

# FOREST MANAGEMENT AND STUMP-TO-FOREST GATE CHAIN-OF-CUSTODY SURVEILLANCE EVALUATION REPORT

## *Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources – County Forest Program*

### **SCS-FM/COC-00083G**

101 S. Webster St. PO Box 7921, Madison, Wisconsin, USA 53707-7921

[Jeffrey.barkley@wisconsin.gov](mailto:Jeffrey.barkley@wisconsin.gov)

<http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/CountyForests/>

CERTIFIED	EXPIRATION
22/Dec/2014	21/Dec/2019

DATE OF FIELD AUDIT
08-12/Aug/2016
DATE OF LAST UPDATE
21/Sept/2016

#### *SCS Contact:*

**Brendan Grady** | Director  
Forest Management Certification  
+1.510.452.8000

[bgrady@scsglobalservices.com](mailto:bgrady@scsglobalservices.com)

## Foreword

Cycle in annual surveillance audits

**SCS global**  
SERVICES  
2000 Powell Street, Ste. 600, Emeryville, CA 94608 USA  
+1.510.452.8000 main | +1.510.452.8001 fax  
www.SCSglobalServices.com  
*Setting the standard for sustainability™*

<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <sup>st</sup> annual audit	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2 <sup>nd</sup> annual audit	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <sup>rd</sup> annual audit	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 <sup>th</sup> annual audit
<b>Name of Forest Management Enterprise (FME) and abbreviation used in this report:</b>			
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources – County Forest Program (WCFP or FME)			

All certificates issued by SCS under the aegis of the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) require annual audits to ascertain ongoing conformance with the requirements and standards of certification. A public summary of the initial evaluation is available on the FSC Certificate Database <http://info.fsc.org/>.

Pursuant to FSC and SCS guidelines, annual / surveillance audits are not intended to comprehensively examine the full scope of the certified forest operations, as the cost of a full-scope audit would be prohibitive and it is not mandated by FSC audit protocols. Rather, annual audits are comprised of three main components:

- A focused assessment of the status of any outstanding conditions or Corrective Action Requests (CARs; see discussion in section 4.0 for those CARs and their disposition as a result of this annual audit);
- Follow-up inquiry into any issues that may have arisen since the award of certification or prior to this audit; and
- As necessary given the breadth of coverage associated with the first two components, an additional focus on selected topics or issues, the selection of which is not known to the certificate holder prior to the audit.

**Organization of the Report**

This report of the results of our evaluation is divided into two sections. Section A provides the public summary and background information that is required by the Forest Stewardship Council. This section is made available to the general public and is intended to provide an overview of the evaluation process, the management programs and policies applied to the forest, and the results of the evaluation. Section A will be posted on the FSC Certificate Database (<http://info.fsc.org/>) no less than 90 days after completion of the on-site audit. Section B contains more detailed results and information for the use by the FME.

## Table of Contents

---

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY .....	4
1. GENERAL INFORMATION .....	4
1.1 Annual Audit Team.....	4
1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation .....	5
1.3 Standards Employed .....	5
2 ANNUAL AUDIT DATES AND ACTIVITIES .....	5
2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities .....	5
2.2 Evaluation of Management Systems .....	11
3. CHANGES IN MANAGEMENT PRACTICES .....	11
4. RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION.....	11
4.1 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations .....	11
4.2 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations .....	14
5. STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS .....	19
5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted .....	19
5.2 Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Responses from the Team, Where Applicable .....	19
6. CERTIFICATION DECISION .....	20
7. CHANGES IN CERTIFICATION SCOPE .....	20
8. ANNUAL DATA UPDATE .....	20
8.1 Social Information.....	29
8.2 Annual Summary of Pesticide and Other Chemical Use .....	29
SECTION B – APPENDICES (CONFIDENTIAL).....	31
Appendix 1 – List of FMUs Selected For Evaluation.....	31
Appendix 2 – List of Stakeholders Consulted.....	31
Appendix 3 – Additional Audit Techniques Employed.....	32
Appendix 4 – Pesticide Derogations .....	32
Appendix 5 – Detailed Observations.....	32
Appendix 6 – Chain of Custody Indicators for FMEs.....	72

## SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY

### 1. General Information

#### 1.1 Annual Audit Team

<b>Auditor Name:</b>	Kyle Meister	<b>Auditor role:</b>	FSC Lead Auditor
<b>Qualifications:</b>	<p>Kyle Meister is a Certification Forester with SCS Global Services. He has been with SCS since 2008 and has conducted FSC FM pre-assessments, evaluations, and surveillance audits in Brazil, Panama, Mexico, Costa Rica, Bolivia, Indonesia, India, Japan, New Zealand, Spain, and all major forest producing regions of the United States. He has conducted COC assessments in Oregon, Pennsylvania, and California. Mr. Meister has successfully completed CAR Lead Verifier, ISO 9001:2008 Lead Auditor, and SA8000 Social Systems Introduction and Basic Auditor Training Courses. He holds a B.S. in Natural Resource Ecology and Management and a B.A. in Spanish from the University of Michigan; and a Master of Forestry from the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies.</p>		
<b>Auditor Name:</b>	Mike Ferrucci	<b>Auditor role:</b>	SFI Lead Auditor
<b>Qualifications:</b>	<p>Mike Ferrucci is qualified as a RAB-QSA Lead Auditor (ISO 14001 Environmental Management Systems), as an SFI Lead Auditor for Forest Management, Procurement, and Chain of Custody, as an FSC Lead Auditor Forest Management and Chain of Custody, as a Tree Farm Group Certification Lead Auditor, and as a GHG Lead Auditor. Mike has led Sustainable Forest Initiative (SFI) certification and precertification reviews throughout the United States. He has also led or participated in joint SFI and Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) certification projects in nearly one dozen states and a joint scoping or precertification gap-analysis project on tribal lands throughout the United States. He also co-led the pioneering pilot dual evaluation of the Lakeview Stewardship Unit on the Fremont-Winema National Forest.</p> <p>Mike Ferrucci has 33 years of forest management experience. His expertise is in sustainable forest management planning; in certification of forests as sustainably managed; in the application of easements for large-scale working forests, and in the ecology, silviculture, and management of mixed species forests, with an emphasis on regeneration and management of native hardwood species. Mike has conducted or participated in assessments of forest management operations throughout the United States, with field experience in 4 countries and 33 states. Mike has been a member of the Society of American Foresters for over thirty-five years. He is Past Chair of the SFI Auditor’s Forum. Mike is also a Lecturer at the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, where he has taught graduate courses and workshops in forest management, harvesting operations, professional forest ethics, private forestry, and financial analysis.</p>		
<b>Auditor Name:</b>	Michelle Matteo	<b>Auditor role:</b>	Wildlife biologist/ assistant FSC/SFI auditor
<b>Qualifications:</b>	<p>Michelle L. Matteo is a lead auditor for SCS based in Southern New England. Michelle is a forester, arborist and maintains a (state) Massachusetts Forester License as well as an International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) Arborist Certification. Michelle has</p>		

	completed a 3-day ISO 19011 training designed & presented in relation to the FSC Standards, completed hundreds of CoC audits, certification audits of the Northeast Master Logger program, and is a team auditor for Forest Management audits. She earned an MS in Forestry and BS in Wildlife & Fisheries Biology, both from the University of Massachusetts.
--	--

## 1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation

A. Number of days spent on-site assessing the applicant:	3.5
B. Number of auditors participating in on-site evaluation:	3
C. Additional days spent on preparation, stakeholder consultation, and post-site follow-up:	2
<b>D. Total number of person days used in evaluation:</b>	<b>12.5</b>

## 1.3 Standards Employed

### 1.3.1. Applicable FSC-Accredited Standards

Title	Version	Date of Finalization
FSC-US Forest Management Standard	1-0	July 2010
FSC-STD-50-001	1-2	November 2010
All standards employed are available on the websites of FSC International ( <a href="http://www.fsc.org">www.fsc.org</a> ), the FSC-US ( <a href="http://www.fscus.org">www.fscus.org</a> ) or the SCS Standards page ( <a href="http://www.scsglobalservices.com/certification-standards-and-program-documents">www.scsglobalservices.com/certification-standards-and-program-documents</a> ). Standards are also available, upon request, from SCS Global Services ( <a href="http://www.SCSglobalServices.com">www.SCSglobalServices.com</a> ).		

### 1.3.2. SCS Interim FSC Standards

Title	Version	Date of Finalization
SCS COC Indicators for FMEs	5-1	December 2012
This SCS Interim Standard was developed by modifying SCS' Generic Interim Standard to reflect forest management in the region and by incorporating relevant components of the Draft Regional / National Standard and comments from stakeholders. More than one month prior to the start of the field evaluation, the SCS Draft Interim Standard for the country / region was sent out for comment to stakeholders identified by FSC International, SCS, the forest managers under evaluation, and the National Initiative. A copy of the standard is available at <a href="http://www.scsglobalservices.com/certification-standards-and-program-documents">www.scsglobalservices.com/certification-standards-and-program-documents</a> or upon request from SCS Global Services ( <a href="http://www.SCSglobalServices.com">www.SCSglobalServices.com</a> ).		

## 2 Annual Audit Dates and Activities

### 2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities

09 – August – 2016	
FMU/Location/ sites visited*	Activities/ notes
Washburn County Forestry Office/Spooner	Opening Meeting, Part 1: Client update, introductions, review audit scope, audit plan, intro/update to FSC and SCS standards and protocols, review of open CARs/OBS, and final site selection.
Washburn (all auditors)	All auditors: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site 7 (4-14): 247 ac mix of aspen regeneration harvest and oak thinning, managed for early successional habitat. Review of cutting report; natural heritage information</li> </ol>

	<p>reviewed and no resources were impacted due to distance of harvest from these areas. Discussion of stand origins in 1930s and management since; previous attempts to create smaller stands for grouse, but now county is trying to increase stand sizes for larger landscape features and to lower road and harvest costs. Interviews with staff and contractors. Inspection of oak thinning area and discussion on operations and residual damage. Observation of rutting repair site post-storm.</p> <p>Matteo and Meister:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Site 6 (2-15): 66 ac mix of aspen regeneration harvest and pine thinning (marked, but not harvested). Inspection of wildlife opening maintained through periodic mowing and/or herbicide treatments every 3-5 years. Inspection of riparian management zone adjacent to harvest site; distances and harvest restrictions met through marking. Discussion on collaboration with fisheries.</li> <li>3. Site 3 (42-12): 216 ac mix of aspen regeneration harvest and oak/ northern hardwood thinning under active operations. Observation of oak thinning area; good use of slash to control erosion and compaction and avoidance of wetlands. Little to no detectable residual damage. Retention of white oak, red oak, red maple, sugar maple, white pine, and red pine. Interview with contractor in aspen regeneration harvest. Inspection of aspen regeneration harvest. Good use of slash over skid trails due to use of hot-saw and harvester. Property boundary marked with blue paint and respected by loggers.</li> <li>4. Site 1 (30-10): 306 ac mix of aspen regeneration harvest and oak thinning (completed and closed). Inspection of oak thinning area and review of residual damage procedures. County sought damages due to contractor exceeding residual damage threshold, for which the contractor paid. Inspection of young aspen stand that was regenerated as a part this harvest and the adjacent oak thinning areas. A wet meadow was noted, which was avoided during harvest and marked by staff. Some residual pine and oak within young aspen stand had fallen or became snags.</li> </ol> <p>Ferrucci:</p> <p>Site Z Gull Lake Oak Prescribed Fire: 2011 Scarified Using “Salmon Blade”; 2012 Shelterwood Establishment Harvest; 2015 Regeneration Survey 70% mil-acre plots stocked with oak, but 2,400 Oak and 9,500 Maple seedlings per acre was determined to require further treatment; 2016 burned 22 acres in 2 units which successfully controlled the Red maple; oaks are sprouting back.</p> <p>Site ZZ Gardner Lake Fire Road: This road is also an ATV Road Route, serving as a connector. It was impacted by a recent severe</p>
--	---

	<p>thunderstorm (10+ inches in a few hours) but is currently being graded.</p> <p>Site 11 Tract 4-12, Contract #4113 Completed Partial Harvest on 109 acres: Two different harvest units were inspected, both showing retention of healthy, desirable trees, good utilization, and minimal impacts to soils or residual trees. Most of area received an improvement thinning, but a small area had a selection harvest. Discussed current methods for assessing northern hardwood stands involving detailed assessment including total and crop-tree stocking, interfering vegetation, and impacts from deer factoring into a matrix for deciding whether to attempt selection or begin to regenerate.</p> <p>Site 10 Tract 29-12, Contract #4126, Jack Pine Clear-cut and regeneration treatments on 25 acres: Fall 2014 scarified using bulldozer equipped with a straight blade; late fall 2014 clear-cut, retaining scattered Red Pine and some clumps of oak; sprint 2015 aerial seeding with follow-up check for seed on ground; germination confirmed summer 2016 with formal regeneration survey scheduled in 2017 at 3-year mark. Confirmed presence of established Jack Pine and oak seedlings on most of scarified areas. Discussed biodiversity aspects of the Jack Pine management program with the WDNR Wildlife Biologist, who confirmed that Jack Pine regeneration treatments with varied levels and patterns of retention are appropriate, and that larger areas of such treatments are desirable and are implemented in the surrounding landscape, supported by actions on county forests.</p> <p>Site 9 Tract 5-13, Contract #4124 Completed Red Pine Thinning on 90 acres: The stand was planted in the early 1980's after a very large fire. Cut 1 row in 3 in places, with a 2-row removal alternating with 1 in 3 in other places. Healthy stand, no residual damage.</p>
Washburn County Forestry Office	Review of contracts and training, harvest/ sales, and chemical use records.
<b>10 – August – 2016</b>	
<b>FMU/Location/ sites visited*</b>	<b>Activities/ notes</b>
Burnett County Forestry Office/Siren (SFI only; Meister & Matteo)	NA – SFI only
Polk (SFI only; Ferrucci)	
<b>11 – August – 2016</b>	
<b>FMU/Location/ sites visited*</b>	<b>Activities/ notes</b>
Sawyer County Forestry Office/Hayward	Introductions, overview of FMU, and finalize itinerary.
Sawyer South (Ferrucci and Matteo)	<p>General notes from discussions with County Forest employees &amp; DNR Liaisons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RTE/special concern species are often found in rivers and</li> </ul>

	<p>wetlands. Ephemeral pools are generally protected, but not large enough to map.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Old BMPs Manual did not have a wetland buffer strip specification; 2010 version specifies a 15-foot buffer zone from wetland edge.</li> <li>• Some counties give digital information to the operator so they can have the digital map on their machines.</li> <li>• Question about maps and why they appear hand drawn – Select staff replied that they print out a screen shot of the selected data sets/GIS information on the computer, then use a light table to trace the GIS datasets and draw the site map.</li> </ul> <p>Site 1, Tract 4-14, Contract 2796-14, Completed Harvest on 88 acres:  3 blocks viewed, all tree harvest, retaining oak, conifer, &amp; cherry; aspen clearcut with retention; and spruce thinning/release with removal of aspen and hardwood. Cut was scheduled to be in winter or dry summer conditions, however winter did not freeze, so logger used many mats in order to access site. Cut to length processor and Ponsse four-wheeler used. Uneven edge viewed on white spruce area. Good retention of species such as ash, oak, no aspen were retained. Green tree retention notes leave species, commonly noted to always leave young conifers and oak. Generally a narrative of what and why is retained, however no notation about aspen and why some representation was not viewed.</p> <p>2. Tract 10-12, Contract 2729-12, Completed Harvest on 92 acres:  Site looks very good, no residual damage, no EAB or Ash decline viewed, had to pre-freeze down trails in advance in order to have solid frozen ground to harvest on. Cut-to-length job, first stop was selection thin, other part of stand were aspen removal. No gaps planned for the harvest, question if they are seeing a diversity of regeneration without gaps. Yes, diversity is there in the regeneration, therefore there is no need to actively create gaps. Discussion ensued regarding growth rates and tracking growth of specific stands. Regeneration plots planned to be put in this fall for more accurate growth rates. The forest is not growing as fast as predicted and the Forest has a minimum harvest level of 5 cords per acre. If the expected growth is not seen, County can either defer the harvest or cut less. County could also adjust the harvest acres and cut more of one species than another if needed; maybe also use established CFI plots on neighboring lands for baseline data.</p> <p>3. Tract 36-14, Contract 2825-14, Active Harvest on 111 acres:  Logger was not working today due to the rain. Machinery on-site - Ponsse 40 forwarder with high flotation tracks (light, low pressure machine to prevent compaction/erosion. Symbolology on hand-traced map is incorrect; intermittent stream is</p>
--	---



