RUBY CANYON ENVIRONMENTAL

&

FIRST CORP

Validation and Verification Report

ACR587 Bluesource - North Maine Woods Forestry Project

July 16, 2022

Ruby Canyon Environmental, Inc.
743 Horizon Ct. Suite 385
Grand Junction, Colorado 81506
(970) 241-9298
www.rubycanyonenv.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION

Bluesource LLC (Bluesource) contracted with Ruby Canyon Environmental, Inc. (RCE) to perform the validation and verification of the ACR587 Bluesource – North Maine Woods Forestry Project (Project) for the reporting period of September 4, 2020 – September 3, 2021 and a crediting period of September 4, 2020 – September 3, 2040 under the American Carbon Registry (ACR) program. Bluesource acts as the project developer for the landowner and project proponent, North Maine Woods, LLC (North Maine Woods). This report is documentation of validation and verification activities that RCE performed for the Project. For the validation, RCE reviewed the project information as described in the Project Plan "Bluesource – North Maine Woods North Maine Woods Forestry Project" dated June 10, 2022. For the verification, RCE ensured that the GHG assertion was materially correct, that the data provided to RCE was well documented, and that if Bluesource made any material errors, that these errors were corrected.

RCE worked with Forest Resource Solutions and Technologies (FRST) to complete this validation and verification.

1.1 OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the validation are to evaluate:

- Conformance to the ACR standard and the approved ACR Methodology for Improved Forest Management (Methodology);
- The following elements of the GHG Plan:
    - Project boundary and procedures for establishing the project boundary;
    - Physical infrastructure, activities, technologies, and processes of the project;
    - GHGs, sources, and sinks within the project boundary;
    - Temporal boundary;
    - Description of and justification for the baseline scenario;
    - Methodologies, algorithms, and calculations that will be used to generate estimates of emissions and emission reductions/removal enhancements;
    - Process information, source identification/counts, and operational details;
    - Data management systems;
    - QA/QC procedures;
    - Processes for uncertainty assessments; and
    - Project-specific conformance to ACR eligibility criteria.
- Reported GHG baseline, ex ante estimated project emissions and emissions reductions/removal enhancements, leakage assessment, and impermanence risk assessment and mitigation (if applicable).

The objectives of the verification are to evaluate:

- The emissions reductions and to ensure that the assertion is materially correct;
- The data provided to RCE can be documented and if errors or omissions are detected, they be corrected

RCE retains all data and documents for seven years after the end of the project reporting period or for the duration required by ACR, whichever is longer.

1.2 Project Background

The Project is located on 86,221 acres of mixed hardwood and softwood forests located in Northern Maine. The project is entirely within Somerset County, Maine. Nearby population centers include Jackman and Greenville, Maine.

The project activity is improved forest management, with Tree-Star Timberland's forest management practices representing a significant improvement in the carbon storage and conservation value than higher return, more aggressive management regimes of industrial private lands in the region, which are characterized by shorter, even-aged rotations. Management decisions of the forest focus on sustainable merchantable timber products and natural forest growth. The project ensures long-term sustainable management of the forests, which could otherwise undergo significant commercial timber harvesting.

1.3 Responsible Party

Project Proponent
Tree-Star Timberlands, Ltd
Harlow St
Bangor, ME 04401
Louis Villeneuve
418-806-3040

Project Developer
Bluesource LLC
582 Market St., Suite 1505
San Francisco, CA
Josh Strauss, Vice President
949-233-1501

1.4 Validation and Verification Team

Lead Validator and Verifier: Zach Eyler
Biometrician: Andrea Eggleton, FRST
Professional Forester: Christian Eggleton, FRST
Forestry Analyst: Tim Facemire, FRST
Forestry Analyst: Andrew Russo, FRST
Internal Reviewer: Phillip Cunningham

1.5 Validation and Verification Criteria

1.5.1 Validation and Verification Standards, Guidelines, and Tools

- Bluesource – North Maine Woods Forestry Project (June 10, 2022)

