification results and corrective actions.</p> <p>iv. Maintaining records of group member production and sales.</p> <p>v. The entrance and exit of group members is determined an external board. A copy of the board's decision is sent to TCNEF and is kept with the group member's, or ex-group members, file for the duration of the certification period.</p> <p>vi. All certification documents are maintained by the group manager for 5 years.</p>

Group Assessment Requirements:	Finding:
Group member size restriction:	TCNEF currently has the capacity to manage the group and conduct annual monitoring.
SW Certificate auditing strategy:	The 2017 reassessment occurred during winter. During the next four years some annual audits should occur during the spring-fall logging season.

Appendix V: Certified Group Member Participation List

1. Total # certified group members: 101

GROUP MEMBERSHIP TABLE

Note: TCNF has provided RA with a membership table that also includes address and contact information for all members.

Name of Member	Master Logger Cohort #	Cert. #	Date of Entry
XXXX	9	XXXX	03/09/12
XXXX	1	XXXX	07/01/01
XXXX	14	XXXX	12/08/15
XXXX	A	XXXX	07/01/05
XXXX	13	XXXX	11/21/14
XXXX	5	XXXX	12/02/05
XXX	1	XXXX	07/01/01
XXXX	10	XXXX	03/09/12
XXXX	14	XXXX	12/08/15
XXXX	2	XXXX	04/30/02
XXXX	11	XXXX	01/31/13
XXXX	5	XXXX	12/02/05
XXXX	3	XXXX	04/15/00
XXXX	9	XXXX	03/04/11
XXXX	3	XXXX	04/16/04
XXXX	1	XXXX	07/01/01
XXXX	3	XXXX	04/16/04
XXXX	4	XXXX	05/05/05
XXXX	7	XXXX	08/06/08
XXXX	6	XXXX	06/22/07
XXX	8	XXXX	05/14/10
XXXX	14	XXXX	12/08/16
XXXX	3	XXX	04/16/04
XXXX	12	XXX	11/19/13
XXXX	11	XXXX	01/31/13
XXXX	C	XXXX	07/02/08
XXXX	1	XXXX	07/01/01
XXXX	7	XXXX	06/17/08
XXXX	2	XXXX	04/29/98

xxxx	9	xxxx	03/04/11
xxxx	1	xxxx	07/01/01
xxxx	5	xxxx	12/02/05
xxxxx	9	xxxx	03/04/11
xxxx	4	xxxx	05/05/05
xxxx	12	xxxx	11/19/13
xxxx	14	xxxx	12/08/15
xxxx	A	xxxx	07/01/05
xxxx	5	xxxx	12/02/05
xxxx	3	xxxx	04/16/04
xxxx	11	xxxx	01/31/13
xxx	2	xxxx	04/29/02
xxxx	1	xxxx	07/01/01
xxxx	1	xxxx	07/01/01
xxxx	7	xxxx	06/17/08
xxxx	7	xxxxx	06/17/08
xxxx	7	xxxx	08/06/08
xxxx	11	xxxx	01/31/13
xxxx	1	xxxx	07/01/01
xxxx	1	xxxx	07/01/01
xxxx	9	xxxx	03/04/11
xxxx	7	xxxx	06/17/08
xxxx	10	xxxx	04/16/04
xxxx	4	xxxx	05/05/05
xxxx	3	xxxx	04/16/04
xxxx	9	xxxx	03/04/11
xxxx	2	xxxx	04/30/02
xxxx	4	xxxx	05/05/05
xxxxx	1	xxxx	07/01/01
xxxx	1	xxxx	07/01/01
xxxx	C	xxxx	07/02/08
xxxx	8	xxxx	03/31/10
xxxx	4	xxxx	05/05/05
xxxx	5	xxxx	12/02/05
xxxx	3	xxxx	04/16/04
xxxx	5	xxxx	12/02/05
xxxx	7	xxxx	08/06/08
xxxx	7	xxxx	06/17/08