	<p>displayed for both the Thornapple River and Pepper Creek, however these are both perennial streams.</p> <p>Corduroyed main skid trails well to reduce compaction and erosion. Very small amount of residual damage, good use of slash to control water off of the site with the recent rains. Multiple old trails used as skid trails/haul roads. Reserve trees viewed on-site - adequate pockets of aspen, oak, maple, basswood, birch retained. In WisFIRS, this site will now be coded as a 'regeneration harvest' for the next management activity</p> <p>4. Tract 27-15, Contract 2861-16, Completed Harvest on 72 acres: Over story removal with reserves (2-aged stand selection cut), select cut, and clearcut areas. NHI hit for wood turtle - no impacts to site per wildlife biologist Celia Cruz. Discussion with wildlife biologist of adjacent sale 2688 with NHI hit for grey wolf; wolf area was outside the harvest area therefore no impact. Good retention of large, high quality stems for seed tree potential. Harvest stuck to the old harvested main skid trails in a herringbone pattern off the main woods road to retain and protect regeneration. Adequate slash in wetter spots. Overstory removal area also had adequate slash in wetter spots. Boundaries clearly marked and respected.</p> <p>5. Tract 9-14, Contract 2701-14 : Completed harvest on 119 acres: Select cut of northern hardwoods &amp; high quality oak, and clear cut of aspen stands. Seasonal harvesting restriction from June to Aug. Due to high recreation pressure, aesthetic considerations were made and broke up the big-toothed aspen (some quaking aspen as well) harvest into large chunks. Aspen was cut in the spring and machine peeled on-site, then trucked. Good utilization of material; bark free popple dries within the year, then goes to Excelsior plant and is grated to be used as erosion control material. Big-toothed and quaking aspen are hybridizing. Good retention of large mixed species in the selection cut. Pond adjacent to site had riparian buffer maintained. Mats were installed across wet area and upper intermittent stream had a ford crossing. Lower intermittent stream has had its water crossing culverts blown-out multiple times in the past 4 to 5 years, requiring extensive repairs and reconstruction to the culvert and roadbed. County recently decided to change this to a ford crossing. Logger used a temporary bridge for duration of harvest, pre-manufactured 50 foot long metal bridge with a 100,000 pound weight limit and deck with treated lumber. ATV 'play' area on way into site was discontinued in order to protect adjacent water resources.</p>
<p>Sawyer North (Meister)</p>	<p>1. 5-11: 147 ac northern hardwood selection harvest with initial basal area of 146 and thinned to 100. Site was heavier to American basswood, but had retention of all species (basswood, maple species, yellow birch, and white ash). Some post-harvest blow-down was evident, which may favor some gap-phase species.</p>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. 7-13: 64 ac mix of red pine thinning and northern hardwood with aspen overstory. Objective is to allow northern hardwood area to completely succeed to northern hardwood and remove aspen to release subdominant trees. 3<sup>rd</sup> red pine thinning with objective to release vigorous trees from understory competition. Interview with employees.</li> <li>3. 8-16: 110 ac aspen regeneration with northern hardwood patches slated for thinning. Harvest is marked, but not harvested yet. Conifers selected for retention include hemlock, northern white-cedar and white pine.</li> <li>4. 9-16: Marked 23 ac sale of red pine thinning under two age classes. Aspen patch within site will be removed while retaining oak and other hardwood.</li> <li>5. 26-13: 53 ac of oak-aspen. Aspen was cut to regenerate and heavier to oak areas were thinned to promote oak. Maples, oaks and pines were retained within aspen area. Retained aspen observed within and adjacent to a vernal pool. Salvage harvest occurred on this site and several others 6 months after harvest due to a wind storm. Species and structures selected for retention during the original harvest were left when and where not interfering with salvage operations.</li> <li>6. 18-15: 55 ac of oak thinning with a small aspen regeneration patch (13 ac). Wind storm caused this site to be entered ahead of schedule to clean up damage due to trails nearby. Oak thinning functioned as a mix of thinning and shelterwood preparation in some areas. Oak and pine left within aspen matrix. Little to no residual stand damage observed.</li> <li>7. 17-15: 80 ac of aspen regeneration and oak overstory removal with seed-tree retention. Within aspen unit, red pine, white pine, and oaks retained. Oak regeneration area had several oaks retained at even intervals to provide seed, but not necessarily require a later release treatment.</li> <li>8. 19-15: 136 ac of red pine that was marked for its 4<sup>th</sup> thinning. Will be thinned from 153 BA to 125. Discussion on how to maintain red pine on this higher quality site while staying under natural/ semi-natural management.</li> <li>9. 03-16: 70 ac of red oak and northern hardwood thinning. Objective is to increase vigor of retained trees, especially dominant canopy oaks. One more improvement thinning is scheduled prior to the stand being evaluated for regeneration options.</li> </ol>
County offices	Central office audit and stakeholder consultation
<b>12 – August – 2016</b>	
<b>FMU/Location/ sites visited*</b>	<b>Activities/ notes</b>
DNR Service Center - Spooner	Closing Meeting and Review of Findings: Convene with all relevant staff to summarize audit findings, potential non-conformities and next steps

## 2.2 Evaluation of Management Systems

SCS deploys interdisciplinary teams with expertise in forestry, social sciences, natural resource economics, and other relevant fields to assess an FME’s conformance to FSC standards and policies. Evaluation methods include document and record review, implementing sampling strategies to visit a broad number of forest cover and harvest prescription types, observation of implementation of management plans and policies in the field, and stakeholder analysis. When there is more than one team member, team members may review parts of the standards based on their background and expertise. On the final day of an evaluation, team members convene to deliberate the findings of the assessment jointly. This involves an analysis of all relevant field observations, stakeholder comments, and reviewed documents and records. Where consensus between team members cannot be achieved due to lack of evidence, conflicting evidence or differences of interpretation of the standards, the team is instructed to report these in the certification decision section and/or in observations.

## 3. Changes in Management Practices

There were no significant changes in the FME’s management system that affected conformance to FSC requirements.

## 4. Results of the Evaluation

### 4.1 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations

<b>Finding Number: 2015.1</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU): All FSC counties	
<b>Deadline</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify): no deadline
<b>FSC Indicator:</b>	FSC-US Forest Management Standard 1.1.a.
<p><b>Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):</b> The Wisconsin County Forest Program (WCFP) was established per County Forest Law (s 28.10 &amp; 28.11 Wis. Stats.) (County Forest Comprehensive Land Use Plans (CLUP) – Ch 905 (typically). Only county lands currently enrolled under the County Forest Law are included within the scope of this FSC multi-site certificate, which ensures that management planning and public consultation and processes are in place, as required by the County Forest Law.</p> <p>About eight acres of forestland in Forest County were withdrawn from the County Forest Law to address some third-party access issues in a manner that is not allowed under the County Forest Law, but by stipulation concerted between involved parties these acres, and documented in the withdrawal order, shall “remain in county forest ownership, be open for public use, and be managed for timber production, wildlife habitat, and recreation”. This acreage is so small that it could be grouped with</p>	

<p>adjacent timber sales on lands enrolled as county forest upon harvest. For harvest on lands not enrolled as county forest to be eligible for FSC certification, compliance with legal and/or administrative requirements must be followed and program modifications made to ensure that forest management on non-County Forest Law lands is compliant with applicable certification requirements (e.g., Chain of custody, management planning, public consultation, etc.).</p>	
<p><b>Corrective Action Request (or Observation):</b> Forest management plans and operations should demonstrate compliance with all applicable federal, state, county, municipal, and tribal laws, and administrative requirements (e.g., regulations).</p>	
<p><b>FME response</b> (including any evidence submitted)</p>	<p><u>The Issue:</u> This Observation was issued based on a discussion about 8 acres of land that had been withdrawn from enrollment as county forest, but which is still owned by the county and that for all intents and purposes will be managed in the same manner as the surrounding county forest land. The auditor suggested that since the non-county forest land was so small and management would be similar on the adjacent county forest, there is a risk that the areas may be grouped during timber harvest. The auditor asked whether these lands would be considered certified forest and whether forest products would be sold as FSC or SFI certified. The response is <u>no</u>, lands which are not enrolled under the County Forest Law are not included in the scope of our FSC or SFI certificates. Similarly, any forest product sold from these lands would not be sold as certified material. The auditors suggested that if the Wisconsin County Forest Program desired to include additional county lands managed as sustainable forests within its certificates this would likely be possible, but we would need to create a system to track such lands and would need to examine our policies/procedures to ensure that management would comply with the FSC &amp; SFI standards and our own policies.</p> <p><u>The Response:</u> County lands which are not enrolled under the county forest law are not subject to any of the provisions in s. 28.11 Wis. stats. or any of the associated Administrative Codes or DNR handbook guidance. As a result, the DNR’s role in the planning, administration, and management of such lands is significantly different (non-existent) and is likely not consistent with the expectations of a <i>group manager</i> for a group FSC/SFI forest management certificate. Additionally, these lands are typically not addressed currently in Comprehensive County Forest Land Use Plans. As such, there would likely be some substantial system changes that would need to be implemented to accommodate including non-county forest lands within the scope of the certificate. Timber sold on non-county forest lands cannot be sold as certified wood. The counties need to make sure these sales are not using haul tickets that indicate wood is certified.</p> <p>The WCFA Legislative and Forest Certification Committee discussed whether there may be a way to sell wood from non-<i>county forest</i> county owned lands as certified, if desired by a particular county, if the required controls and planning were addressed to comply with the certification standard. The committee unanimously moved to recommend counties not include wood from non-enrolled county owned lands under forest certification unless the management objectives are included in the 15-year plan and forest certification requirements are being met.</p>

	<p>The county forest specialist sent an email reminder on 4/1/2016 to county forest administrators and DNR liaison foresters, reminding them that timber sold from non-county forest lands shall not be sold as certified wood. This means certification numbers, claims, and logos shall not be included on timber sale documents (contract, scale slips, etc.) and any non-certified products are to be kept separate from certified materials during any harvest operation. If a county desires to include non-county forest lands under the scope of the existing FSC forest management certificate, that county must work with the DNR County Forest Specialist who will in turn work with the forest certification certifying body to ensure all certification requirements have been addressed, prior to incorporating non-county forest lands and selling any products as certified. In addition, direction was provided to the County Forest Staff Specialists that do the bulk of the work on 3 yr. internal county forest audits to include this in their audits for 2015-2016.</p>
<b>SCS review</b>	<p>FME provided records of the email sent on April 1, 2016 and the internal audits conducted in counties in which this issue was discussed recently. A sample of responses from County Forest Administrators was reviewed. It was found through these records and interviews with staff that there is a high level of understanding of the legal requirements of enrollment and which lands are outside of the scope of the FSC certificate.</p>
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed  <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major  <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i></p>

## 4.2 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations

<b>Finding Number: 2016.1</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU): Sawyer County	
<b>Deadline</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify): None
<b>FSC Indicator:</b>	FSC-US Forest Management Standard 4.2.b.
<p><b>Non-Conformity</b> (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): The FME's employees and contractors demonstrate a safe work environment overall. As confirmed through a review of timber sale and chemical application contracts on all counties visited, contracts or other written agreements include safety requirements.</p> <p>However, contracted operators could improve performance with attention to their use of PPE. One logger on an active logging site was interviewed in Washburn County. The operator was FISTA trained, as confirmed through the FME's records of contractor qualifications. However, the contractor did not have his or her hardhat inside the harvest machine, which meant that it could not be put on prior to exiting the machine. The contractor was aware of the need for this PPE, but it was stored in his or her truck back at the landing or parking area.</p>	
<p><b>Corrective Action Request</b> (or Observation): The FME's contractors should demonstrate a safe work environment.</p>	
<b>FME response</b> (including any evidence submitted)	
<b>SCS review</b>	
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

<b>Finding Number: 2016.2</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU): Sawyer County	
<b>Deadline</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify): None
<b>FSC Indicator:</b>	FSC-US Forest Management Standard 6.3.f (see also 7.1.q)
<p><b>Non-Conformity</b> (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): Management maintains, enhances, or restores habitat components and associated stand structures, in abundance and distribution that could be expected from naturally occurring processes. Trees selected for retention are generally representative of the dominant species found on the site with the exception of larger aspen regeneration harvest blocks on counties visited in 2016. Site-specific retention practices for harvest are documented in Form 2460.</p> <p>Leaving standing aspen trees within aspen regeneration units is occasionally done, generally in association with the protection of other features such as vernal pools or small wetlands or seeps. Dead or live aspen trees may also be left as den trees. More often when aspen are left uncut they are located on the edges of regeneration units as part of riparian or visual buffers. Foresters are able to describe many good reasons for not retaining individual or groups of live, standing aspen trees in these units (e.g., Sawyer Form 2460 for 2851-15: “Aspen, the dominant tree species of this stand, is not being left as a component of green tree retention due to the high risk for blowdown and to not inhibit the natural regeneration of Aspen of which is the objective for this harvest”). However, there is less familiarity with reasons for leaving some.</p> <p>As part of the harvest planning, approval and record-keeping process a “Timber Sale Notice and Cutting Report” is prepared for all sales (Form 2460). The “Narrative” portion includes relevant sections including “b Ecological Considerations, including Management History, Silvicultural Systems, Green Tree Retention, Post-Harvest Regeneration Plan, Invasive Species Evaluation, Insect/Disease Concerns, Skidding/Seasonal Restrictions, Wildlife Action Plan/ Species of Greatest Conservation Need, Conservation Opportunity Area (COA), Results of NHI, and Comments” and “e. Wildlife Considerations, including Snag, Den and Mast Tree Retention, Game Openings, and Comments”. The level of documentation varies greatly, and could be improved to better document reasons for decisions to have levels of retention that are less than guidelines.</p> <p>For example, Washburn and Sawyer Counties, the 2460 Form’s site narrative or ecological considerations sections do not always follow the recommended practice of documenting reasons for not retaining the recommended level of 3-5% of stand area or crown cover or selecting retention trees generally representative of the dominant species found on the site. This recommendation is found in the CLUP in section 505.3.5 under Sawyer County and section 830.3.1 under Washburn County.</p> <p>More importantly, plan writers were instructed in the FME’s response to OBS 2014.2 “to provide reasonable written justification in the 2460 timber sale cutting notice narrative when green tree retention does not maintain species that are representative of the dominant species naturally found on the site.” Examples of sales prepared after this guidance was issued and do not reference aspen retention explicitly include Sawyer 2870-16 and 28701-16 (note: version of 2460 Form is 10-15 and sales</p>	

<p>were established 3/16); and Washburn 2-15 (unsold).</p> <p>Wildlife specialists interviewed have knowledge of the impacts of retained tree species and structures on certain groups of fauna, so there may be an opportunity to consult wildlife staff on this issue.</p> <p>There is an opportunity to examine and refine the criteria and implementation of stand level retention within larger aspen regeneration harvest blocks.</p>	
<p><b>Corrective Action Request (or Observation):</b> Management should maintain, enhance or restore habitat components and associated stand structures, in abundance and distribution that could be expected from naturally occurring processes. These components include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) large live trees, live trees with decay or declining health, <b>snags</b>, and well-distributed coarse down and dead woody material. <b>Legacy trees</b> where present are not harvested; and</li> <li>b) vertical and horizontal complexity.</li> </ul> <p>Trees selected for <b>retention</b> should be generally representative of the dominant species found on the site.</p>	
<p><b>FME response</b> (including any evidence submitted)</p>	
<p><b>SCS review</b></p>	
<p><b>Status of CAR:</b></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Closed</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)</p>



<b>Finding Number: 2016.3</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU): Sawyer County	
<b>Deadline</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify): None
<b>FSC Indicator:</b>	FSC-US Forest Management Standard 7.1.o
<p><b>Non-Conformity</b> (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): The management plan includes maps describing the resource base, the characteristics of general management zones, special management areas, and protected areas at a level of detail to achieve management objectives and protect sensitive sites.</p> <p>However, some maps prepared for timber sales in Sawyer County on 2460 Forms include incorrect symbology for perennial streams or do not include legends. In addition, some wetlands are difficult to identify since the symbol is not included in the legend.</p>	
<p><b>Corrective Action Request</b> (or Observation): The management plan should include maps describing the resource base, the characteristics of general management zones, special management areas, and protected areas at a level of detail to achieve management objectives and protect sensitive sites.</p>	
<b>FME response</b> (including any evidence submitted)	
<b>SCS review</b>	
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

<b>Finding Number: 2016.4</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Major CAR</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Minor CAR</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Observation</b>	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):	
<b>Deadline</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
<b>FSC Indicator:</b>	FSC-STD-50-001, V1-2, 1.5, 1.15, 1.16, & 5.1
<p><b>Non-Conformity</b> (or <i>Background/ Justification in the case of Observations</i>):          Promotional uses of the FSC trademark found on a variety of documents noted below, do not conform to the FSC Requirements for Trademark Use and have not been submitted for approval and/or logo approvals were not available at the time of the audit:</p> <p>Sawyer County – the Forest Wood Residue, Forest Twig/Pole Harvesting, Permit to Cut Boughs, Bill to Purchaser, and Timber Sale Contract, have old FSC logos with incomplete certificate codes and License code is not present. The old claim of FSC Pure is used. Bill to Purchaser’s logo does not conform to the trademark format and size (logo is stretched in height).</p> <p>Washburn County – Load Ticket has an incomplete certificate code and does not include the FSC website address.</p>	
<p><b>Corrective Action Request</b> (or <i>Observation</i>):          All uses of the FSC trademarks must comply with the Trademark Standard. The on-line logo generator is the way that logo approvals are applied for, processed, and approved.</p> <p>1.5 The <b>FSC trademark license code</b> assigned by FSC shall be included with all applications described in this standard, unless stated otherwise.</p> <p>1.15 The use of the FSC “checkmark-and-tree” logo shall be directly accompanied by the trademark symbols ® or ™ (in superscript font). The symbol, which represents the registration status of an FSC trademark in the country in which FSC certified products or materials are <b>to be distributed</b>, is an intrinsic part of the logo. The appropriate symbol shall also be added to “FSC” or “Forest Stewardship Council” for the first use in any text. The registration status of the FSC trademarks for the respective country is listed in Annex 1.</p> <p>1.16 The organization shall submit artwork of all new reproductions of FSC trademarks to the certification body for approval.</p> <p>5.1 The following elements shall be used in the <b>promotional panel</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) FSC “checkmark-and-tree” logo</li> <li>b) FSC trademark license code</li> <li>c) Promotional statement “The Mark of Responsible Forestry”, “Responsible Forest Management” or other claim provided or approved by FSC</li> <li>d) FSC website address</li> </ul>	
<b>FME response</b> (including any evidence)	

<i>submitted)</i>	
<b>SCS review</b>	
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i>

## 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

Contractors	Indigenous people
Recreation user groups	Advisory committee members

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

<input type="checkbox"/> <i>FME has not received any stakeholder comments from interested parties as a result of stakeholder outreach activities during this annual audit.</i>	
<b>Stakeholder comments</b>	<b>SCS Response</b>
<b>Economic concerns</b>	
None received for FSC counties.	