- Bluesource – North Maine Woods Forestry Project Monitoring Report (April 29, 2022)
- ACR Standard, Version 6.0 (July 2019)
- ACR Validation and Verification Standard Version 1.1 (July 2019)
- Improved Forest Management Methodology for Quantifying GHG Removals and Emission Reductions through Increased Forest Carbon Sequestration on Non‐Federal U.S. Forestlands v.1.3, April 2018
- Errata and Clarifications - Improved Forest Management Methodology for Quantifying GHG Removals and Emission Reductions through Increased Forest Carbon Sequestration on Non‐Federal U.S. Forestlands v.1.3, September 30, 2021
- ISO 14064-3:2006 "Greenhouse gases – Part 3: Specification with guidance for the validation and verification of greenhouse gas assertions"

1.5.2 Level of Assurance

The verification was conducted to a reasonable level of assurance.

1.5.3 Materiality

The verification was conducted to ACR's required materiality threshold of +/-5% of the GHG project's emissions reductions or removal enhancements.

2 VALIDATION AND VERIFICATION PROCESS

As the first step in validation/verification activities, the Lead Validator/Verifier developed a Validation/Verification Plan to be followed throughout the validation and verification. The plan included the following activities:

- RCE completed a COI form on September 14, 2021 to identify any potential conflict of interest with the Project or Project Developer. The COI form was approved by ACR on September 21, 2021.
- RCE and Bluesource held a validation/verification kick-off meeting on September 22, 2021. During the kick-off meeting RCE reviewed the validation/verification objectives and process, reviewed the schedule, and submitted an initial document request.
- RCE performed a strategic review and risk assessment of the received data and support documents to understand the scope and areas of potential risk in the GHG emissions reductions.
- RCE developed a risk-based sampling plan based upon the strategic review and risk assessment. The validation/verification plan and sampling plan were used throughout the process and were revised as needed based upon additional risk assessments.
- The validation/verification team conducted the site visit to the Project to verify the inventory quality and forest management practices from October 25-28, 2021. During the site visit the Verification Team performed key personnel interviews, conducted sequential sampling of inventory plots, conducted reconnaissance of the Project area boundary, observed elements of natural forest management, and observed harvest locations (if applicable) during and preceding the reporting period.
    - The site visit was attended by the following verification team personnel:
        - FRST:

        - Tim Facemire
        - Andrew Russo
    - During the site visit, the Verification team met with the following individuals:
        - Bluesource
            - Megan McKinley
            - Aaron Wykhuis
        - LandVest
            - Thomas Coleman and Drew Banoch
- RCE performed a risk-based desktop review of the submitted validation/verification documents. The desktop review included an assessment of the GHG calculation methods and inputs, source data completeness, GHG management and monitoring systems and eligibility documentation.
- RCE conducted interviews and had conversations with Project personnel during the verification. Personnel interviewed include:
    - Megan McKinley – Bluesource
    - Aaron Wykhuis – Bluesource
    - Ben Parkhurst – Bluesource
    - Liz Lott – Bluesource
    - Tim Hipp - Bluesource
- RCE submitted requests for corrective actions, additional documentation, and clarifications as necessary to Bluesource throughout the validation/verification.
- RCE's internal reviewer conducted a review of the validation/verification sampling, report, and statement.
- RCE issued a final validation/verification report, verification statement, and List of Findings.
- RCE held an exit meeting with Bluesource.

3 VALIDATION AND VERIFICATION FINDINGS

3.1 PROJECT BOUNDARY AND ACTIVITIES

The Project is located on 86,221 acres of mixed hardwood and softwood forests located in Northern Maine. GHG emission reductions for the Project are quantified by comparing actual onsite carbon stocks against modeled baseline onsite carbon stocks and baseline carbon in harvested wood products. The difference in these Project and baseline carbon stocks year over year is the basis for calculating the Project's primary goal of maintaining and enhancing forest GHG pools.

The Project's temporal boundary is the crediting period from September 4, 2020 – September 3, 2040.

3.2 GHG SOURCES SINKS, AND RESERVOIRS

Table 1 shows the GHG emission sources included in the project boundary based on the Methodology. RCE confirmed that the Project Plan appropriately identifies the offset project boundary and includes all relevant SSRs.

