# 4. Results of the Evaluation

## 4.1 Existing Corrective Action Request (or observation)s and Observations

| | |
|---|---|
| | **Finding Number: 2012.2** |
| ***Select one:*** ☐ **Major CAR** ☐ **Minor CAR** ☒ **Observation** | |
| **FMU CAR/OBS issued to** (when more than one FMU): | |
| **Deadline** | ☐ Pre-condition to certification<br>☐ 3 months from Issuance of Final Report<br>☒ Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation)<br>☐ Other deadline (specify): |
| **FSC Indicator(s)**: | FSC-Us Forest Management Standard V1.0 6.3.h. |
| **Non-Conformity** *(or justification in the case of observations)*: After last year's audit, when they received a minor CAR (2011.5) the SFMA and Baxter State Park began developing a park-wide strategy to address the topics of this indicator. They have included surrounding landowners in this effort. This is a first of a kind effort in the State and is to be encouraged. A final draft of the strategy was not available at the audit. | |
| **Corrective Action Request** *(or observation)*: The auditor feels strongly that this strategic process should be completed. Sufficient progress has been made to meet the intent of CAR 2011.5. A full review of this strategy should be addressed at next year's audit. | |
| **FME response** *(including any evidence submitted)* | |
| **SCS review** | Interview with Rick Morrill and review of documentation produced for regional meetings show that significant progress is being made of the regional effort to map, monitor and control invasives. Progress should continue to be evaluated at future audits.<br>07/16/2014 BSP has met all requirements of the indicator on Park property and remains open to cooperation with surrounding landowners to address the problem of invasive species. The auditor recommends that this observation be closed. |
| **Status of CAR:** | ☒ Closed<br>☐ Upgraded to Major<br>☐ *Other decision (refer to description above)* |

## 4.2 New Corrective Action Request (or observation)s and Observations

| | |
|---|---|
| | **Finding Number: 2014-1** |
| ***Select one:*** ☐ **Major CAR** ☐ **Minor CAR** ☒ **Observation** | |
| **FMU CAR/OBS issued to** (when more than one FMU): | |
| **Deadline** | ☐ Pre-condition to certification<br>☐ 3 months from Issuance of Final Report<br>☐ Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation)<br>☐ Other deadline (specify): |
| **FSC Indicator**: | FSC-Us Forest Management Standard V1.0 6.1.a. (see also 7.3.a) |
| **Non-Conformity** *(or justification in the case of observations)*: There are a number of on-going surveys in BSP by in-house and outside professionals addressing the elements of this indicator. SFMA staff calls on BSP naturalist for consultations.<br>SFMA staff interviews indicated that they had not had formal training in the identification of most common RTE plants and rare ecological communities. | |
| **Corrective Action Request** *(or observation)*: Formal training on the identification of RTE species, especially plants, and rare ecological communities would improve staff's ability to identify potential RTE sites during initial field inspections and other activities conducted to complete environmental impact assessments. | |
| **FME response** *(including any evidence submitted)* | |
| **SCS review** | |
| **Status of CAR:** | ☐ Closed<br>☐ Upgraded to Major<br>☐ *Other decision (refer to description above)* |
| | **Finding Number: 2014-2** |
| ***Select one:*** ☐ **Major CAR** ☐ **Minor CAR** ☒ **Observation** | |
| **FMU CAR/OBS issued to** (when more than one FMU): | |
| **Deadline** | ☐ Pre-condition to certification<br>☐ 3 months from Issuance of Final Report<br>☐ Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation)<br>☐ Other deadline (specify): |
| **FSC Indicator**: | FSC-Us Forest Management Standard V1.0 6.3.a.3 |
| **Non-Conformity** *(or justification in the case of observations)*: The SFMA has established significant reserves containing old growth. There are stands within the SFMA that have not been evaluated for the presence of Type I or II old growth. Staff does not have a written protocol for the identification of potential Type I or II old growth. | |
| **Corrective Action Request** *(or observation)*: A written protocol defining old growth based on the definitions in the standard and the regional context, as well as a procedure for assessing its presence or absence, would improve staff knowledge and efficiency in the field. | |
| **FME response** *(including any* | |