Social concerns	
I have worked for several years with Polk, Burnett and Washburn Counties in partnership with the state trails that they manage and operate. I can say without hesitation that through my experience with each of these counties, they do an admirable job balancing resource protection and management with the demands of the outdoor recreational user. They each follow the guidance and protocol that they are asked to use when managing state trails.	While only Washburn is FSC-certified, the audit team observed several instances in which county and DNR staff worked collaboratively to meet recreation users' trail demands while protecting sensitive soil and water resources. Through regular seasonal maintenance and combining timber harvests with some trail infrastructure projects, county forests play a major role in providing opportunities for recreation and resource protection.
Environmental concerns	
None received for FSC counties.	

## 6. Certification Decision

The certificate holder has demonstrated continued overall conformance to the applicable Forest Stewardship Council standards. The SCS annual audit team recommends that the certificate be sustained, subject to subsequent annual audits and the FME's response to any open CARs.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Comments:</b>	

## 7. Changes in Certification Scope

Any changes in the scope of the certification since the previous audit are highlighted in **yellow** in the tables below.

### Name and Contact Information

Organization name	Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources – County Forest Program		
Contact person	Jeff Barkley		
Address	101 S. Webster St. Madison, WI 53707	Telephone	608-264-9217
		Fax	608-266-8756
		e-mail	Jeffrey.barkley@wisconsin.gov
		Website	http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/CountyForests/

### FSC Sales Information

<input type="checkbox"/> FSC Sales contact information same as above.	
FSC salesperson	Sabina Dhungana, Forest Products Services Specialist

Address	Telephone	(608) 261-0754
	Fax	(608) 266-8756
	e-mail	Sabina.Dhungana@wisconsin.gov
	Website	www.dnr.wi.gov

**Scope of Certificate**

Certificate Type	<input type="checkbox"/> Single FMU	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple FMU
	<input type="checkbox"/> Group	
SLIMF (if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/> Small SLIMF certificate	<input type="checkbox"/> Low intensity SLIMF certificate
	<input type="checkbox"/> Group SLIMF certificate	
# Group Members (if applicable)		
Number of FMUs in scope of certificate	19	
Geographic location of non-SLIMF FMU(s)	Latitude & Longitude: See table on page 9.	
Forest zone	<input type="checkbox"/> Boreal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Temperate
	<input type="checkbox"/> Subtropical	<input type="checkbox"/> Tropical
<b>Total forest area in scope of certificate which is:</b>		Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac
privately managed		
state managed		
community managed	1,646,961 acres (Rpt.50A - FSC only)	
<b>Number of FMUs in scope that are:</b>		
less than 100 ha in area	100 - 1000 ha in area	
1000 - 10 000 ha in area	4	more than 10 000 ha in area
		15
<b>Total forest area in scope of certificate which is included in FMUs that:</b>		Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac
are less than 100 ha in area	0	
are between 100 ha and 1000 ha in area	0	
meet the eligibility criteria as low intensity SLIMF FMUs	0	
<b>Division of FMUs into manageable units:</b>		
FMU are individual County Forests which are further subdivided into compartments and stands.		

**FSC Data Request**

**Production Forests**

<b>Timber Forest Products</b>	Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac
Total area of production forest (i.e. forest from which timber may be harvested)	1,321,593 forested area scheduled for management (Rpt.101) (96.46% of total forested area is eligible for harvest)
Area of production forest classified as 'plantation'	0
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by replanting or by a	125,624(PR, SW and 2/3 PJ)

combination of replanting and coppicing of the planted stems	(Rpt.102)																																														
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by natural regeneration, or by a combination of natural regeneration and coppicing of the naturally regenerated stems	1,195,969																																														
<b>Silvicultural system(s)</b>	<b>Area under type of management</b>																																														
Even-aged management																																															
Clearcut (clearcut size range (1-236 (20.58 avg) ac (WisFIRS export))	135,679 - 1/3 PJ, OX , ½ MR, Fb, SB, ½ T, ½ C (Rpt.102)																																														
Shelterwood	176,092 PW, O & ½ MR																																														
Other: (e.g., coppice, seed-tree)	598,723 (A, BW, MC, SC, ½ T, ½ C)																																														
Uneven-aged management																																															
Individual tree selection	212,251 NH																																														
Group selection	73,214 BH, SH, CH, H, MD																																														
Other:																																															
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (e.g. nursery, recreation area, windbreak, bamboo, silvo-pastoral system, agro-forestry system, etc.)																																															
The sustainable rate of harvest (usually Annual Allowable Harvest or AAH where available) of commercial timber (m3 of round wood)	<p style="text-align: right;">Acres: (Rpt. 201)</p> <table border="0"> <tr><td>ASPEN</td><td>12,183</td></tr> <tr><td>BTMLAND HDWDS</td><td>170</td></tr> <tr><td>WHITE BIRCH</td><td>262</td></tr> <tr><td>WHITE CEDAR</td><td>470</td></tr> <tr><td>CENTRAL HDWDS</td><td>18</td></tr> <tr><td>BALSAM FIR</td><td>196</td></tr> <tr><td>FIR SPRUCE</td><td>284</td></tr> <tr><td>HEMLOCK</td><td>83</td></tr> <tr><td>MISC. CONIFEROUS</td><td>6</td></tr> <tr><td>MISC. DECIDUOUS</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr><td>RED MAPLE</td><td>797</td></tr> <tr><td>NORTH. HDWDS</td><td>11,254</td></tr> <tr><td>OAK</td><td>4,513</td></tr> <tr><td>SCRUB OAK</td><td>545</td></tr> <tr><td>JACK PINE</td><td>1187</td></tr> <tr><td>RED PINE</td><td>4290</td></tr> <tr><td>WHITE PINE</td><td>1647</td></tr> <tr><td>BLACK SPRUCE</td><td>817</td></tr> <tr><td>SWAMP CONIFER</td><td>229</td></tr> <tr><td>SWAMP HDWDS</td><td>2300</td></tr> <tr><td>WHITE SPRUCE</td><td>174</td></tr> <tr><td>TAMARACK</td><td>619</td></tr> <tr><td><b>42,048 Total acres</b></td><td></td></tr> </table>	ASPEN	12,183	BTMLAND HDWDS	170	WHITE BIRCH	262	WHITE CEDAR	470	CENTRAL HDWDS	18	BALSAM FIR	196	FIR SPRUCE	284	HEMLOCK	83	MISC. CONIFEROUS	6	MISC. DECIDUOUS	4	RED MAPLE	797	NORTH. HDWDS	11,254	OAK	4,513	SCRUB OAK	545	JACK PINE	1187	RED PINE	4290	WHITE PINE	1647	BLACK SPRUCE	817	SWAMP CONIFER	229	SWAMP HDWDS	2300	WHITE SPRUCE	174	TAMARACK	619	<b>42,048 Total acres</b>	
ASPEN	12,183																																														
BTMLAND HDWDS	170																																														
WHITE BIRCH	262																																														
WHITE CEDAR	470																																														
CENTRAL HDWDS	18																																														
BALSAM FIR	196																																														
FIR SPRUCE	284																																														
HEMLOCK	83																																														
MISC. CONIFEROUS	6																																														
MISC. DECIDUOUS	4																																														
RED MAPLE	797																																														
NORTH. HDWDS	11,254																																														
OAK	4,513																																														
SCRUB OAK	545																																														
JACK PINE	1187																																														
RED PINE	4290																																														
WHITE PINE	1647																																														
BLACK SPRUCE	817																																														
SWAMP CONIFER	229																																														
SWAMP HDWDS	2300																																														
WHITE SPRUCE	174																																														
TAMARACK	619																																														
<b>42,048 Total acres</b>																																															
<b>Non-timber Forest Products (NTFPs)</b>																																															
Area of forest protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for the production of NTFPs or services	0																																														

Other areas managed for NTFPs or services	0
Approximate annual commercial production of non-timber forest products included in the scope of the certificate, by product type	Sphagnum moss- 25,800 bales in 2015, typically <20,000 bales (0391B sub-product); N6.3.1 Christmas trees 10 trees and 14 tons of boughs (WisFIRS export product 40 & 42T)
<b>Explanation of the assumptions and reference to the data source upon which AAH and NTFP harvest rates estimates are based:</b>	
Data is derived from "WisFIRS" which is database that contains all recon, treatment, and timber sale data for State and County Lands. Sustainable rate of harvest is based on long term harvest goals (15yr avg.) under an area control system.	
<b>Species in scope of joint FM/COC certificate: <i>Scientific/ Latin Name (Common/ Trade Name)</i></b>	
<p><b>Species</b></p> <p>Aspen/Popple: <i>Populus tremuloides</i> <i>Populus grandidentata</i></p> <p>Balsam poplar <i>Populus balsamifera</i></p> <p><b>Bottomland hardwoods:</b></p> <p>Eastern Cottonwood <i>Populus deltoides</i> Swamp white oak <i>Quercus bicolor</i> Siver maple <i>Acer saccharinum</i> American elm <i>Ulmus americana</i> River birch <i>Betula nigra</i> Green ash <i>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</i></p> <p><b>Central hardwoods:</b></p> <p>White oak <i>Quercus alba</i> Bur oak <i>Quercus macrocarpa</i> Black oak <i>Quercus velutina</i> Northern pin oak <i>Quercus ellipsoidalis</i> Black walnut <i>Juglans nigra</i> Butternut <i>Juglans cinerea</i> Shagbark hickory <i>Carya ovata</i> Bitternut hickory <i>Carya cordiformis</i> Black cherry <i>Prunus serotina</i> Red maple <i>Acer rubrum</i></p>	<p><b>Miscellaneous conifers:</b></p> <p>Scotch pine <i>Pinus sylvestris</i> European larch <i>Larix decidua</i> Norway spruce <i>Picea abies</i> Eastern redcedar <i>Juniperus virginiana</i> Blue spruce <i>Picea pungens</i></p> <p><b>Miscellaneous deciduous:</b></p> <p>Norway maple <i>Acer platanoides</i> Boxelder <i>Acer negundo</i> Black locust <i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i> Honey locust <i>Gleditsia triacanthos</i> Eastern Hophornbeam, Ironwood <i>Ostrya virginiana</i> Musclewood, Bluebeech <i>Carpinus caroliniana</i></p> <p><b>Northern hardwoods:</b></p> <p>Sugar maple <i>Acer saccharum</i> Yellow birch <i>Betula alleghaniensis</i> White ash <i>Fraxinus americana</i> American beech <i>Fagus grandifolia</i> American basswood <i>Tilia americana</i> White birch <i>Betula papyrifera</i> Northern red oak <i>Quercus rubra</i> Red Pine <i>Pinus resinosa</i> Jack Pine <i>Pinus banksiana</i> Eastern white pine <i>Pinus strobus</i> Black spruce <i>Picea mariana</i></p>

Hackberry	<i>Celtis occidentalis</i>	Tamarack	<i>Larix laricina</i>
Balsam fir	<i>Abies balsamea</i>	Black ash	<i>Fraxinus nigra</i>
Eastern hemlock	<i>Tsuga canadensis</i>	White spruce	<i>Picea glauca</i>
		Northern white cedar	<i>Thuja occidentalis</i>

**FSC Product Classification**

Timber products			
	Product Level 1	Product Level 2	Species
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>W1 Rough Wood</b>	W1.1 Roundwood (logs)	13,949 MBF and 433,037 cds. (Rpt. 37A-total cordwood minus small diameter reported below) –All species listed above.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		W1.2 Fuel Wood	1,081 cds –All species listed above. (Rpt. 37A – Firewood)
<input type="checkbox"/>		W1.3 Twigs	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>W2 Wood charcoal</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>W3 Wood in chips or particles</b>	W3.1 Wood chips	<4” diameter (prod code 26) and mixed diameter (prod code 24)- Rpt. 37A (total cords-sum of cords by species) 194,108 cd eq. –All species listed above.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Other*</b>	Please List:	

Note: If your operation produces processed wood products such as wood pellets, planks, beams, poles etc. please discuss with SCS staff as you may need a separate CoC certificate.

Non-Timber Forest Products			
	Product Level 1	Product Level 2	Product Level 3 and Species
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>N1 Bark</b>		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>N4 Straw, wicker, rattan and similar</b>	N4.1 Rattan cane (rough form)	
<input type="checkbox"/>		N4.2 Rattan taper (clean, peeled and spitted)	
<input type="checkbox"/>		N4.3 Decorative objects and wickerwork	
<input type="checkbox"/>		N4.4 Rattan furniture	
<input type="checkbox"/>		N4.5 Rattan furniture components	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>N6 Plants and parts of plants</b>	N6.1 Flowers	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		N6.2 Grasses, ferns, mosses and lichens	Sphagnum moss ( <i>Sphagnum</i> spp.)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		N6.3 Whole trees or plants	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N6.3.1 Christmas trees 10 trees and 14 tons of boughs – <i>Abies balsamea</i>



<input type="checkbox"/>			(WisFIRS export product 42T)
<input type="checkbox"/>		N6.4 Pine cones	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>N7 Natural gums, resins, oils and derivatives</b>	N7.1 Rubber/latex	
<input type="checkbox"/>		N7.2 Gum resin	
<input type="checkbox"/>		N7.3 Resin and manufactured resin products	
<input type="checkbox"/>		N7.4 Tannin	
<input type="checkbox"/>		N7.5 Essential oils	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>N9 Food</b>	N9.1 Nuts	
<input type="checkbox"/>		N9.2 Tea	
<input type="checkbox"/>		N9.3 Palm-hearts	
<input type="checkbox"/>		N9.4 Mushrooms, truffles	
<input type="checkbox"/>		N9.5 Fruits	
<input type="checkbox"/>		N9.6 sap-based foods	
<input type="checkbox"/>		N9.7 Game	
<input type="checkbox"/>		N9.8 Honey	

**Conservation Areas**

Total area of forest and non-forest land protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for conservation objectives		48,564 Acres (WisFIRS report; prefix R, Y and Z)	
<b>High Conservation Value Forest/ Areas</b>			
High Conservation Values present and respective areas:			Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac
Code	HCV Type	Description & Location	Area
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> HCV1	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g. endemism, endangered species, refugia).	Assorted bogs, Wetland communities, fens, kettle lakes, and other areas containing significant biodiversity values (including endangered & threatened species) - Numerous counties(13)	31,586
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> HCV2	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant large landscape level forests, contained within, or containing the management unit, where viable populations of most if not all naturally-occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance.	Upper Nemadji Floodplain Forest –Douglas Brazeau Cedar Swamp - Oconto Penokee Range Hardwood-Iron Silent Wood Benchmark Forest- Washburn	5,112
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> HCV3	Forests or areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems.	Barrens-Eau Claire, Clark, Douglas, Jackson Old Growth/ pine relics-Forest, Juneau, Sawyer, Taylor Oak Savanna- Washburn	2,252