Table 1. GHG Emissions Sources

Source	GHG	Description
Above-ground biomass	CO_2	Major carbon pool for project activity
Below-ground biomass	CO_2	Major carbon pool for project activity
Standing dead wood	CO_2	Major carbon pool in unmanaged stands for the project activity
Harvest wood products	CO_2	Major carbon pool for project activity
Market Effects	CO_2	Reductions in project outputs due to project activity may be compensated by other entities in the marketplace. Those emissions must be included in the quantification of project benefits.

3.3 ELIGIBILITY

3.3.1 ACR Eligibility

RCE confirmed the following ACR eligibility criteria listed in the ACR Standard, Version 6.0 by reviewing the project proponent's Project Plan, Monitoring Report, and calculations as well as other supporting documentation described throughout this report (a full list of documents reviewed is in Appendix A).

- Start Date: The project start date is September 4, 2020.
- Minimum Project Term: The minimum project term is 40 years.
- Crediting Period: The crediting period is 20 years as specified by the Methodology, September 4, 2020- September 3, 2040.
- Real: RCE confirmed that the GHG reductions follow the ACR methodology and are verifiable.
- Emission or Removal Origin: RCE confirmed that Treestar Timberlands, Ltd owns and has control over, or document effective control over the GHG sources/sinks from which the emissions reductions or removals originate.
- Offset Title: RCE confirmed that all Project lands are owned directly by the Project Proponent (Treestar Timberlands, Ltd), which hold full legal title.
- Additional: RCE confirmed that the project is additional as described in Section 3.4.
- Regulatory Compliance: RCE confirmed that the Project was in compliance with all applicable regulations.
- Permanent: RCE confirmed that the Project correctly applied the ACR Tool for Risk Analysis and Buffer Determination to account for permanence. A total risk score of 16% was confirmed.
- Net of Leakage: RCE confirmed that the Project correctly accounted for leakage per the Methodology.
- Independently Validated and Verified: RCE is a third-party validation and verification body that the project proponent has contracted to validate and verify the Project.
- Environmental and Community Assessments: RCE reviewed project impacts as described in section 3.6 of this report.

3.3.2 Methodology Eligibility

RCE reviewed the Project against the ACR Methodology eligibility and applicability conditions and confirmed the following:

- The Project is located on non-federally owned private forestland.
- Tree-Star Timberlands, Ltd controls the timber rights on the forestland and can legally harvest.
- The Project may have harvesting, but Tree-Star Timberlands, Ltd is certified by the Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI) for all their lands.
- The Project is not on tribal lands.
- The Project is not on public non-federal lands.
- The Project does not use non-native species where adequately stocked native stands were converted for forestry or other land uses after 1997.
- The Project has not drained or flooded wetlands on or after the project start date.
- North Maine Woods owns all lands and timber rights on the Project area.
- The Project's stocking levels will increase well above the baseline conditions for the duration of the Project and by the end of the Crediting Period.

3.4 ADDITIONALITY

The Project meets the requirements for the demonstration of additionality specified by the ACR Standard and the Methodology.

3.4.1 Regulatory Surplus Test

RCE confirmed that there are no existing laws, regulations, statutes, legal rulings, or other regulatory frameworks in effect as of the start date that requires the Project activity and the associated GHG emissions reductions; thus the Project passes the regulatory surplus test.

3.4.2 Common Practice Test

The geographic region for the Project includes northern Maine. Throughout the geographic region, industrial forestland is heavily cut, often through clear-cutting and high-grading, and is managed to maximize NPV of the forestland investment. The project is an industrial, forestland ownership. Without the Project the property would have been likely managed for timber production and would resemble typical industrial forestlands in the region. With Project implementation the forestland carbon stocks will exceed the common practice found in the region.