| | |
|---|---|
| *evidence submitted)* | |
| **SCS review** | |
| **Status of CAR:** | ☐ Closed<br>☐ Upgraded to Major<br>☐ *Other decision (refer to description above)* |

| | |
|---|---|
| | **Finding Number: 2014-3** |
| ***Select one:*** ☐ **Major CAR** ☐ **Minor CAR** ☒ **Observation** | |
| **FMU CAR/OBS issued to** (when more than one FMU): | |
| **Deadline** | ☐ Pre-condition to certification<br>☐ 3 months from Issuance of Final Report<br>☐ Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation)<br>☐ Other deadline (specify): |
| **FSC Indicator**: | FSC-Us Forest Management Standard V1.0 6.5.e.1 (see also 6.5.e.2) |
| **Non-Conformity** *(or justification in the case of observations)*: The SFMA is developing a new riparian management zone policy; now in draft form. | |
| **Corrective Action Request** *(or observation)*: The final policy should be reviewed at the next audit to ensure conformance with the applicable indicators. | |
| **FME response** *(including any evidence submitted)* | |
| **SCS review** | |
| **Status of CAR:** | ☐ Closed<br>☐ Upgraded to Major<br>☐ *Other decision (refer to description above)* |

| | |
|---|---|
| | **Finding Number: 2015-4** |
| ***Select one:*** ☐ **Major CAR** ☒ **Minor CAR** ☐ **Observation** | |
| **FMU CAR/OBS issued to** (when more than one FMU): | |
| **Deadline** | ☐ Pre-condition to certification<br>☐ 3 months from Issuance of Final Report<br>☐ Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation)<br>☐ Other deadline (specify): |
| **FSC Indicator**: | FSC-Us Forest Management Standard V1.0 9.4.a. |
| **Non-Conformity** *(or justification in the case of observations)*: The Frost Pond Forest was designated to study late successional and/or Type II old growth management. No activity has occurred since 2003 when an initial harvest was conducted.<br>A protocol for monitoring HCVF attributes and the effectiveness of the harvest in maintaining them does not exist. | |
| **Corrective Action Request** *(or observation)*: A monitoring protocol should be in place prior to any further | |

| | |
|---|---|
| activity. | |
| **FME response** *(including any evidence submitted)* | |
| **SCS review** | |
| **Status of CAR:** | ☐ Closed<br>☐ Upgraded to Major<br>☐ *Other decision (refer to description above)* |

# 5. Stakeholder Comments

In accordance with SCS protocols, consultation with key stakeholders is an integral component of the evaluation process. Stakeholder consultation takes place prior to, concurrent with, and following field evaluations. Distinct purposes of such consultation include:

- To solicit input from affected parties as to the strengths and weaknesses of the FME's management, relative to the standard, and the nature of the interaction between the company and the surrounding communities.
- To solicit input on whether the forest management operation has consulted with stakeholders regarding identifying any high conservation value forests (HCVFs).

Principal stakeholder groups are identified based upon results from past evaluations, lists of stakeholders from the FME under evaluation, and additional stakeholder contacts from other sources (e.g., chair of the regional FSC working group). The following types of groups and individuals were determined to be principal stakeholders in this evaluation:

## 5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted

| | |
|---|---|
| SFMA Staff | Logging contractor personnel |

Stakeholder consultation activities are organized to give participants the opportunity to provide comments according to general categories of interest based on the three FSC chambers, as well as the SCS Interim Standard, if one was used. The table below summarizes the major comments received from stakeholders and the assessment team's response. Where a stakeholder comment has triggered a subsequent investigation during the evaluation, the corresponding follow-up action and conclusions from SCS are noted below.

## 5.2 Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Responses from the Team, Where Applicable

☐ *FME has not received any stakeholder comments from interested parties as a result of stakeholder outreach activities during this annual audit.*