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV4	Forests or areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g. watershed protection, erosion control).	Winx Flowage – Clark	320
<input type="checkbox"/>	HCV5	Forests or areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g. subsistence, health).		0
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV6	Forests or areas critical to local communities’ traditional cultural identity (areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in cooperation with such local communities).	Burial Mounds - Oconto	5
<b>Total Area of forest classified as ‘High Conservation Value Forest/ Area’</b>				39,275

### Areas Outside of the Scope of Certification (Partial Certification and Excision)

<input type="checkbox"/> N/A – All forestland owned or managed by the applicant is included in the scope.		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Applicant owns and/or manages other FMUs not under evaluation.		
<input type="checkbox"/> Applicant wishes to excise portions of the FMU(s) under evaluation from the scope of certification.		
<b>Explanation for exclusion of FMUs and/or excision:</b>	29 County Forests exist in WI. Of those, 19 of them have chosen to commit to FSC certification. The other 10 are either SFI certified or not certified under any forest certification program. Within each county, there may be forestlands that are outside of the scope for other reasons, such as being inaccessible to forest management for timber production.	
<b>Control measures to prevent mixing of certified and non-certified product (C8.3):</b>	Each FMU has its own log or haul tickets that include the appropriate certificate codes as applicable. Non-certified FMUs are not permitted to use any certificate codes. Forest areas outside of the scope within certified counties typically are not managed through timber harvests.	
<b>Description of FMUs excluded from or forested area excised from the scope of certification:</b>		
<b>Name of FMU or Stand</b>	<b>Location (city, state, country)</b>	<b>Size (<input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac)</b>
Refer to table 1.1.2 of this section and the FMU summary table below.	Scattered across WI.	~750,000 acres. (Includes SFI-only counties, non-certified counties, and straight county land in FSC counties)

## WI County Forest FMU Summary

SFI Certificate: NSF-SFIS-1Y943

FSC Certificate: # SCS-FM/COC-00083G - county  
sub-code

County Name	Certification Status	FSC County Sub-code	General Location Latitude	General Location Longitude	Forest Administrator	Email Address	Co. Forest Lands	Special Use Lands	Total Acres
Ashland	FSC/SFI	a	46° 12' 45" N	-90° 28' 56" W	Chris Hoffman	choffman05@centurytel.net	40,305.19	0	40,305.19
Barron	FSC/SFI	b	45° 37' 16" N	-91° 52' 6" W	John Cisek	john.cisek@co.barron.wi.us	16,264.69	0	16,264.69
Bayfield	FSC/SFI	r	46° 47' 12" N	-90° 58' 52" W	Jason Bodine	jbodine@bayfieldcounty.org	171,993.06	0	171,993.06
Burnett	SFI		45° 52' 29" N	-92° 10' 38" W	Jason Nichols	jnichols@burnettcounty.org	111,099.56	0	111,099.56
Chippewa	FSC	c	45° 11' 50" N	-91° 14' 53" W	Mike Dahlby	mdahlby@co.chippewa.wi.us	32,968.88	1,654.56	34,623.44
Clark	FSC	d	44° 35' 54" N	-90° 47' 46" W	Rick Dailey	rick.dailey@co.clark.wi.us	134,190.10	63.50	134,253.60
Douglas	FSC/SFI	S	46° 17' 39" N	-92° 0' 7" W	Jon Harris	jharris@douglascountywi.org	264,406.06	15,636.14	280,042.20
Eau Claire	FSC/SFI	e	44° 45' 9" N	-91° 2' 7" W	Joshua Pedersen	Josh.Pedersen@co.eau-claire.wi.us	51,642.23	1168.88	52,811.11
Florence	FSC/SFI	f	45° 46' 53" N	-88° 15' 4" W	Patrick Smith	psmith@co.florence.wi.us	36,331.65	63.15	36,394.80
Forest	FSC/SFI	g	45° 31' 52" N	-88° 52' 26" W	David Ziolkowski	dzforestco@ez-net.com	14,095.73	0	14,095.73
Iron	FSC/SFI	h	46° 17' 45" N	-90° 13' 48" W	Eric Peterson	icfadmin@ironcountyforest.org	173,752.48	1,048.02	174,800.50
Jackson	FSC/SFI	i	44° 20' 57" N	-90° 32' 6" W	Jim Zahasky	jim.zahasky@centurytel.net	119,405.90	2,685.40	122,091.30
Juneau	FSC/SFI	j	44° 1' 2" N	-90° 8' 14" W	Brian Loyd	pfadm@co.juneau.wi.us	15,931.07	1,867.72	17,798.79
Langlade	SFI		45° 20' 1" N	-89° 4' 14" W	Erik Rantala	erantala@co.langlade.wi.us	128,117.41	1,885.24	130,002.65
Lincoln	FSC/SFI	q	45° 22' 57" N	-89° 50' 45" W	Kevin Kleinschmidt	kkleinschmidt@co.lincoln.wi.us	100,421.30	421.75	100,843.05
Marathon	SFI		44° 52' 11" N	-89° 41' 33" W	Tom Lovlien	tglovlief@mail.co.marathon.wi.us	29,384.47	552.10	29,936.57
Marinette	SFI		45° 27' 39" N	-88° 10' 59" W	Pete Villas	pvillas@marinettecounty.com	226,409.60	3,528.91	229,938.51
Monroe	Not Certified		44° 6' 50" N	-90° 44' 54" W	Chad Ziegler	chiegler@co.monroe.wi.us	6,848.69	432.30	7,280.99
Oconto	FSC/SFI	k	45° 2' 24" N	-88° 16' 40" W	Monty Brink	monty.brink@co.oconto.wi.us	43,546.40	159.43	43,705.83

Oneida	SFI		45° 35' 24" N	-89° 37' 1" W	John Bilogan	<a href="mailto:jbilogan@co.oneida.wi.us">jbilogan@co.oneida.wi.us</a>	82,098.31	179.20	82,277.51
Polk	SFI		45° 36' 21" N	-92° 43' 11" W	Jeremy Koslowski	<a href="mailto:jeremy.koslowski@co.polk.wi.us">jeremy.koslowski@co.polk.wi.us</a>	16,445.71	720.39	17,166.10
Price	FSC/SFI	l	45° 34' 9" N	-90° 23' 54" W	Eric Holm	<a href="mailto:eric.holm@co.price.wi.us">eric.holm@co.price.wi.us</a>	91,427.44	795.01	92,222.45
Rusk	SFI		45° 35' 15" N	-91° 4' 19" W	Paul Teska	<a href="mailto:pteska@ruskcountywi.us">pteska@ruskcountywi.us</a>	89,083.57	240.00	89,323.57
Sawyer	FSC/SFI	m	45° 42' 43" N	-91° 3' 9" W	Greg Peterson	<a href="mailto:greg.peterson@sawyercountygov.org">greg.peterson@sawyercountygov.org</a>	115,196.50	0	115,196.50
Taylor	FSC/SFI	n	45° 19' 15" N	-90° 3' 47" W	Russ Aszmann	<a href="mailto:russ.aszmann@co.taylor.wi.us">russ.aszmann@co.taylor.wi.us</a>	17,669.06	18.86	17,687.92
Vernon	Not Certified		43° 35' 16" N	-91° 0' 29" W	Andy LaChance	<a href="mailto:andy.lachance@vernoncounty.org">andy.lachance@vernoncounty.org</a>	997.46	0	997.46
Vilas	SFI		46° 2' 8" N	-89° 17' 19" W	John Gagnon	<a href="mailto:jogagn@co.vilas.wi.us">jogagn@co.vilas.wi.us</a>	41,078.62	61.27	41,139.89
Washburn	FSC/SFI	o	45° 57' 3" N	-91° 44' 54" W	Mike Peterson	<a href="mailto:mlpeters@co.washburn.wi.us">mlpeters@co.washburn.wi.us</a>	149,264.63	721.67	149,986.30
Wood	FSC/SFI	p	44° 22' 45" N	-90° 6' 2" W	Fritz Schubert	<a href="mailto:fschubert@co.wood.wi.us">fschubert@co.wood.wi.us</a>	37,069.75	692.58	37,762.33
<b>Totals :</b>							<b>2,357,445.52</b>	<b>34,596.08</b>	<b>2,392,041.60</b>

Prepared by Division of Forestry, **May 23, 2016**

WI. Department Of Natural Resources, Report 50A 5/23/16

	Total Acres
FSC	1,652,878.79
SFI	2,215,380.11
Non-certified	8,278.45

## 8. Annual Data Update

### 8.1 Social Information

Number of forest workers (including contractors) working in forest within scope of certificate (differentiated by gender):		
# of male workers : 1452	# of female workers : 72	
Number of accidents in forest work since last audit:	Serious: 1	Fatal: 0

### 8.2 Annual Summary of Pesticide and Other Chemical Use

<input type="checkbox"/> FME does not use pesticides.					
County Name	Commercial name of pesticide / herbicide	Active ingredient	Quantity applied annually (kg or lbs)	Size of area treated during previous year	Reason for use
Ashland	None				
Barron	None				
Bayfield	Element 4	Triclopyr	94 oz.	10	Buckthorn control
	Transline	Clypyralid	23 oz.	3.5	Black locust "
	Chopper	Imazapyr	99 gallons	634	Conifer site prep
	Accord XRT	Glyphosate	238 gallons	634	Conifer site prep
	Oust Extra	Sulfomeruron	40 lbs.	634	Conifer site prep
	Milestone	Triisopropanolammonium salt	8.5 gallons	240	Knapweed control
Chippewa	Garlon 4	Triclopyr	110 ounces	15	Garlic Mustard
	Cornerstone Plus	Glyphosate	100 ounces	15	Garlic Mustard
	Oust XP	Sulfometuron Methyl	1.5 ounces	15	Garlic Mustard
Clark	Rodeo	Glyphosate	51.5 qt.	45.5	Pine Release / Site Prep
	Sulfomet Xtra	Sulfometuron Methyl	2.91 oz.	2	Site Prep
	Element 4	Triclopyr	22.5 gal.	16	Oak release
	Accord XRT II	Glyphosate	16 qt.	8	Site Prep
	Transline	Clopyralid	20.64 oz.	2	Invasive control
	Milestone	Aminopyralid	13.55 oz.	2	Invasive control
	Tordon K	Picloram	32.25 oz.	2	Invasive control
	Oust XP	Sulfometuron Methyl	35 oz.	45	Pine release
	Polaris	Imazapyr	64 oz.	8	Site Prep
Destiny HC Surfactant	Surfactant	16 oz.	.5	Site Prep	

	Preference Surfactant	Surfactant	16.13 oz.	2	Invsaves
Douglas	Milestone	Triisopropanola-mmonium Salt	.5 oz.	.02	Japanese knotweed control
Eau Claire	Chopper	Imazapyr	110 lbs.	88	Site Prep
	Accord	Glyphosate	368 lbs	88	“ “
	Oust	Sulfometuron Methyl	5.5 lbs	88	“ “
Florence	Element 4	Triclopyr	<2.5 gal.	4	Oak Wilt
Forest	None				
Iron	None				
Jackson	Element 4	Triclopyr	438 lbs.	186	Invasives
	Cornerstone	Glyphosate	8.1 lbs.	11	Weed control
	Milestone	Aminopyralid	.06	6	Weed control
	Arsenal	Imazapyr	20	56	Phragmites
Juneau	Cornerstone	Glyphosate	.5 lbs.	.5	Spot treatment of garlic mustard
Lincoln	Cornerstone Plus	Glyphosate	3% solution	5	Garlic Mustard spot spray
	Garlon	Triclopyr	2% solution	20	Garlic Mustard
	Oust	Sulformeturon Methyl	25 oz.	25	Garlic Mustard
Oconto	Cellutreat	Borate	100 lbs.	135	Annosum control
Price	Generic Glyphosate (Honcho / GlyStar)	Glyphosate	5 gal.	10 (Trails, opening, park use around statues, trees & stumps)	Weed / grass control, planting site prep, invasives control
Sawyer	None				
Taylor	None				
Washburn	Spike	Tebuthiuron	28 lbs.	40	Wildlife opening maintenance
Wood	Cellutreat	Borate	Variable – depends on logging contracts and logging activity	100	Prevent introduction/spread of Annosum Root Disease

## SECTION B – APPENDICES (CONFIDENTIAL)

### Appendix 1 – List of FMUs Selected For Evaluation

- FME consists of a single FMU  
 FME consists of multiple FMUs or is a Group

SCS staff establishes the design and level of sampling prior to each group or multiple FMU evaluation according to FSC-STD-20-007. A list of the FMUs sampled and the rationale behind their selection is listed below.

FMU Name	FMU Size Category: - SLIMF - non-SLIMF - Large > 10,000 ha	Forest Type: - Plantation - Natural Forest	Rationale for Selection: - Random Sample - Stakeholder issue - Ease of access - Other – please describe
Sawyer County	Non-SLIMF	Natural Forest	NA
Washburn County	Non-SLIMF, Large	Natural Forest	Ease of access

### Appendix 2 – List of Stakeholders Consulted

#### List of FME Staff Consulted



Audit Attendee  
List.xlsx

#### List of other Stakeholders Consulted

Name	Organization	Contact Information	Consultation method	Requests Cert. Notf.
Rabbit Sherriff	Self	rabbit_sheriff@hotmail.com; 715-520-6789	Phone	Y
Steven R. Hoffman	Wisconsin DNR	steven.hoffman@wisconsin.gov; 715-463-2896	Email	N
Cameron Bump	Northwest District Trails Coordinator, Bureau of Parks & Recreation Wisconsin DNR	cameron.Bump@wisconsin.gov; 715-839-2786	Email	N
Sue Smedegard	Burnett County Snow Trails Association	suesmed@gmail.com	Email	Y
Arnold Rice	Allen Webster Logging (www.websterlogging.com)	<a href="mailto:arnoldrice4@gmail.com">arnoldrice4@gmail.com</a>	Field	Y

### Appendix 3 – Additional Audit Techniques Employed

No additional audit techniques were employed.

### Appendix 4 – Pesticide Derogations

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> There are no active pesticide derogations for this FME.	
Name of pesticide / herbicide (active ingredient)	Date derogation approved
FME has derogation for hexazinone, which has not been used since before 2014; no use was reported in 2014, 2015 or 2016. The derogation is no longer required since hexazinone is not on the 2015 list of FSC HHP.	9/Dec/2014

### Appendix 5 – Detailed Observations

Evaluation Year	FSC P&C Reviewed
2014	All – (Re)certification Evaluation
2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Natural forests &gt; 50,000 ha (123,553 ac) and FMUs containing HCVs: 1.5, 2.3, 3.2, 4.2, 4.4, 5.6, 6.2, 6.3, 6.9, 8.2 and 9.4</li> <li>Other Criteria selected: 1.4, 3.1, 3.3, 3.4, 4.3, 6.10, 8.1, 9.1, 9.2, 9.3</li> </ul>
2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Natural forests &gt; 50,000 ha (123,553 ac) and FMUs containing HCVs: 1.5, 2.3, 3.2, 4.2, 4.4, 5.6, 6.2, 6.3, 6.9, 8.2 and 9.4</li> <li>Other Criteria selected: 2.1, 2.2, 4.1, 4.5, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 8.4 and 8.5</li> </ul>
2017	
2018	

- C= Conformance with Criterion or Indicator*
- NC= Nonconformance with Criterion or Indicator*
- NA = Not Applicable*
- NE = Not Evaluated*

The Wisconsin County Forest Program (WCFP) employs several documents to guide management. There are three main levels of documentation that comprise the Forest Management Plan (FMP):

DNR liaison:

- WDNR Public Forest Lands Handbook 2460.5 & WDNR Timber Sale Handbook 2461
- Wisconsin Forest Management Guidelines (WFMG)
- BMP Manuals
- Cutting Notice & Report – Form 2460

Wisconsin County Forests Association (WCFA)

- Strategic Plan (2012)
- Documentation and training programs to support the Strategic Plan

Individual Counties:

- Comprehensive Land Use Plans (CLUP or county plan)
- Annual Work Plans (AWP)



- Partnership meeting minutes
- Timber Sale Contracts

In the FSC-US Forest Management Standard Checklist, the abbreviations cited above may be used.