3.4.3 Implementation Barriers Test

The Project chose to assess the financial barriers test per the ACR Standard and Methodology. RCE confirmed that carbon funding is reasonably expected to incentivize the Project's implementation. Due to the Project being implemented, Treestar Timberlands, Ltd loses the ability to monetize timber harvests during the life of the Project. Bluesource provided a financial assessment comparison of NPV between the baseline scenario with harvesting and the project scenario without harvesting but including revenue from carbon credits. The baseline scenario NPV was significantly greater demonstrating that carbon funding is integral to the project activity.

3.5 Permanence

RCE and FRST confirmed that the Project correctly applied the ACR Tool for Risk Analysis and Buffer Determination to account for permanence. A total risk score of 16% was confirmed.

RCE and FRST also confirmed that the Project committed to a 40-year agreement with ACR by signing the AFOLU Carbon Project Reversal Risk Mitigation Agreement. Through this agreement and the ACR Tool the Project adequately addressed potential causes of unintentional reversals.

3.6 Leakage

RCE and FRST confirmed that the Project correctly accounted for leakage. The Project demonstrated that that there is no activity-shifting leakage since there is an entity-wide management certification that covers all entity owned lands. The Project also correctly accounted for market leakage per the Methodology – since wood products decreased by greater than 25%, the market leakage is 40%.

3.7 Programmatic Development Approach

RCE confirmed that the Project is utilizing a Programmatic Development Approach (PDA). The Project currently only has one "site" but expects to potentially add additional area to the Project in the future. RCE confirmed that the Project has completed the required PDA Project Design Document and included it as an addendum to the GHG Plan.

3.8 Environmental and Community Impacts

The Project Plan includes a summary of the Project activity's net positive environmental and community impacts. The Project will provide habitat protection for wildlife, plant species, and trees, water quality protection and protection from soil erosion and degradation among other benefits. The Project is not expected to cause any negative environmental impacts.

Sustainable Development Goals

Table 2. SDGs

Goal	Impact (+, -, N/A)	Rationale	RCE Conclusion
GOAL 1: No Poverty	N/A		Not included.
GOAL 2: Zero Hunger	N/A		Not included.
GOAL 3: Good Health and Well-being	N/A		Not included.
GOAL 4: Quality Education	N/A		Not included.
GOAL 5: Gender Equality	N/A		Not included.
GOAL 6: Clean Water and Sanitation	+	The project proponent has watershed protection goals that the Project will help meet.	Project will provide this benefit.
GOAL 7: Affordable and Clean Energy	N/A		Not included.
GOAL 8: Decent Work and Economic Growth	N/A		Not included.

GOAL 9: Industry, Innovation and Infrastructure	N/A		Not included.
GOAL 10: Reduced Inequality	N/A		Not included.
GOAL 11: Sustainable Cities and Communities	N/A		Not included.
GOAL 12: Responsible Consumption and Production	N/A		Not included.
GOAL 13: Climate Action	+	The goal of the project proponent in committing to sustainable forest management practices will be to continually sequester and prevent intensive forest management.	Project will provide this benefit.
GOAL 14: Life Below Water	N/A		Not included.
GOAL 15: Life on Land	+	By maintaining forest and ensuring sustainable forest management the Project provides conservation benefits.	Project will provide this benefit.
GOAL 16: Peace and Justice Strong Institutions	N/A		Not included.
GOAL 17: Partnerships to achieve the Goal	N/A		Not included.

3.9 Local Stakeholder Consultation

No formal stakeholder consultation occurred since the Project is held on private lands.

3.10 Monitoring Plan

The Project Plan includes a Monitoring Plan that identifies all monitored data and parameters. RCE confirmed that the monitoring parameters and approaches conform to the methods required by the Methodology. The plan includes all relevant data parameters and appropriately identifies units of measurements, data sources, methodologies, uncertainty, monitoring frequency and procedures, and QA/QC procedures. After discussions with Bluesource and reviews of project documents, RCE determined that the Monitoring Plan accurately reflects how Project data is monitored and recorded and there are no deviations relevant to the Project activity against the requirements of the Methodology. Bluesource and Treestar Timberlands, Ltd implemented the monitoring plan as stated in the Project Plan during Project activities.