xxxx	7	xxxx	06/17/08
xxxx	B	xxxx	03/01/07
xxxx	14	xxxx	12/8/2015
xxxx	2	xxxx	04/30/02
xxxx	9	xxxx	03/04/11
xxxx	10	xxxx	04/16/04
xxxx	3	xxxx	04/16/04
xxxx	5	xxxx	12/02/05
xxxx	4	xxxx	05/05/05
xxx	A	xxxx	07/01/05
xxxx	1	xxxx	07/01/01
xxxx	1	xxxx	07/01/01
xxxx	8	xxxx	11/17/10
xxxx	C	xxxx	07/02/08
xxxx	6	xxxx	06/22/07
xxxx	2	xxxx	04/30/02
xxxx	3	xxxx	04/16/04
xxxx	3	xxxx	04/16/04
xxxx	6	xxxx	06/22/07
xxxx	8	xxxxx	05/14/10
xxxx	8	xxxx	05/28/10
xxxx	2	xxxx	04/30/02
xxxx	8	xxxx	05/14/10
xxxx	15	xxxx	4/1/2016
xxxx	15	xxxx	4/2/2016
xxxx	15	xxxxx	4/3/2016
xxxx	15	xxxx	4/4/2016
xxxx	15	xxxx	1/27/2017
xxxx	15	xxxxx	1/27/2017
xxxx	15	xxxx	1/27/2017
xxxx	15	xxxx	1/27/2017
xxxx	15	xxxx	1/27/2017
xxxx	15	xxxx	1/27/2017
xxxx	15	xxxx	01/27/17

APPENDIX IV: List of all visited sites (confidential)

Location	Logger	Site description / Audit Focus and Rationale for selection
----------	--------	---

Township C, ME	xxxx	Unorganized township north of Andover. CTL operation on private land. Active overstory removal and thinning per forester prescription. Reviewed harvest plans, safety, hazardous materials and spill management, and field operations. Long-term Master Logger but first Smartlogging audit.
Milton TWM, ME	xxxx	Active whole-tree strip regeneration/thinning harvest with mixed forest products. Reviewed harvest plans, safety, hazardous materials and spill management, and field operations. Long-term Master Logger but first Smartlogging audit.
Livermore, ME	xxxx	Active mechanical selection harvest in pine/hemlock/hardwood. Reviewed harvest plans, safety, hazardous materials and spill management, and field operations. Long-term Master Logger but first Smartlogging audit.
Wilton, ME	xxxx	Active chainsaw and forwarder thinning and ash pre-salvage in anticipation of emerald ash borer with utilization of small firewood and small-scale chipping. Reviewed harvest plans, safety, hazardous materials and spill management, and field operations. Long-term Master Logger but first Smartlogging audit.
Madison, ME	xxxx	Active chainsaw & skidder harvest of mature aspen and mixedwoods on private woodlot. Reviewed harvest plans, safety, hazardous materials and spill management, and field operations. Long-term Master Logger but first Smartlogging audit.
Knox, ME	xxxx	Active CTL/forwarder selection harvest in pine/oak mixedwoods. Reviewed harvest plans, safety, hazardous materials and spill management, and field operations. Long-term Master Logger but first Smartlogging audit.
Freeport, ME	xxxx	Selection harvest in mixed forest with subdivision plan. Reviewed harvest plans, safety, hazardous materials and spill management, and field operations. Recent closeout with stream BMPs evaluated. Long-term Master Logger but first Smartlogging audit.
Jay, Me	xxxx	Active chain saw/skidder selection harvest on oak-northern hardwoods. Reviewed harvest plans, safety, hazardous materials and spill management, and field operations. Long-term Master Logger but first Smartlogging audit.

APPENDIX V: Detailed list of stakeholders consulted (confidential)

List of FMO Staff Consulted

Name	Title	Contact	Type of Participation
Wright, Ted	Executive Director	2017-688-8195 (office) 207-532-8721 (mobile) executivedirector@tcnef.org	Interview
Clark, Jessica	Office Manager	jessica@maineloggers.com	Interview

List of other Stakeholders Consulted

Name	Organization	Contact	Type of Participation
xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	Field interview
xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	Field interview
xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	Field interview
xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	Field interview
xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	Field interview
xxx	xxxx	xxxx	Field interview
xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	Field interview
xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	Field interview
xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	Field interview
xxxxx	xxxx	xxxx	Field interview

XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	Field interview
XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	Field interview
XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	Field interview
XXXX	XXXX	XXXX <hr/>	Email contact
XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	Phone interview
XXXX	XXXXX	XXXX <hr/>	Email contact
XXXX	XXXXX	XXXX <hr/>	Email contact
XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	Phone interview
XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	Phone interview
XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	Email interview
XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	Phone interview
XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	Phone interview