**FSC Principles Checklist**

*FSC Forest Management Standard (v1.0)—United States*

REQUIREMENT	C/NC	COMMENT/CAR
<b>Principle #1: Compliance with Laws and FSC Principles</b> <b>Forest management shall respect all applicable laws of the country in which they occur, and international treaties and agreements to which the country is a signatory, and comply with all FSC Principles and Criteria.</b>		
<b>1.1 Forest management shall respect all national and local laws and administrative requirements.</b>	NE	
<b>1.2. All applicable and legally prescribed fees, royalties, taxes and other charges shall be paid.</b>	NE	
<b>1.3. In signatory countries, the provisions of all binding international agreements such as CITES, ILO Conventions, ITTA, and Convention on Biological Diversity, shall be respected.</b>	NE	
<b>1.4. Conflicts between laws, regulations and the FSC Principles and Criteria shall be evaluated for the purposes of certification, on a case by case basis, by the certifiers and the involved or affected parties.</b>	NE	
<b>1.5. Forest management areas should be protected from illegal harvesting, settlement and other unauthorized activities.</b>	C	
<b>1.5.a.</b> The forest owner or manager supports or implements measures intended to prevent illegal and unauthorized activities on the <b>Forest Management Unit</b> (FMU).	C	Timber theft and trespass issues on County Forest properties are dealt with locally, and are typically investigated by county law enforcement, DNR forester-rangers, or county forest patrol officers, as confirmed in interviews. Through these cooperative efforts, Counties patrol each FMU or use other means to prevent and detect such activities, including, for example, the use of remote cameras (e.g., Jackson County), daily or weekly monitoring of active timber sales, use of gates and other
<b>1.5.b.</b> If illegal or unauthorized activities occur, the forest owner or manager implements actions designed to curtail such activities and correct the situation to the extent possible for meeting all land management objectives with consideration of	C	

<p>available resources.</p>		<p>mechanisms to control access. County sheriffs issue citations for ordinance violations throughout the year (i.e. off trail ATV use, unpermitted firewood cutting, illegal deer stands in trees, etc.). See below for more detail by county.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ashland, Barron, Bayfield, Chippewa, Clark, Douglas, Eau Claire, Florence, Forest, Iron, Jackson, Lincoln, Oconto, Taylor, and Washburn: No significant instances of timber theft and other illegal or unauthorized activities were detected or reported, as confirmed in review of records and interviews with staff.</li> <li>• Juneau: A farm field was found to be encroaching on Juneau County Forest land by approximately 4 acres. The site was surveyed and a letter + copy of the survey were mailed to the farm owners. The owners agreed with the findings and have stopped their encroachment. The 4 acres will be replanted in spring of 2017. No other illegal harvesting or settlement has been found to have occurred on the Juneau County Forest.</li> <li>• Price: There has been some illegal white birch pole harvesting. We no longer have permits to harvest misc. white birch products. We contact the local DNR wardens to take care of any enforcement needs.</li> <li>• Sawyer: Harvesting of birch poles without a permit has become issue, increased law enforcement efforts to address the problem.</li> <li>• Wood: Yes, illegal firewood cutting, dumping, unauthorized motor vehicles, etc. Some efforts to improve road closures. Not much success controlling illegal activities. Enforcement capabilities are inadequate.</li> </ul>
<p><b>1.6. Forest managers shall demonstrate a long-term commitment to adhere to the FSC Principles and Criteria.</b></p>	<p>NE</p>	
<p><b>Principle #2: Long-term tenure and use rights to the land and forest resources shall be clearly defined, documented and legally established.</b></p>		

<p><b>2.1. Clear evidence of long-term forest use rights to the land (e.g., land title, customary rights, or lease agreements) shall be demonstrated.</b></p>	<p>C</p>	
<p><b>2.1.a</b> The forest owner or manager provides clear evidence of <i>long-term</i> rights to use and manage the FMU for the purposes described in the management plan.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>County Land Information Department and Register of Deeds maintain all documentation related to ownership and use rights for all counties. Each county’s CLUP includes an explanation of ownership and use rights and the authority to manage the FMU.</p> <p>For example, for counties visited in 2016, Chapter 100 of the CLUP, specifically section 115 and 120, mention the state and county laws and regulations that grant the counties the authority to own and manage the FMU (e.g., Sawyer and Washburn CLUPs). Sawyer County demonstrated records of ownership that are accessible via an online, publicly available database (<a href="http://sawycow.wgxtreme.com">http://sawycow.wgxtreme.com</a>).</p>
<p><b>2.1.b</b> The forest owner or manager identifies and documents legally established use and access rights associated with the FMU that are held by other parties.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Register of Deeds maintains any recorded agreements held with other parties, as verified through a sample of records for the counties visited in 2016. See County Forest CLUP– Ch 500 for policies specific to public use/access, including any schedule of public use fees. Stakeholders interviewed in 2016 recognize the use and access rights of multiple user groups.</p>
<p><b>2.1.c</b> Boundaries of land ownership and use rights are clearly identified on the ground and on maps prior to commencing management activities in the vicinity of the boundaries.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Maps included in timber sale prospectuses for each county visited in 2016 included property boundaries where they existed. Timber sale boundaries were clearly marked with paint in the field and set back from any property boundaries, which was confirmed in maps and interviews with staff.</p>
<p><b>2.2. Local communities with legal or customary tenure or use rights shall maintain control, to the extent necessary to protect their rights or resources, over forest operations unless they delegate control with free and informed consent to other agencies.</b></p>	<p>C</p>	
<p><b>2.2.a</b> The forest owner or manager allows the exercise of <i>tenure</i> and <i>use rights</i> allowable by</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Evidence of compliance to public access includes field observation of road and trail traffic, deer</p>

<p>law or regulation.</p>		<p>stands, and other infrastructure for recreation. Interviews with staff indicate a high level of awareness of public access rights and restrictions, rights-of-way, and other use rights.</p> <p>Stakeholders interviewed indicate that counties work collaboratively with different user groups to ensure that these rights are respected while protecting sensitive natural resources.</p>
<p><b>2.2.b</b> In FMUs where tenure or use rights held by others exist, the forest owner or manager consults with groups that hold such rights so that management activities do not significantly impact the uses or benefits of such rights.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Counties hold public meetings on planned management activities, for which records are maintained and available publicly. Many counties also have a Citizen Advisory Committee that includes representatives of different interests, including recreational user groups and other use rights holders. Where tribal resources or rights exist, each county holds consultations with tribes during the management planning process.</p> <p>Interviews with stakeholders confirmed that the counties regularly meet with these groups to ensure that forest management activities are compatible with recreation and other rights.</p>
<p><b>2.3. Appropriate mechanisms shall be employed to resolve disputes over tenure claims and use rights. The circumstances and status of any outstanding disputes will be explicitly considered in the certification evaluation. Disputes of substantial magnitude involving a significant number of interests will normally disqualify an operation from being certified.</b></p>	<p>C</p>	
<p><b>2.3.a</b> If <i>disputes</i> arise regarding tenure claims or use rights then the forest owner or manager initially attempts to resolve them through open communication, negotiation, and/or mediation. If these good-faith efforts fail, then federal, state, and/or local laws are employed to resolve such disputes.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>No new tenure claims or use rights other than those highlighted in C1.5. Per records reviewed and staff interviewed in 2016, counties work to resolve issues such as encroachment and timber theft as quickly and peacefully as possible through open communication and, where necessary, legal mechanisms.</p>
<p><b>2.3.b</b> The forest owner or manager documents any significant disputes over</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Records regarding timber theft issues in Sawyer County were observed; however, these could not be</p>

tenure and use rights.		shared since the investigation is ongoing and is highly sensitive according to interviews with managerial staff.
<b>Principle #3: The legal and customary rights of indigenous peoples to own, use and manage their lands, territories, and resources shall be recognized and respected.</b>		
<b>3.1. Indigenous peoples shall control forest management on their lands and territories unless they delegate control with free and informed consent to other agencies.</b>	NE	
<b>3.2. Forest management shall not threaten or diminish, either directly or indirectly, the resources or tenure rights of indigenous peoples.</b>	C	
<b>3.2.a</b> During management planning, the forest owner or manager consults with American Indian groups that have legal rights or other binding agreements to the FMU to avoid harming their resources or rights.	C	County Board meetings and forestry committee meetings in which policies for resource management and work plans are set allow for public input, including representatives of indigenous people. The DNR and counties also maintain relationships with local Tribes and solicit input as needed. Indian treaty rights, and specifically Lake Superior Bands of Chippewa, were granted reserved rights to hunt, fish and gather on all ceded lands in eastern Minnesota and northwest Wisconsin as part of the treaties of 1837 and 1842. On those public lands within the ceded territory, including County Forests, a free permit process is used to provide for tribal gathering of firewood, boughs, tree bark, lodge poles, marsh hay, jack pine stumps, and maple syrup. The Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission (GLIFWC) is a consortium of tribal representatives that represents tribal resources interests within the ceded territory. In Washburn, staff showed examples of permits issued to tribal members for gathering ironwood poles, herbs, and other plant-based resources. The tribal member must provide their tribal ID card for this access, which is recorded by the counties.
<b>3.2.b</b> Demonstrable actions are taken so that forest management does not adversely affect tribal resources. When applicable, evidence of, and measures for, protecting tribal resources are incorporated in the management plan.	C	According to interviews with staff, local tribal offices are committed to government-to-government relationships. This has been a challenge to counties since most dealing are between state and federal

		<p>governments with tribes. Nevertheless, tribal representatives do attend county committee meetings to provide feedback. Sawyer County has a tribal member on the county forestry committee to represent tribal interests.</p> <p>GLIFWC has a representative on the DNR's elk advisory committee, which covers portions of Sawyer County.</p> <p>Staff interviewed are aware of procedures for identifying known archaeological sites and implement measures to protect them. The most recent formal trainings in which some tribes participated with staff occurred in 2007 and 2009, according to interviews (note: this is documented in FSC CAR 2007.1). Staff at various county offices stated that oftentimes tribal members are reluctant to participate in trainings and do not wish to share locations of sites unless absolutely necessary.</p>
<p><b>3.3. Sites of special cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance to indigenous peoples shall be clearly identified in cooperation with such peoples, and recognized and protected by forest managers.</b></p>	<p>NE</p>	
<p><b>3.4. Indigenous peoples shall be compensated for the application of their traditional knowledge regarding the use of forest species or management systems in forest operations. This compensation shall be formally agreed upon with their free and informed consent before forest operations commence.</b></p>	<p>NE</p>	
<p><b>Principle #4: Forest management operations shall maintain or enhance the long-term social and economic well-being of forest workers and local communities.</b></p>		
<p><b>4.1. The communities within, or adjacent to, the forest management area should be given opportunities for employment, training, and other services.</b></p>	<p>C</p>	
<p><b>4.1.a</b> Employee compensation and hiring</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Employment opportunities at DNR and County</p>

<p>practices meet or exceed the prevailing <i>local</i> norms within the forestry industry.</p>		<p>Forests are non-discriminatory, including with respect to place of residence. At all counties visited in 2016, state and federal postings were visible in a public place. State hiring processes adhere to strict policies for compliance to equal opportunity, selecting interview candidates, and other measures to ensure fair hiring practices. More information is available at <a href="http://oser.state.wi.us/index.asp">http://oser.state.wi.us/index.asp</a>.</p>
<p><b>4.1.b</b> Forest work is offered in ways that create high quality job opportunities for employees.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>County and DNR jobs are quality positions with competitive compensation and benefits. The workforce demonstrates a high degree of commitment to their work and to the natural resources that they are charged with managing in the peoples’ interest. Though employee salaries can be less than industry, there are other benefits that help offset the differences, such as training and reduced travel. Employees interviewed stated that benefits and salaries are currently comparable to private industry.</p> <p>There is a long average tenure of DNR and County forestry staff, indicating that the quality of work life (compensation, work hours, job security, intangibles, etc.) is favorable compared to other employment opportunities. County employees interviewed during the 2016 audit expressed high job satisfaction and ample opportunities for training, including through DNR-sponsored programs.</p> <p>Interviewed employees about training opportunities and reviewed a sample of training records in personnel files for all counties visited in 2016. Common topics for records reviewed for 2011-2016 included invasive species, Karner Blue Butterfly, Natural Heritage Index, Chainsaw Safety, WisFIRS, Damage Assessment, Pesticide applicator, Mining, etc.</p>
<p><b>4.1.c</b> Forest workers are provided with fair wages.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>A description of how salaries and benefits are determined is available at <a href="http://oser.state.wi.us/index.asp">http://oser.state.wi.us/index.asp</a>, including through adherence to federal and state laws for exempt and non-exempt employees. County employees</p>

		interviewed stated that wages and benefits are comparable to somewhat less than to what could be earned in similar positions in private industry; however, access to training was cited as an important factor in considering positions with counties or DNR.
<b>4.1.d</b> Hiring practices and conditions of employment are non-discriminatory and follow applicable federal, state and local regulations.	C	Refer to <a href="http://oser.state.wi.us/index.asp">http://oser.state.wi.us/index.asp</a> for information on hiring practices. See also 4.1.a and 4.1.c. Contracts reviewed in 2016 include stipulations to adhere to federal and state laws, including equal opportunity and non-discrimination.  As observed in county offices, OSHA and anti-discrimination posters are posted in a publicly visible place (e.g., Washburn County, Sawyer County).
<b>4.1.e</b> The forest owner or manager provides work opportunities to qualified local applicants and seeks opportunities for purchasing local goods and services of equal price and quality.	C	FME distributes bid prospectuses to a comprehensive list of potential bidders, and intentionally varies the sizes of timber sales to allow access to a range of local companies. This process is described in the publicly available CLUP for each county, specifically in Chapter 500, section 525 (e.g., Burnett CLUP).
<b>4.1.f</b> Commensurate with the size and scale of operation, the forest owner or manager provides and/or supports learning opportunities to improve public understanding of forests and forest management.	C	County employees reside in small, mid-sized and large communities throughout Wisconsin and the workforce is engaged in civic activities throughout the state both as private citizens in off hours and as DNR and County representatives during work hours. DNR Liaisons and County Forest staff support a large number and wide range of environmental education activities. For example, DNR staff attend public meetings related to the management of County Forests and also provide educational opportunities to the public, such as tours, WCFA meetings (records reviewed for 2014-16), Log A Load (Sawyer County fundraiser to the Children’s Miracle Network), tree and planting with elementary school students (Sawyer County). Records of other events are available on the WCFA website.
<b>4.1.g</b> The forest owner or manager participates in local economic development and/or civic activities, based on scale of	C	See also 4.1.f. Annual budgets for forest access roads, trails, campsites, and other infrastructure are documented in each County’s AWP. What



<p>operation and where such opportunities are available.</p>		<p>infrastructure projects were completed and final costs are documented in Annual Reports.</p> <p>DNR offers several training events that are open to private consultants and forest industry professionals (e.g., <a href="http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/ForestLandowners/cuttingNoticeTraining.html">http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/ForestLandowners/cuttingNoticeTraining.html</a>). DNR hired a forest economist in 2015 that has been providing publications on the economic impacts of forests and timber in the state (<a href="http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/forestbusinesses/factsheets.html">http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/forestbusinesses/factsheets.html</a>).</p> <p>WCFA documents the impacts of the WCFP on its website under the “Economic” tab (<a href="http://www.wisconsincountyforests.com/">http://www.wisconsincountyforests.com/</a>; viewed 8/8/16), and a myriad of other educational and civic activities put on by WCFA and WCFP participants (individual county forests and WDNR).</p>
<p><b>4.2. Forest management should meet or exceed all applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of employees and their families.</b></p>	<p>C</p>	
<p><b>4.2.a</b> The forest owner or manager meets or exceeds all applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of employees and their families (also see Criterion 1.1).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Other than the normal minor bumps, bruises and scrapes from working in the field, Counties only reported one serious accident to a contractor’s employee in Florence County that was hit in the shoulder by a tree. He was transported to a hospital for treatment. Since logging contractors are insured independently, they may not always report accidents to the County. Counties reported that there have been no changes in the occupational health &amp; safety regulatory framework.</p> <p>Accident records for staff are maintained in personnel files and were reviewed for all counties in 2016.</p>
<p><b>4.2.b</b> The forest owner or manager and their employees and contractors demonstrate a safe work environment. Contracts or other written agreements include safety</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>See above for reported accident in Florence County. Counties reported that there have been no changes in contract language.</p>

<p>requirements.</p>		<p>Contracts reviewed for timber harvests and chemical use for all counties in 2016 contained safety requirements (e.g., Washburn County 2013 chemical use contract, section “Requirements”; and timber sale contract items 22-23).</p> <p>Refer to <b>OBS 2016.1</b>.</p>
<p><b>4.2.c</b> The forest owner or manager hires well-qualified service providers to safely implement the management plan.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Employees of contractors interviewed had FISTA training. For dual FSC-SFI-certified counties, records of contractors’ FISTA training were viewed in county files and confirmed on the FISTA database. There was one case in Washburn County where a contractor used a new, poorly trained employee that caused residual stand damage, which was dealt with through the county making use of contract clauses related to damages.</p>
<p><b>4.3 The rights of workers to organize and voluntarily negotiate with their employers shall be guaranteed as outlined in Conventions 87 and 98 of the International Labor Organization (ILO).</b></p>	<p>NE</p>	
<p><b>4.4. Management planning and operations shall incorporate the results of evaluations of social impact. Consultations shall be maintained with people and groups (both men and women) directly affected by management operations.</b></p>	<p>C</p>	
<p><b>4.4.a</b> The forest owner or manager understands the likely social impacts of management activities, and incorporates this understanding into management planning and operations. Social impacts include effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Archeological sites and sites of cultural, historical and community significance (on and off the FMU);</li> <li>• Public resources, including air, water and food (hunting, fishing, collecting);</li> <li>• Aesthetics;</li> <li>• Community goals for forest and natural resource use and protection such as</li> </ul>	<p>C</p>	<p>County board and forestry committee meetings in which policies for resource management and work plans are set allow for public input. Those meetings are typically held monthly and are public-noticed. County Forest Administrators are available to the public for people to provide feedback, in this way they are constantly evaluating social impacts and incorporating them into management. WCFA has been overseeing the Wisconsin County Forest Practices Study, which is evaluating many facets of forest management in the stat, including social impacts.</p> <p>Refer to County Forest Comprehensive Land Use Plan</p>