3.11 Baseline Scenario

The Project's baseline scenario represents aggressive industrial harvests with stricter parameters than recommended state practices, targeted to maximize net present value at a 6% discount rate for private lands. The baseline scenario applies harvesting across the Project area as allowed by the Methodology to maximize NPV.

The Project's baseline model simulates a range of harvest types and rotation lengths based on legal requirements and simulated growth within each stratum. The objective of modeling was to determine

possible timber harvests in the project area over 100-years within the framework of legal and reasonable harvest constraints.

Stands were modeled for several different prescriptions, including no-harvest, shelterwood removal, single tree selection, variable retention, clearcut, and diameter limit.

Bluesource utilized the USDA's Forest Vegetation Simulator (FVS) northeast variant to model harvests and yields. Growth was calibrated using tree cores taken on or near plots, which were used to assign site index values calculated from site index curves and associated equations from Carmean et al 1989. National Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) soil survey site index data supplemented tree core data where cores did not produce a valid sample. FRST reviewed all data and calculations related to site index and confirmed that a reasonable species and site index for the region was assigned on an individual plot basis to appropriately calibrate growth. The process was confirmed to be consistently and systematically applied to each plot.

RCE reviewed the resulting baseline outputs to ensure that they reflected the modeling objectives and the legal additionality requirements.

3.12 On-site Inventory Verification Check

In preparation for and during the site visits, the Verification Team reviewed evidence necessary to verify Project inventory estimates.

The Project inventory consists of three forested strata. The Verification Team confirmed that stocking and vegetation comprising a particular stratum were consistent with descriptions in inventory data and the Project Plan. FRST randomized the plot order and measured at least one plot in each stratum during the site visit.

The current inventory contains 245 permanent, fixed-radius plots. At each plot location, trees were measured in two nested plots: a larger 1/15th acre plot with radius of 30.4 feet, and a smaller 1/100th acre plot with radius of 11.8 feet. The larger plot measured all trees greater than or equal to 5 inches DBH while the smaller, nested plot measured all living trees between 1-4.99 inches.

Given this sample design and Project size, the Verification Team was required to achieve a minimum of thirteen plots within the project to successfully verify inventory stocking levels. The Project did indeed pass a paired t-test with the thirteen minimum plots.

Project Area

During the site visit, the Verification Team conducted boundary-line reconnaissance by visiting Project boundary edge lines and points, plotting edge points with GPS receivers, and determining whether there were discrepancies with the digital Project boundary files provided by Bluesource and the physical boundary witnessed on-site. This was done to determine the risk that Project area inaccuracies could contribute to a material misstatement in Project emission reductions. To the extent feasible, the Verification Team confirmed that the Project area boundary was appropriate and accurate.

3.13 Project Data and GHG Emissions Reduction Assertion

RCE reviewed the Project Plan and Project data and calculations to ensure that appropriate equations were used in calculating baseline emissions, project emissions, and net emissions reductions.

3.13.1 Baseline Emissions

RCE and FRST confirmed that the baseline emissions were correctly calculated. See more detail in section 3.9.

3.13.2 Project Emissions

RCE and FRST confirmed that the project emissions were correctly calculated.

3.13.3 Emissions Reductions

RCE verified that Bluesource calculated emissions reductions according to relevant Methodology equations and that the methods are included in the Project Plan.

RCE and FRST assessed quantitative uncertainty of the emission reduction calculations and the methodologies and applicable data sets and sources. RCE and FRST confirmed that the Project has appropriate measures in place to address uncertainty and that the sampling error associated with the mean of the estimated emission reductions/removals was less than +/-10%. RCE and FRST also confirmed that all defaults, projections, and other data used were correct and consistent with expectations.

RCE recalculated emissions reductions for the first reporting period according to the equations defined in the Methodology and the Project Plan and found the Project assertion to be free of material misstatement.

4 Validation and Verification Results

RCE developed a combined List of Findings for both the validation and verification. The List of Findings noted all corrective action requests (CARs), non-material findings (NMs), additional documentation requests (ADRs), and clarification requests (CRs). Bluesource appropriately responded to all items in the List of Findings. The List of Findings is provided as Appendix B.

5 Validation and Verification Conclusion

RCE conducted a risk-based validation and verification of the ACR587 Bluesource – North Maine Woods Forestry Project that included a strategic review of the project data, documentation, and emission reduction calculations. The objective of the validation activities was to assess the project design, baseline scenario, and monitoring plan and to ensure compliance of the Project Plan to the assessment criteria defined in Section 1.5.1. The objective of the verification activities was to conduct an independent assessment of the Project's initial reporting period and resulting ex-post GHG emission reductions.

RCE concludes to a reasonable level of assurance that the Project's GHG assertion is free of material misstatement. The data and information supporting the GHG assertion were based on industry defaults

and actual historical records. The emission reductions resulting from the reporting period September 4, 2020 – September 3, 2021 can be considered in conformance with the:

- ACR Standard, Version 6.0 (July 2019)
- ACR Validation and Verification Standard Version 1.1 (May 2018)
- Improved Forest Management Methodology for Quantifying GHG Removals and Emission Reductions through Increased Forest Carbon Sequestration on Non‐Federal U.S. Forestlands v.1.3, April 2018
- Errata and Clarifications - Improved Forest Management Methodology for Quantifying GHG Removals and Emission Reductions through Increased Forest Carbon Sequestration on Non‐Federal U.S. Forestlands v.1.3, September 30, 2021
- ISO 14064-3:2006 "Greenhouse gases – Part 3: Specification with guidance for the validation and verification of greenhouse gas assertions"

Table 3 provides a summary of the Emission Reduction Tons (ERTs).

Table 3. Total ERTs

Vintage	Removal ERTs ($mtCO_2e$)	Other ERTs ($mtCO_2e$)	Total GHG Reductions and Removals ($mtCO_2e$)		Risk Buffer ($mtCO_2e$)	Final ERTs ($mtCO_2e$)
2020	59,179	80,478	139,657		22,345	117,312
2021	122,335	166,368	288,703		46,193	242,510
Total	**181,514**	**246,846**	**428,360**		**68,538**	**359,822**

Note: Totals might not sum due to rounding.

Lead Validator and Verifier Signature

Zach Eyler

Internal Reviewer Signature

Phillip Cunningham

6 APPENDIX A—DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

1. 5505-275 Deed Merriweather to Tree-Star (R2204379xAB81A).signed
2. G1_WestBranch_ConservationEasement_2003
3. NMaineWoods_ACR_PDA_PDD_5_17_22
4. NMaineWoods_GHGPlan_Series
5. NMW_LargeMap_Series
6. NMW_SVMap_Series
7. NorthMaineWoods_100Yr_calcs_Series
8. NorthMaineWoods_Boundary_10_14_21_Shapefile
9. NorthMaineWoods_CC_Series
10. NorthMaineWoods_CC1_Series
11. NorthMaineWoods_CC2_Series
12. NorthMaineWoods_CheckCruiseSummary
13. NorthMaineWoods_FVS_Plots_Series
14. NorthMaineWoods_GROW_Series
15. NorthMaineWoods_IndTreeGrow
16. NorthMaineWoods_Inventory_Master_9_15_21
17. NorthMaineWoods_invStrata_10_14_21_Shapefile
18. NorthMaineWoods_Plots_9_13_21_Shapefile
19. NorthMaineWoods_Regeneration_Calcs
20. NorthMaineWoods_RMZ_10_14_2021_Shapefile
21. NorthMaineWoods_RP_ERT_HWP_Series
22. NorthMaineWoods_RP1_MonitoringReport_Series
23. NorthMaineWoods_SHW60_Series
24. NorthMaineWoods_SHW80_Series
25. NorthMaineWoods_SiteIndex_Series
26. NorthMaineWoods_SiteIndex_Wcores_Series
27. NorthMaineWoods_SiteVisit_CO2_Series
28. NorthMaineWoods_Start_RP_Series
29. NorthMaineWoods_Strata_10_14_21_Shapefile
30. NorthMaineWoods_STS50BA10_Series
31. NorthMaineWoods_STS75BA10_Series
32. SFI-NSF_CERTIFICATE_C0624942-FM1
33. TreeStar_CarbonPlot_Methodology_10_23_2020
34. TreeStar_PCT_2021_completed_Shapefile

7 APPENDIX B—LIST OF FINDINGS

Includes Corrective Action Requests, Non-Material Findings, Additional Documentation Requests, and Clarification Requests, as necessary.