<p>employment, subsistence, recreation and health;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community economic opportunities;</li> <li>• Other people who may be affected by management operations.</li> </ul> <p>A summary is available to the CB.</p>	<p>– Ch 300, County Forest annual work plans, County Forestry Committee meetings, WDNR Timber Sale and Public Forest Lands Handbooks, and Timber Sale Cutting Notice &amp; Report (Form 2460).</p> <p>See annual summary reporting provided by counties below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ashland, Barron, Bayfield, Chippewa, Douglas, Eau Claire, Florence, Lincoln, Oconto, Price, Sawyer, Taylor, Washburn and Wood Counties reported to major stakeholder feedback or investigations outside of routine questions and requests for additional information on hunting, recreation and forest management.</li> <li>• Clark: Stakeholders call regularly with concerns or questions about various management activities occurring on the county forest, parks, and campgrounds. Concerns/questions are addressed in a timely manner by county forestry &amp; parks staff. There have been no “major issues” that have required in depth investigations since the last evaluation.</li> <li>• Forest: Currently in a public scoping survey (185 participants) for updating our Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (CORP). Since the last audit completed a public Informational meeting (116 attendees) to review proposed changes to the 15 Year Comprehensive Land Use Plan.</li> <li>• Iron: Completed a new 5 year outdoor recreation plan for the County Forest. Received public comment and held public hearing on new Rec plan. There were no stakeholder comments in relation to any allegations that needed a response or investigation. Forest Administrator makes contact with the public routinely throughout the year to answer questions and deal with concerns as they arise.</li> <li>• Jackson: We have regular monthly meetings that are open to the public and any changes to the 15 plan must go to the full County Board that is also open to the public.</li> </ul>
---	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Juneau: In 2016, Juneau County Outdoor Recreation Plan will be reviewed and updated. One comment on a county forest timber sale was received in an area known as Oak Ridge. An individual didn't want to see any trees cut in their favorite area of County Forest. Site consisted of over-mature oak that was converting to red maple &amp; white pine. Harvest goal was to promote oak regeneration and encourage oak to exist into the future on Oak Ridge. WI DNR staff established and marked the sale. Harvesting followed cutting prescription, abundant leave trees were left and very little damage was done to advanced regen. The individual was informed of why sale was important to promote oak and no further comments have been received.</li> </ul>
<p><b>4.4.b</b> The forest owner or manager seeks and considers input in management planning from people who would likely be affected by management activities.</p>	C	<p>County Forest Administrators respond to any stakeholder comments as they are received, as confirmed in interviews with stakeholders and staff. No major issues other than those listed under other indicators surfaced in the last year. Refer to information on each county in WCFP FSC data request summary in 4.4.a.</p>
<p><b>4.4.c</b> People who are subject to direct adverse effects of management operations are apprised of relevant activities in advance of the action so that they may express concern.</p>	C	<p>County board meetings and forestry committee meetings in which policies for resource management and work plans are set allow for public input. Adjacent land owners are contacted in cases when management activities occur near property boundaries or otherwise may affect use rights. County Forest Administrators are available to the public for people to provide feedback, in this way they are constantly evaluating social impacts and incorporating them into management.</p>
<p><b>4.4.d</b> For <i>public forests</i>, consultation shall include the following components:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clearly defined and accessible methods for public participation are provided in both long and short-term planning processes, including harvest plans and operational plans;</li> </ol>	C	<p>The County board and forestry committee meetings fulfill this requirement, as well as the administrators being available to the general public upon request. For example, in Sawyer County, county staff reported that the second Wednesday of each month that the Forestry Committee Meeting is held and that there is room for public comment at each meeting.</p>

<p>2. Public notification is sufficient to allow interested stakeholders the chance to learn of upcoming opportunities for public review and/or comment on the proposed management;</p> <p>3. An accessible and affordable appeals process to planning decisions is available. Planning decisions incorporate the results of public consultation. All draft and final planning documents, and their supporting data, are made readily available to the public.</p>		<p>The County Forest Law establishes mechanisms for public participation in all planning processes. Annual work plans are open for public comment as advertised in local newspapers and on each County’s website well before management activities take place. Appeals are dealt with prior to plans becoming finalized as to avoid any conflicts; however, the public may contact their elected county representative or present information during monthly public meetings to appeal decisions. All draft and final plans are made available in County offices and on each County’s website. Specific data may be requested from county forest managers.</p>
<p><b>4.5. Appropriate mechanisms shall be employed for resolving grievances and for providing fair compensation in the case of loss or damage affecting the legal or customary rights, property, resources, or livelihoods of local peoples. Measures shall be taken to avoid such loss or damage.</b></p>	<p>C</p>	
<p><b>4.5.a</b> The forest owner or manager does not engage in negligent activities that cause damage to other people.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Through implementation of measures to protect property boundaries and ensure compliance to health &amp; safety laws, FME avoids negligent actions. Any such cases would be handled through legal staff.</p>
<p><b>4.5.b</b> The forest owner or manager provides a known and accessible means for interested stakeholders to voice grievances and have them resolved. If significant disputes arise related to resolving grievances and/or providing fair compensation, the forest owner or manager follows appropriate dispute resolution procedures. At a minimum, the forest owner or manager maintains open communications, responds to grievances in a timely manner, demonstrates ongoing good faith efforts to resolve the grievances, and maintains records of legal suites and claims.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>FME must provide mechanisms for public input on forest management activities per the law that established the program. Refer to C1.5, C2.3, and C4.4. WCFP maintains communications with the local public and tribes regarding resources of others that may be impacted during management.</p>
<p><b>4.5.c</b> Fair compensation or reasonable mitigation is provided to local people, communities or adjacent landowners for</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Through interviews with staff, the audit team confirmed that there have been no recent cases of substantiated damage to adjacent lands or permitted</p>

substantiated damage or loss of income caused by the landowner or manager.		use rights.
<b>Principle #5: Forest management operations shall encourage the efficient use of the forest’s multiple products and services to ensure economic viability and a wide range of environmental and social benefits.</b>		
<b>5.1. Forest management should strive toward economic viability, while taking into account the full environmental, social, and operational costs of production, and ensuring the investments necessary to maintain the ecological productivity of the forest.</b>	NE	
<b>5.2. Forest management and marketing operations should encourage the optimal use and local processing of the forest’s diversity of products.</b>	NE	
<b>5.3. Forest management should minimize waste associated with harvesting and on-site processing operations and avoid damage to other forest resources.</b>	NE	
<b>5.4. Forest management should strive to strengthen and diversify the local economy, avoiding dependence on a single forest product.</b>	NE	
<b>5.5. Forest management operations shall recognize, maintain, and, where appropriate, enhance the value of forest services and resources such as watersheds and fisheries.</b>	NE	
<b>5.6. The rate of harvest of forest products shall not exceed levels which can be permanently sustained.</b>	C	
<p><b>5.6.a</b> In FMUs where products are being harvested, the landowner or manager calculates the sustained yield harvest level for each sustained yield planning unit, and provides clear rationale for determining the size and layout of the planning unit. The sustained yield harvest level calculation is documented in the Management Plan.</p> <p>The sustained yield harvest level calculation</p>	C	<p>Minor changes to annual allowable harvest rate occur each year when planning is conducted for each county forest. During planning, if harvest intervals or early or late constraints are changed, the calculated annual allowable harvest will change accordingly. Additionally, if harvest dates are updated on a large amount of the property the annual allowable harvest can also be impacted.</p> <p>Harvest rates established using area control</p>

<p>for each planning unit is based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• documented growth rates for particular sites, and/or acreage of forest types, age-classes and species distributions;</li> <li>• mortality and decay and other factors that affect net growth;</li> <li>• areas reserved from harvest or subject to harvest restrictions to meet other management goals;</li> <li>• silvicultural practices that will be employed on the FMU;</li> <li>• management objectives and desired future conditions.</li> </ul> <p>The calculation is made by considering the effects of repeated prescribed harvests on the product/species and its ecosystem, as well as planned management treatments and projections of subsequent regrowth beyond single rotation and multiple re-entries.</p>		<p>methods. County Forestry Committees and County Boards develop budgets annually, during which annual allowed harvest acres are considered. CF administrators can provide any documentation of Department budgets that is requested. WisFIRS Reports 36A and 37A contain stumpage value for sales completed by year.</p> <p>Minor changes to annual allowable harvest rate occur each year when planning is conducted for each county forest. During planning, if harvest intervals or early or late constraints are changed the calculated annual allowable harvest will change accordingly. Additionally, if harvest dates are updated on a large amount of the property the annual allowable harvest can also be impacted.</p>
<p><b>5.6.b</b> Average annual harvest levels, over rolling periods of no more than 10 years, do not exceed the calculated sustained yield harvest level.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>As a whole, the certified counties reported 37,913 established sale acres and 2,998 deferred acres (evaluated but not ready for harvest) totaling accomplishments of 40,911 for CY15 – rpt. 301) vs. 41,990 (long term goal – 15 year avg.-CY15 – rpt. 303). WCFP records show that timber harvests remain within the AAH on average over the past 10 years (examined records in Annual Reports for Washburn and Sawyer Counties).</p>
<p><b>5.6.c</b> Rates and methods of timber harvest lead to achieving desired conditions, and improve or maintain health and quality across the FMU. Overstocked stands and stands that have been depleted or rendered to be below productive potential due to natural events, past management, or lack of management, are returned to desired stocking levels and composition at the earliest practicable time as justified in management objectives.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>WCFP uses standard harvest scheduling established in WisFIRS for each stand type. Future entries are based on species composition, stocking, and past management. A combination of moving harvests forward and delaying harvest is being used to ensure a more balanced age class distribution over time.</p>
<p><b>5.6.d</b> For NTFPs, calculation of quantitative sustained yield harvest levels is required only in cases where products are harvested in</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Currently, the only significant commercial operations of NTFPs occur on counties with Sphagnum moss resources. Harvest areas and intervals are set</p>

<p>significant commercial operations or where traditional or customary use rights may be impacted by such harvests. In other situations, the forest owner or manager utilizes available information, and new information that can be reasonably gathered, to set harvesting levels that will not result in a depletion of the non-timber growing stocks or other adverse effects to the forest ecosystem.</p>		<p>according to data from past years that shows how quickly the resource can recover. No counties that harvest and sell Sphagnum were visited in 2016.</p> <p>For small-scale NTFPs, permits were observed for Washburn and Sawyer Counties for items such as herbs and plant parts.</p>
<p><b>Principle #6: Forest management shall conserve biological diversity and its associated values, water resources, soils, and unique and fragile ecosystems and landscapes, and, by so doing, maintain the ecological functions and the integrity of the forest.</b></p>		
<p><b>6.1. Assessments of environmental impacts shall be completed -- appropriate to the scale, intensity of forest management and the uniqueness of the affected resources -- and adequately integrated into management systems. Assessments shall include landscape level considerations as well as the impacts of on-site processing facilities. Environmental impacts shall be assessed prior to commencement of site-disturbing operations.</b></p>	<p>NE</p>	
<p><b>6.2 Safeguards shall exist which protect rare, threatened and endangered species and their habitats (e.g., nesting and feeding areas). Conservation zones and protection areas shall be established, appropriate to the scale and intensity of forest management and the uniqueness of the affected resources. Inappropriate hunting, fishing, trapping, and collecting shall be controlled.</b></p>	<p>C</p>	
<p><b>6.2.a</b> If there is a likely presence of RTE species as identified in Indicator 6.1.a then either a field survey to verify the species' presence or absence is conducted prior to site-disturbing management activities, or management occurs with the assumption that potential RTE species are present.</p> <p>Surveys are conducted by biologists with the</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Assessments to detect the presence or potential presence of RTE species and ecosystems are completed during the preparation of each county's CLUP.</p> <p>The Wisconsin Natural Heritage Inventory (NHI) is consulted prior to forest management activities. Foresters work in consultation with Wildlife and Endangered Resources staff to address any</p>



<p>appropriate expertise in the species of interest and with appropriate qualifications to conduct the surveys. If a species is determined to be present, its location should be reported to the manager of the appropriate database.</p>		<p>occurrences. Forestry, wildlife and ER staffs often conduct additional site surveys for species if the NHI database indicates the need. The NHI system allows for reporting of any additional occurrences by a variety of staff. Staff explained any modifications or protections made for management when a NHI hit was detected during compartment planning in the 2016 audit.</p>
<p><b>6.2.b</b> When RTE species are present or assumed to be present, modifications in management are made in order to maintain, restore or enhance the extent, quality and viability of the species and their habitats. <b>Conservation zones</b> and/or <b>protected areas</b> are established for RTE species, including those S3 species that are considered rare, where they are necessary to maintain or improve the short and long-term viability of the species. Conservation measures are based on relevant science, guidelines and/or consultation with relevant, independent experts as necessary to achieve the conservation goal of the Indicator.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Impacts to RTE species are documented in timber sale files and the timber sale cutting notice (Form 2460-001). Management activities that impact RTE species and habitats occur regularly. Management activities are planned and carried out with consultation from wildlife and/or endangered resources staff and using species specific guidelines applied to local conditions to mitigate potential impact to RTE species and habitats.</p>
<p><b>6.2.c</b> For medium and large public forests (e.g. state forests), forest management plans and operations are designed to meet species' recovery goals, as well as landscape level biodiversity conservation goals.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Refer to HCP for Karner Blue butterfly. In other Counties, there is an HCP for Kirtland's warbler and plans for other RTE species, such as the American marten. Counties can receive funding of five cents per acre for wildlife habitat improvement, which can be used for game or non-game species. Some counties visited in 2016 have some suitable habitat for Karner Blue butterfly and create large-scale clear cuts to promote conditions for lupine.</p>
<p><b>6.2.d</b> Within the capacity of the forest owner or manager, hunting, fishing, trapping, collecting and other activities are controlled to avoid the risk of impacts to vulnerable species and communities (See Criterion 1.5).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Activities that may impact RTE species may be conducted under the authority of a broad or site specific incidental take permit as approved by DNR. The HCP for the Karner Blue butterfly also contains descriptions of review processes used to determine whether or not a management activity is likely to qualify as a take.</p>
<p><b>6.3. Ecological functions and values shall be maintained intact, enhanced, or restored,</b></p>	<p>C</p>	

<p><b>including: a) Forest regeneration and succession. b) Genetic, species, and ecosystem diversity. c) Natural cycles that affect the productivity of the forest ecosystem.</b></p>		
<p><b>6.3.a.1</b> The forest owner or manager maintains, enhances, and/or restores under-represented <b>successional</b> stages in the FMU that would naturally occur on the types of sites found on the FMU. Where old growth of different community types that would naturally occur on the forest are under-represented in the landscape relative to natural conditions, a portion of the forest is managed to enhance and/or restore old growth characteristics.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Assessments of under-represented, naturally occurring successional stages occur during comprehensive land use planning processes (refer to each county’s CLUP). Specific property goals for management of these areas are described in the CLUP (e.g., chapter 500) and/or in annual work plans. The DNR has developed some species-specific analysis of forest cover types, which are available on the DNR webpage.</p> <p>During review of CLUPs for the 2016 audit, it was found that some counties are working to develop late seral stands through passive management or modified active management, such as the use of extended rotations. Early successional habitat types are also under-represented in some counties as described in the CLUP. For example, oak-savannahs may use timber harvests, prescribed fire or other types of active management to maintain their openness and species composition.</p>
<p><b>6.3.a.2</b> When a <b>rare ecological community</b> is present, modifications are made in both the management plan and its implementation in order to maintain, restore or enhance the viability of the community. Based on the vulnerability of the existing community, <b>conservation zones</b> and/or <b>protected areas</b> are established where warranted.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Some counties visited in 2016 are within an ecoregion that contains pine barren ecosystems, which not only are rare, but support a number of RTE species or species of concern such as sharp-tailed grouse and Karner Blue butterfly. Common modifications include creating larger openings with little to no retention.</p>
<p><b>6.3.a.3</b> When they are present, management maintains the area, structure, composition, and processes of all <b>Type 1</b> and <b>Type 2 old growth</b>. Type 1 and 2 old growth are also protected and buffered as necessary with conservation zones, unless an alternative plan is developed that provides greater overall protection of old growth values.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Relict old growth stands (Type 1) are typed as reserved; there is no active management. There are 5 stands in three FSC County Forests (Eau Claire, Bayfield, and Forest). On any managed old-growth stand – any forest management is conducted primarily to maintain or enhance old growth characteristics, such as invasive species control. Only one of these stands has a planned treatment and</p>