Corrective Action Request, Non-Material Finding, Additional Documentation Request, or Clarification Request ID#	Finding	Client response	RCE response	Additional Client response	Additional RCE response	Additional Client response		Open or Closed
CAR 1	In 'NorthMaineWoods_RP_ERT_HWP_03_11_2022' on the ACR_IFM_ERT_Calcs tab on row 14 - sum stocks baseline, it appears that the yearly value of HWP Baseline is being counted for every preceding year as well as the current for sum stocks. After discussion with ACR, the cumulative HWP Baseline is only incorporated upon the year the baseline stocks drop below the average baseline.	Row 14 equation has been updated to not include preceding year.	Thank you for making this change, this item may be closed.					Closed
CAR 2	In 'NorthMaineWoods_RP_ERT_HWP_03_11_2022' on the GHG_Plan_Tables tab the Buffer credits is being multiplied by 0.18 instead of the correct buffer factor.	Buffer credit in row26 of ERT sheet on GHG_Plan_Tables is now multiplied by the correct buffer factor(0.16).	Thank you for making this change, this item may be closed.					Closed
CAR 3	On page 32 and 41 of the NMaineWoods_GHGPLan_03_11_12 it lists the start date as August 12, 2020.	Start Date and RP date have been updated to Sept 04, 2020 and Sept 03, 2021 respectively in the GHG plan.	This has not been changed on page 41. Other GHG Plan issues are tracked in CAR 4.	Start date on page 41 has been updated to September 4, 2020.	The start date has been updated but the next sentence still suggests the project interval ends on August 11th?	The project interval end date has been updated to September 3.	Confirmed, this item may be closed.	Closed
CAR 4	There are corrections that are needed within the 'NMaineWoods_GHGPlan_04_14_22' document: In section A7. the total GHG removal over the first 20 years is not 3,090,258. In Section d.1 Decay Class, Table E1-3, have 4 listed despite 5 being measured in the field and described in the CarbonPlot_Methodology. Table E1-1 has not had Constrained Area acres updated. In section E5. only the word 'North' has been included from the Project Title. Update the Table of Contents. There are corrections needed in the 'NorthMaineWoods_RP1_MonitoringReport_4_26_22' document: Section II.7 Current crediting period should only be for 20 years. Section V Decay Class reads 4. Section V Defect only includes dead defect %s.	Section A7 total GHG removal over the first 20 years has been updated to 3,090,251. Decay class has been updated to 5 classes in the GHG plan. Table E1-1 has been updated. Section E5 has been updated. Table of contents has been updated. Section II.7 of the Monitoring report has been updated. Section V has been updated to 5 decay classes. Section V Defect has been updated to include live and dead defect.	Thank you for making these changes, they have been confirmed. This item may be closed.					Closed
NM 1								
ADR 1	As the SSURGO dataset is commonly updated, please provide the full soils data database used in the determination of site index, as referenced in 'SI_W_Soil_8_13_21'.	SSURGO dataset uploaded to SiteIndex folder.	Thank you for providing this document, this item may be closed.					Closed
ADR 2	Please provide the text of the Conservation Easement that is mentioned in section B(2) of the deed.	The Conservation Easement has been provided.	The conservation easement aligns with the mechanisms and management activities of a forest carbon project. This item may be closed.					Closed
ADR 3	Please provide source for prices in the Stumpage_Prices tab of the NorthMaineWoods_100Yr_calcs_03_08_2022.	Timber price source uploaded to RegionalForestryDocs folder	Thank you for providing this document the proper values have been confirmed, this item may be closed.					Closed
ADR 4	How did the property owner obtain fixed cost estimates for the property? Please provide associated documentation.	Fixed costs estimates are regional averages and were obtained from interviews with consulting foresters and other landowners in the region with similar properties and management. This has been updated in the GHG plan.	Thank you for including these details in the GHG plan, this item may be closed.					Closed
ADR 5	Please provide evidence of the 5% field QA/QC procedures, including documents like checked cruise cards.	A check cruise summary has been provided in the shared verification folder.	Thank you for providing this documentation, this has been confirmed to meet the standard. This item may be closed.					Closed
ADR 6	Please provide the SFI certification that is mentioned in the GHG Plan and Monitoring Report.	The SFI certificate has been provided in the shared folder.	Thank you for providing this document. This item may be closed.					Closed
CR 1	"The Forestry Rules of Maine 2017," available: https://www.maine.gov/dacf/mfs/publications/handbooks_guides/rule_book.pdf, identify that "In many cases, a permit is required to harvest timber in P-RR subdistricts" and "Operating in a P-FW requires consultation with IF&W and may require a permit from MFS. Refer to the complete Chapter 27 rules for more information" (Page 31). How are these incorporated into the baseline considerations? Is there potential that the silvicultural prescriptions identified for these areas would not be permitted?	In speaking with local foresters during interviews, Bluesource ascertained that harvesting in unorganized townships (ie, those that fall under Chapter 27 rules) is, in practice, not restrictive. Obtaining permits is not considered a barrier to timber operations at the discretion of the landowner. However, for conservatism, areas marked by the state as P-FW that coincide with the project area were already included in the RMZ and are thus constrained by those parameters. There was a small overlap of ~25 acres of P-RR designation in the very SE corner of the property. This has been added to the RMZ in its newest iteration.	These additional acres have been confirmed, this item may be closed.					Closed
CR 2	Within the 'NMaineWoods_GHGPlan_03_11_22' document the CC prescription says it applies only to softwood and Red Spruce strata, but red spruce is not listed as a separate strata in the plan. Please clarify.	Prescription description for CC(clearcut) changed to "Applies only to softwood strata"	Thank you for making this change, this item may be closed.					Closed