<p>Type 1 Old Growth is protected from harvesting and road construction. Type 1 old growth is also protected from other timber management activities, except as needed to maintain the ecological values associated with the stand, including old growth attributes (e.g., remove exotic species, conduct controlled burning, and thinning from below in dry forest types when and where restoration is appropriate).</p> <p>Type 2 Old Growth is protected from harvesting to the extent necessary to maintain the area, structures, and functions of the stand. Timber harvest in Type 2 old growth must maintain old growth structures, functions, and components including individual trees that function as refugia (see Indicator 6.3.g).</p> <p>On public lands, old growth is protected from harvesting, as well as from other timber management activities, except if needed to maintain the values associated with the stand (e.g., remove exotic species, conduct controlled burning, and thinning from below in forest types when and where restoration is appropriate).</p> <p>On American Indian lands, timber harvest may be permitted in Type 1 and Type 2 old growth in recognition of their sovereignty and unique ownership. Timber harvest is permitted in situations where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Old growth forests comprise a significant portion of the tribal ownership.</li> <li>2. A history of forest stewardship by the tribe exists.</li> <li>3. High Conservation Value Forest attributes are maintained.</li> <li>4. Old-growth structures are maintained.</li> </ol>	<p>that is not until 2099. No activity in these areas has occurred since the last audit.</p> <p>*Note: while some counties may use the term ‘old growth’ to describe older stands or stand that will eventually develop old-growth characteristics (i.e., late seral), these areas do not meet the FSC-US definition of old growth.</p>
---	---

<p>5. Conservation zones representative of old growth stands are established.</p> <p>6. Landscape level considerations are addressed.</p> <p>7. Rare species are protected.</p>		
<p><b>6.3.b</b> To the extent feasible within the size of the ownership, particularly on larger ownerships (generally tens of thousands or more acres), management maintains, enhances, or restores habitat conditions suitable for well-distributed populations of animal species that are characteristic of forest ecosystems within the landscape.</p>	C	<p>DNR wildlife biologists work with liaison foresters and county forest administrators to plan and carry out projects for wildlife habitat improvement. Funding of \$.05/ acre is provided to county forests by the DNR to perform habitat improvement work. Additionally, individual biologists, foresters, and county forest administrators pursue additional projects for the benefit of wildlife at a local level. Some recent examples of efforts to benefit wildlife include: Young Forest Initiative, barrens restoration and management, grouse/woodcock habitat, Kirtland’s Warbler habitat, turkey habitat, etc. Projects are often conducted in partnership with other groups including ruffed grouse society, national wild turkey federation, USFWS, etc.</p>
<p><b>6.3.c</b> Management maintains, enhances and/or restores the plant and wildlife habitat of <b>Riparian Management Zones (RMZs)</b> to provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) habitat for aquatic species that breed in surrounding uplands;</li> <li>b) habitat for predominantly terrestrial species that breed in adjacent <b>aquatic habitats</b>;</li> <li>c) habitat for species that use riparian areas for feeding, cover, and travel;</li> <li>d) habitat for plant species associated with riparian areas; and,</li> <li>e) stream shading and inputs of wood and leaf litter into the adjacent aquatic ecosystem.</li> </ul>	C	<p>Forest management activities regularly occur near riparian areas. Wisconsin BMPs for Water Quality are followed when conducting management near riparian areas. BMP, soil disturbance, and ephemeral pond monitoring projects are conducted on county forest lands by the DNR forest hydrologist. BMP monitoring was completed in 2013 on county forest lands and a report has recently been published. The Forest Guilds report completed in 2016 (cited in C8.2) also contains some evaluation of BMPs that affect riparian habitats.</p>
<p><b>Stand-scale Indicators</b></p> <p><b>6.3.d</b> Management practices maintain or enhance plant species composition, distribution and frequency of occurrence similar to those that would naturally occur on</p>	C	<p>The harvests observed in 2016 are consistent the natural disturbance regimes that would maintain conditions for the species’ groups found on those sites. For example, aspen regeneration harvests mimic wind and fire events that would naturally keep</p>

<p>the site.</p>		<p>aspen on the landscape. Oak thinnings and northern hardwood selections harvests are consistent with wind-throw and natural mortality events that would promote the growth of healthier trees.</p>
<p><b>6.3.e</b> When planting is required, a local source of known provenance is used when available and when the local source is equivalent in terms of quality, price and productivity. The use of non-local sources shall be justified, such as in situations where other management objectives (e.g. disease resistance or adapting to climate change) are best served by non-local sources. <b>Native species</b> suited to the site are normally selected for regeneration.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Seed sources predominantly come from areas around the state’s current and past nurseries (Boscobel and Wisconsin Rapids). Some counties send local seed sources to out-of-state nurseries to be container grown. See below for more detail by county.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ashland, Barron, Chippewa, Forest, Iron, Price, Taylor and Washburn reported that no planting / seeding has occurred since the last audit.</li> <li>• Bayfield: 100 pounds of jack pine seed from the Hayward, WI nursery (collected locally); 28,200 jack pine seedlings sourced from Bayfield County; 218,400 red pine seedlings sourced from seed zone 28 in Ontario, Canada; 1,200 red pine seedlings sourced from Forest County, WI.</li> <li>• Clark: Jack pine planted on the county forest 2015 was grown by a contractor with seed purchased from the WI DNR sourced in central WI. Red pine planted on the county forest is supplied by a contractor that is collected from their local seed source (mostly Canada). Red Pine has very little genetic diversity across its range so seed source is a minimal concern.</li> <li>• Douglas: We have provided locally and regionally collected seed to the nursery that grows our red pine and jack pine stock for us. We have not used any non-local sources.</li> <li>• Eau Claire: Jack Pine seed from Hayward State Nursery; Jack Pine Seedlings from the State Nursery; Red Pine Seedlings from PRT (20.52K from Ontario Tree Seed Plant and 17.4K from Forest County, WI)</li> <li>• Florence, Jackson, Juneau, Lincoln, Oconto, Sawyer and Wood Counties: State of Wisconsin, Dept. of Natural Resources nursery stock from seed sources local to each county have been used, such as for jack pine plantings. Typically,</li> </ul>

		the closest state nursery is used.
<p><b>6.3.f</b> Management maintains, enhances, or restores habitat components and associated stand structures, in abundance and distribution that could be expected from naturally occurring processes. These components include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c) large live trees, live trees with decay or declining health, <b>snags</b>, and well-distributed coarse down and dead woody material. <b>Legacy trees</b> where present are not harvested; and</li> <li>d) vertical and horizontal complexity.</li> </ul> <p>Trees selected for <b>retention</b> are generally representative of the dominant species found on the site.</p>	C	<p>Sites observed contained large, legacy trees such as conifers within aspen regeneration harvests. Selection harvests observed had snags retained. See site notes for more information.</p> <p>See <b>OBS 2016.2</b>.</p>
<p><b>6.3.g.1</b> In the Southeast, Appalachia, Ozark-Ouachita, Mississippi Alluvial Valley, and Pacific Coast Regions, when <b>even-aged systems</b> are employed, and during salvage harvests, live trees and other native vegetation are retained within the harvest unit as described in Appendix C for the applicable region.</p> <p>In the Lake States Northeast, Rocky Mountain and Southwest Regions, when even-aged silvicultural systems are employed, and during salvage harvests, live trees and other native vegetation are retained within the harvest unit in a proportion and configuration that is consistent with the characteristic natural disturbance regime unless retention at a lower level is necessary for the purposes of restoration or rehabilitation. See Appendix C for additional regional requirements and guidance.</p>	C	<p>Across the certified FMUs, 19,511 acres of even-aged harvests occurred in CY2015 (Advanced WisFIRS TSale Rpt.). When even-aged harvests are conducted green tree retention guidelines, biomass harvesting and coarse woody debris guidelines are all followed, as confirmed in field observation.</p>
<p><b>6.3.g.2</b> Under very limited situations, the landowner or manager has the option to develop a qualified plan to allow minor departure from the opening size limits</p>	NA	<p>There are no additional restrictions on even-aged management for the Lake States-Central Hardwoods region.</p>

<p>described in Indicator 6.3.g.1. A qualified plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is developed by qualified experts in ecological and/or related fields (wildlife biology, hydrology, landscape ecology, forestry/silviculture).</li> <li>2. Is based on the totality of the <b>best available information</b> including peer-reviewed science regarding natural disturbance regimes for the FMU.</li> <li>3. Is spatially and temporally explicit and includes maps of proposed openings or areas.</li> <li>4. Demonstrates that the variations will result in equal or greater benefit to wildlife, water quality, and other values compared to the normal opening size limits, including for sensitive and rare species.</li> <li>5. Is reviewed by independent experts in wildlife biology, hydrology, and landscape ecology, to confirm the preceding findings.</li> </ol>		
<p><b>6.3.h</b> The forest owner or manager assesses the risk of, prioritizes, and, as warranted, develops and implements a strategy to prevent or control <b>invasive species</b>, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. a method to determine the extent of invasive species and the degree of threat to native species and ecosystems;</li> <li>2. implementation of management practices that minimize the risk of invasive establishment, growth, and spread;</li> <li>3. eradication or control of established invasive populations when feasible: and,</li> <li>4. monitoring of control measures and management practices to assess their effectiveness in preventing or controlling invasive species.</li> </ol>	<p>C</p>	<p>Counties reported on the following activities related to this indicator:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ashland: Follow BMPs for invasive species.</li> <li>• Barron: Field foresters and Forest Administrator observe and document the presence of invasives in their daily activities (timber sale set-up, timber sale inspections etc. No invasive species have been detected on the forest to date.</li> <li>• Bayfield: We’ve incorporated the following preventative measure into all of our timber sale contracts: to comply with BMP’s for invasive species, prior to moving equipment onto or off of the sale area, the contractor must scrape or brush soil and debris from exterior surfaces of all logging equipment, to the extent practical.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Buckthorn: 10 acres were treated using chemical and mechanical methods.</li> <li>○ Black Locust: 3.5 acres were treated</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

		<p>using chemical and mechanical methods.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Spotted Knapweed: Herbicide application on 50 miles of road-sides (approximately 240 acres).</li> <li>● Chippewa: Participated in study referred to above. Active Treatment of Garlic Mustard. Hired Beaver Creek Citizen Science Center to complete a written “Chippewa County Forest Terrestrial Invasive Plants: Consolidation of Existing Inventory Data and Preliminary Management Framework”.</li> <li>● Clark: Clark County follows a “Clark County Forest Invasive Plant Plan” that is included in the 15 year comprehensive land use plan for the county. Foresters and other department staff monitor for invasive species year round. When found, sites are added to our invasive species GIS layer. Annually during the months of June and July the department spends 3-5 days treating invasive species focusing on high traffic areas (i.e. rec trails, forest roads, landings, etc.). Treatment information is tracked in our GIS database. Treated sites remain in the GIS database and are continually monitored. By the end of the 2015 growing season, 190 occurrences had been documented. 18 new sites were discovered in 2015. Nearly every documented invasive occurrence is associated with human vectors and most are concentrated in high use recreational areas. Herbicide treatments to control Spotted Knapweed, Leafy Spurge, Cypress Spurge, Japanese Honeysuckle, Purple Loosestrife, and several others began in 2004 and continued through 2015. These treatments have helped contain the spread of invasives and reduced their intensity in the treated areas.</li> <li>● Douglas: Treated a .02 acre outbreak of Japanese Knotweed with Milestone herbicide. Completed a week of experimental biological control of invasive species utilizing goats to consume</li> </ul>
--	--	---



		<p>Buckthorn, Honeysuckle, and Spotted Knapweed in Lucius Woods County Park. Continued monitoring for, and documentation of invasive species presence on reconnaissance plots, established timber sales, County Forest Roads, recreational trails, and Wildlife openings (WisFIRS data collection item).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eau Claire: There are some areas that have buckthorn, honeysuckle, and knapweed, but are not managed intensively at this time.</li> <li>• Florence: Hand pulling of buckthorn and thistle.</li> <li>• Forest: Hand pulling and disposal of Garlic Mustard. Monitoring of all sites during sale establishment.</li> <li>• Iron: Implementation of Invasive species BMP's are used to reduce and minimize spread of invasives. Mowing has been used along highways on invasive species but none have been identified within the County Forest.</li> <li>• Jackson: We are including invasive species in our regular forest reconnaissance and when timber sales are set up. When it is found it is GPS'd and treated following the county forest guidelines that are being developed. We are doing additional surveys and treatments in our parks that are near water bodies. We have also identified invasive species on our recreational trails and following our plan to treat those areas.</li> <li>• Juneau: Small patches, less than (1/2 acre), of garlic mustard have been found along forest edge of Kennedy Park. In the past year the garlic mustard found has been treated with glyphosate in the early spring. Record of finding noted in WisFirs.</li> <li>• Lincoln: Maintain GIS layer for known invasive occurrences. Areas are sprayed and monitored for control. ID books are handed out to user groups.</li> <li>• Oconto: Implement best management practices for invasive species.</li> <li>• Price: Mechanical and herbicide control of</li> </ul>
--	--	---

		<p>buckthorn. This mainly occurs in county parks. Invasive species prevention signs are placed by the boat landings. Invasive species monitoring occurs during daily work activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sawyer: Continued to monitor for any new invasive species location.</li> <li>• Taylor: Taylor County Forest was inventoried for terrestrial invasive species during the summer of 2015 by Beaver Creek Reserve employees. In the next couple of weeks, the Forestry Dept. will be working with a local contractor who is a certified pesticide applicator to eradicate the invasives that pose the most ecological harm to the county forest.</li> <li>• Washburn: We are monitoring a buckthorn infestation in the northeast part of the county. We have funds available to treat and are planning on several treatment (chemical) options later this summer/fall.</li> <li>• Wood: No specific control measures. Invasive species BMP's are part of all timber sale contracts.</li> </ul>
<p><b>6.3.i</b> In applicable situations, the forest owner or manager identifies and applies site-specific fuels management practices, based on: (1) natural fire regimes, (2) risk of wildfire, (3) potential economic losses, (4) public safety, and (5) applicable laws and regulations.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Most prescribed burns in Wisconsin are conducted for Wildlife habitat purposes. Counties work with DNR to complete burn plans and coordinate burns on County Forests. Barrens mgt., red oak regeneration and suppressing woody vegetation in grasslands are three of the more common objectives for prescribed fire.</p> <p>Wildfires: The following numbers are statewide 2015 calendar year so far:  <a href="http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/ForestFire/report.asp">http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/ForestFire/report.asp</a>                      Wildfires – 514 fires have burned 526 acres to date in Wisconsin.</p>
<p><b>6.4. Representative samples of existing ecosystems within the landscape shall be protected in their natural state and recorded on maps, appropriate to the scale and intensity of operations and the uniqueness of the affected resources.</b></p>	<p>NE</p>	
<p><b>6.5 Written guidelines shall be prepared and</b></p>	<p>NE</p>	