CR 3	Within the 'NMaineWoods_GHGPlan_03_11_22' document the CC1 prescription says it is "Constrained to occur at most every 40 years." but also "Overstory removal occurs every 5 years" regarding the same Rx. These two time restrictions seem to conflict, please clarify.	For CC1(overstory removal), the prescription updated to following: "Residual trees per acre for first cut = 450; Natural sprouting and regeneration; Stand basal area > 70 square feet per acre; Merchantable timber > 600 cubic feet per acre. Overstory removal occurs after 5 years of the first cut to residual trees per acre of 450. Retain trees <6 inches DBH. Constrained to occur at most every 40 years."	Thank you for making this change, this item may be closed.					Closed
CR 4	Is this project enrolled in other environmental asset programs for non carbon benefits?	No, although there is a conservation easement. The easement is not restrictive in terms of forest management. It is also not prescriptive in terms of goals or outcomes.	Thank you for this clarification. This item may be closed.					Closed
CR 5	Are there any threatened or endangered species known to be in the project area? If so how does the project account for potential harvesting restrictions these might cause in the baseline?	There are no T&E species or critical habitat within the project area as designated by USFWS, although the area does support Canada Lynx and sedge wren. Both Canada Lynx and sedge wren are known to thrive in early successional forest habitats, particularly in densely regenerating conifer stands, which the baseline scenario maintains and expands across the project area. Sedge wren also benefit from grasslands, marshes, and other non-forested wetlands, which have either been omitted from the project area or included in the RMZ per state BMPs. The state of Maine has element occurrences of particular species of concern (unlisted, not under protection) within the project area, specifically rusty blackbird, yellow rail, and wood turtle. Of these, only wood turtles have BMPs associated with timber harvest. We have included this overlapping wood turtle area (around Baker Lake in the NE of the property) in the updated version of the RMZ. The RMZ as it stands now, as well as the omission of open wetlands and marshes from the project area (favored habitats of yellow rail and rusty blackbird), is sufficient to account for any potential harvest restrictions associated with these species.	Thank you for this clarification. This item may be closed.					Closed