<p><b>implemented to control erosion; minimize forest damage during harvesting, road construction, and all other mechanical disturbances; and to protect water resources.</b></p>		
<p><b>6.6. Management systems shall promote the development and adoption of environmentally friendly non-chemical methods of pest management and strive to avoid the use of chemical pesticides. World Health Organization Type 1A and 1B and chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides; pesticides that are persistent, toxic or whose derivatives remain biologically active and accumulate in the food chain beyond their intended use; as well as any pesticides banned by international agreement, shall be prohibited. If chemicals are used, proper equipment and training shall be provided to minimize health and environmental risks.</b></p>	NE	
<p><b>6.7. Chemicals, containers, liquid and solid non-organic wastes including fuel and oil shall be disposed of in an environmentally appropriate manner at off-site locations.</b></p>	NE	
<p><b>6.8. Use of biological control agents shall be documented, minimized, monitored, and strictly controlled in accordance with national laws and internationally accepted scientific protocols. Use of genetically modified organisms shall be prohibited.</b></p>	NE	
<p><b>6.9. The use of exotic species shall be carefully controlled and actively monitored to avoid adverse ecological impacts.</b></p>	NA	
<p><b>6.9.a</b> The use of <i>exotic species</i> is contingent on the availability of credible scientific data indicating that any such species is non-invasive and its application does not pose a risk to native biodiversity.</p>	NA	<p>County staff interviewed reported that no exotic species are used for commercial or management purposes, which was confirmed during field site visits.</p>
<p><b>6.9.b</b> If exotic species are used, their provenance and the location of their use are documented, and their ecological effects are</p>	NA	

actively monitored.		
<b>6.9.c</b> The forest owner or manager shall take timely action to curtail or significantly reduce any adverse impacts resulting from their use of exotic species	NA	
<b>6.10. Forest conversion to plantations or non-forest land uses shall not occur, except in circumstances where conversion:</b> a) Entails a very limited portion of the forest management unit; and b) Does not occur on High Conservation Value Forest areas; and c) Will enable clear, substantial, additional, secure, long-term conservation benefits across the forest management unit.	NE	
<b>Principle #7: A management plan -- appropriate to the scale and intensity of the operations -- shall be written, implemented, and kept up to date. The long-term objectives of management, and the means of achieving them, shall be clearly stated.</b>		
<p><b>7.1. The management plan and supporting documents shall provide:</b></p> <p>a. Management objectives. b) description of the forest resources to be managed, environmental limitations, land use and ownership status, socio-economic conditions, and a profile of adjacent lands.</p> <p>b. Description of silvicultural and/or other management system, based on the ecology of the forest in question and information gathered through resource inventories. d) Rationale for rate of annual harvest and species selection. e) Provisions for monitoring of forest growth and dynamics. f) Environmental safeguards based on environmental assessments. g) Plans for the identification and protection of rare, threatened and endangered species.</p> <p>b) h) Maps describing the forest resource base including protected areas, planned management activities and land ownership.</p>	C	<p>WCFP employs several documents to guide management. There are three main levels of documentation that comprise the Forest Management Plan (FMP):</p> <p>DNR liaison:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WDNR Public Forest Lands Handbook 2460.5 &amp; WDNR Timber Sale Handbook 2461</li> <li>• Wisconsin Forest Management Guidelines (WFMG)</li> <li>• BMP Manuals</li> <li>• Cutting Notice &amp; Report – Form 2460</li> </ul> <p>Wisconsin County Forests Association (WCFA)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategic Plan (2012)</li> <li>• Documentation and training programs to support the Strategic Plan</li> </ul> <p>Individual Counties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comprehensive Land Use Plans (CLUP or county plan)</li> <li>• Annual Work Plans (AWP)</li> <li>• Partnership meeting minutes</li> </ul>

<p><b>i) Description and justification of harvesting techniques and equipment to be used.</b></p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Timber Sale Contracts</li> </ul>
<p><b>7.1.a</b> The management plan identifies the ownership and legal status of the FMU and its resources, including rights held by the owner and rights held by others.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>County-level FMPs include chapters on statutory authority and ownership. County-level FMPs cite Wisconsin Statutes 28.10 and 28.11, the legislation that establishes the authority for establishment of, administration of, and management of county forests. DNR Public Forest Lands Handbook 2460.5 provides a comprehensive overview of these statutes.</p>
<p><b>7.1.b</b> The management plan describes the history of land use and past management, current forest types and associated development, size class and/or successional stages, and natural disturbance regimes that affect the FMU (see Indicator 6.1.a).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Each county’s CLUP describes the history of the forest in each county, the natural features of the forest, and the relevant biological communities and associated resources (Chapter 130). Current forest types and age classes are presented in Chapter 800 on integrated resource management.</p>
<p><b>7.1.c</b> The management plan describes: a) current conditions of the timber and non-timber forest resources being managed; b) desired future conditions; c) historical ecological conditions; and d) applicable management objectives and activities to move the FMU toward desired future conditions.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>FMPs are complemented by the Wisconsin Forest Management Guidelines (WFMG), published by DNR and revised in 2011. This document presents an excellent history of forest conditions and natural disturbance regimes. Objectives are clearly presented in FMPs, and future conditions and activities are presented in WisFIRS models, AWP’s, and Planning Meeting Minutes. There is some variation among plans in the presentation of desired future conditions.</p>
<p><b>7.1.d</b> The management plan includes a description of the landscape within which the FMU is located and describes how landscape-scale habitat elements described in Criterion 6.3 will be addressed.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>FMPs describe the landscape of each county in Chapter 100, and are complemented by a narrative (Form 2460) prepared for all timber sales. To varying degrees, examples of Form 2460 examined had relevant descriptions of the surrounding landscape. Chapter 500 also includes reference to landscape management and habitat elements.</p>
<p><b>7.1.e</b> The management plan includes a description of the following resources and outlines activities to conserve and/or protect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• rare, threatened, or endangered species and natural communities (see Criterion 6.2);</li> <li>• plant species and community diversity and wildlife habitats (see Criterion 6.3);</li> <li>• water resources (see Criterion 6.5);</li> <li>• soil resources (see Criterion 6.3);</li> </ul>	<p>C</p>	<p>FMPs include all of the elements listed in this indicator, particularly in Chapters 100, 500, and 600. Form 2460 and revised appendices of the plans also contain lists of RTE species. Each plan reviewed clearly identified HCVF (Chapter 600), protected and managed in cooperation with the State Natural Areas Program.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Representative Sample Areas (see Criterion 6.4);</li> <li>• High Conservation Value Forests (see Principle 9);</li> <li>• Other special management areas.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>7.1.f</b> If invasive species are present, the management plan describes invasive species conditions, applicable management objectives, and how they will be controlled (see Indicator 6.3.j).</p>	C	<p>Chapter 800 (830.3) of county plans includes lists and management recommendations for invasive species. This is strongly supplemented by an Invasive Species BMP Manual prepared by the Wisconsin Council on Forestry. Invasive species are also addressed on Form 2460, prior to timber sales.</p>
<p><b>7.1.g</b> The management plan describes insects and diseases, current or anticipated outbreaks on forest conditions and management goals, and how insects and diseases will be managed (see Criteria 6.6 and 6.8).</p>	C	<p>Chapter 600 (610) of county plans addresses control of forest pests and pathogens. The WDNR Public Forest Lands Handbook 2460.5 contains guidance on insects and diseases, with particular emphasis on how to use WisFIRS to develop management options.</p>
<p><b>7.1.h</b> If chemicals are used, the plan describes what is being used, applications, and how the management system conforms with Criterion 6.6.</p>	C	<p>County forests use chemicals sparingly, especially for silviculture, and county management plans mostly address applicable laws and regulations on their use. Chapter 600 (610) includes an integrated pest management program. Chapter 14 in the WFMG addresses pesticide use. But more importantly, a specific plan is required for each application, approved by the County Forest Administrator and detailed in either on Form 2460 or a separate chemical use form.</p>
<p><b>7.1.i</b> If biological controls are used, the management plan describes what is being used, applications, and how the management system conforms with Criterion 6.8.</p>	C	<p>Similar to chemical use, the CLUP includes general reference to biological controls, if any, in Chapter 600. Again, a specific plan would be approved, likely requiring and environmental assessment. As an example, the Washburn County plan includes reference to biological control options for Gypsy moth (Chap. 600 and 900).</p>
<p><b>7.1.j</b> The management plan incorporates the results of the evaluation of social impacts, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• traditional cultural resources and rights of use (see Criterion 2.1);</li> <li>• potential conflicts with customary uses and use rights (see Criteria 2.2, 2.3, 3.2);</li> <li>• management of ceremonial, archeological, and historic sites (see Criteria 3.3 and 4.5);</li> </ul>	C	<p>Social impacts are presented mostly in Chapters 100, 200, 300, and 500 of county plans, which include sections on treaty rights, cultural features, administration, training, ordinances, etc. Addition information is found in Chapter 700 (e.g., Roads, trails, public access), and appendices in Chapters 800 and 900.</p> <p>WCFA maintains information on economic impacts of the FME on its website, and is a part of the Wisconsin’s Forest Practices Study (WFPS) to examine the impacts of Wisconsin’s forestry</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• management of aesthetic values (see Indicator 4.4.a);</li> <li>• public access to and use of the forest, and other recreation issues;</li> <li>• local and regional socioeconomic conditions and economic opportunities, including creation and/or maintenance of quality jobs (see Indicators 4.1.b and 4.4.a), local purchasing opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.e), and participation in local development opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.g).</li> </ul>		<p>practices. More importantly, WCFA sponsored a Forestry Practices Study that examined the socioeconomic and environmental impacts of the WCFP, which was recently completed and published by the Forest Stewards Guild (<a href="http://www.foreststewardsguild.org/publications">www.foreststewardsguild.org/publications</a>).</p> <p>DNR has several other documents that lend support to this indicator and that are based on information obtained from the WCFP. For example, <i>Review of Wisconsin’s Investment in Forest Certification: Expenditures and Impacts 2005 to 2012</i> by the Council on Forestry Steering Committee (11/13/2013) draws information directly from WCFP’s certification program to assess the benefits and costs of certification. DNR also publishes economic studies and fact sheets on its website (see C4.1).</p>
<p><b>7.1.k</b> The management plan describes the general purpose, condition and maintenance needs of the transportation network (see Indicator 6.5.e).</p>		<p>WCFP plans address the transportation network in Chapters 700 and 1000 (Needs), and in AWP. BMP manuals provide description of common methods of maintaining forest roads and trails.</p>
<p><b>7.1.l</b> The management plan describes the silvicultural and other management systems used and how they will sustain, over the long term, forest ecosystems present on the FMU.</p>	C	<p>General references are contained in Chapters 500 and 800 of county plans. The DNR Silviculture Handbook is the primary reference for this element of the plan. Specific silviculture plans are part of Form 2460 and discussed in AWP.</p>
<p><b>7.1.m</b> The management plan describes how species selection and harvest rate calculations were developed to meet the requirements of Criterion 5.6.</p>	C	<p>The degree to which harvest rate calculations were presented in Chapter 800 of county plans varies among counties, but the Public Lands Handbook is the primary reference for harvest rate calculations along with Help menus in WisFIRS and reoccurring training. Species selection for harvest is a product of annual updates from forest recon and the programming of the WisFIRS system.</p>
<p><b>7.1.n</b> The management plan includes a description of monitoring procedures necessary to address the requirements of Criterion 8.2.</p>	C	<p>Most of the required monitoring is part of the forest compartment reconnaissance (recon), described in detail in the WDNR Public Forest Lands Handbook 2460.5.</p>
<p><b>7.1.o</b> The management plan includes maps describing the resource base, the characteristics of general management zones, special management areas, and protected areas at a level of detail to achieve management objectives and protect sensitive</p>	C	<p>All relevant maps are included in Chapters 800 and 900 of WCFP plans. Maps are also available through WisFIRS and GIS.</p> <p>See <b>OBS 2016.3</b>.</p>

sites.		
<p><b>7.1.p</b> The management plan describes and justifies the types and sizes of harvesting machinery and techniques employed on the FMU to minimize or limit impacts to the resource.</p>	C	<p>Although there are general descriptions of harvesting equipment in WFMG, specific requirements for machinery or special provisions for harvesting are included in prescriptions for each harvest and described on Form 2460. Most harvesting on WCFP is done with processors and forwarders, generally considered to have minimal impacts on resources.</p>
<p><b>7.1.q</b> Plans for harvesting and other significant site-disturbing management activities required to carry out the management plan are prepared prior to implementation. Plans clearly describe the activity, the relationship to objectives, outcomes, any necessary environmental safeguards, health and safety measures, and include maps of adequate detail.</p>	C	<p>All elements of this indicator are addressed routinely in the harvest prescription and narrative completed before advertising timber sales. This is a multi-disciplinary process, usually involving DNR personnel with expertise in wildlife, fisheries, water, cultural features, etc. See Form 2460 and the AWP.</p> <p>Timber harvest planning is robust and well-documented, fulfilling the requirements of this and related indicators in this standard (e.g., 6.1.a, 7.1.e, etc.). As part of the harvest planning, approval and record-keeping process a “Timber Sale Notice and Cutting Report” is prepared for all sales. The “Narrative” portion includes the following sections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. General Sale Description</li> <li>b. Ecological Considerations, including Management History, Silvicultural Systems, Green Tree Retention, Post-Harvest Regeneration Plan, Invasive Species Evaluation, Insect/Disease Concerns, Skidding/Seasonal Restrictions, Wildlife Action Plan/Species of Greatest Conservation Need, Conservation Opportunity Area (COA), Results of NHI, and Comments</li> <li>c. Water Quality Considerations</li> <li>d. Aesthetic Considerations</li> <li>e. Wildlife Considerations, including Snag, Den and Mast Tree Retention, Game Openings, and Comments</li> <li>f. Recreation Considerations</li> <li>g. Resources of Special Concern Considerations (Archeological / Historical Review)</li> </ul> <p>Refer to OBS cited under 6.3.f.</p>
<p><b>7.1.r</b> The management plan describes the stakeholder consultation process.</p>	C	<p>Chapter 200 of WCFP plans describes elements of stakeholder consultation, but this is addressed more specifically by the state statutes requiring environmental assessments and public oversight of county plans.</p>
<p><b>7.2 The management plan shall be</b></p>	C	



<p><b>periodically revised to incorporate the results of monitoring or new scientific and technical information, as well as to respond to changing environmental, social and economic circumstances.</b></p>		
<p><b>7.2.a</b> The management plan is kept up to date. It is reviewed on an ongoing basis and is updated whenever necessary to incorporate the results of monitoring or new scientific and technical information, as well as to respond to changing environmental, social and economic circumstances. At a minimum, a full revision occurs every 10 years.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>County forest managers are directed to develop new comprehensive land use plans every 15 years by Wisconsin Statute 28.11(5)(a), although the plans are living documents and updated frequently. AWP's follow the entry of new data from forest reconnaissance, and annual WisFIRS updates produce new 15-year harvest projections.</p> <p>In 2012-13, in review of OBS 2012.3, SCS confirmed that the collection of planning documents that guide management are updated on an as needed basis, in many cases at least every 10 years. Such documents include the Silvicultural Handbook, Public Forest Lands Handbook, 2460 Cutting Notices, Ecological Landscapes, and Annual Work Plans for each county. Assuming that these planning documents continue to play important roles in guiding management of WI's County Forests, the 15 year update schedule for the County Forest Comprehensive Land Use Plans is acceptable.</p> <p>Certain components of management planning documents, such as the DNR Silvicultural Handbook, are updated at least annually due to the results of scientific and technical information.</p>
<p><b>7.3 Forest workers shall receive adequate training and supervision to ensure proper implementation of the management plans.</b></p>	<p>C</p>	
<p><b>7.3.a</b> Workers are qualified to properly implement the management plan; All forest workers are provided with sufficient guidance and supervision to adequately implement their respective components of the plan.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>County staff communicated several types of training during interviews; a sample of records was reviewed in county offices for a sample of employees (see C4.1). Other staff reported FISTA, wetland delineation &amp; restoration, invasive species, WisFIRS, NHI, and storm water control. County staff reported collaborative relationships with supervisors and receive feedback whenever necessary or when they</p>

		have questions.
<b>7.4 While respecting the confidentiality of information, forest managers shall make publicly available a summary of the primary elements of the management plan, including those listed in Criterion 7.1.</b>	C	
<b>7.4.a</b> While respecting landowner confidentiality, the management plan or a management plan summary that outlines the elements of the plan described in Criterion 7.1 is available to the public either at no charge or a nominal fee.	C	The County forest comprehensive land use plans are posted on most County Forestry Department websites – which can be accessed via this link: <a href="http://www.wisconsincountyforests.com/administrators/administrators-contact">http://www.wisconsincountyforests.com/administrators/administrators-contact</a> . Plans are also available at publicly available county forest offices. Other components of the management plan are also available at <a href="http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/CountyForests/timber.html">http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/CountyForests/timber.html</a> . Observed plans online for Sawyer and Washburn Counties.
<b>7.4.b</b> Managers of public forests make draft management plans, revisions and supporting documentation easily accessible for public review and comment prior to their implementation. Managers address public comments and modify the plans to ensure compliance with this Standard.	C	Both draft and final plans are made available for public input. WCFP management plans, annual work plans, and annual reports are posted on county web pages in most counties, and are available in other formats upon request.  Monthly meetings with Forestry and Recreation Committees in each county are open to the public. (Note: all counties have such a committee, but committee names vary).
<b>Principle #8: Monitoring shall be conducted -- appropriate to the scale and intensity of forest management - - to assess the condition of the forest, yields of forest products, chain of custody, management activities and their social and environmental impacts.</b>		
<b>8.1 The frequency and intensity of monitoring should be determined by the scale and intensity of forest management operations, as well as, the relative complexity and fragility of the affected environment. Monitoring procedures should be consistent and replicable over time to allow comparison of results and assessment of change.</b>	NE	
<b>8.2. Forest management should include the research and data collection needed to monitor, at a minimum, the following</b>	C	

<p><b>indicators: a) yield of all forest products harvested, b) growth rates, regeneration, and condition of the forest, c) composition and observed changes in the flora and fauna, d) environmental and social impacts of harvesting and other operations, and e) cost, productivity, and efficiency of forest management.</b></p>		
<p><b>8.2.a.1</b> For all commercially harvested products, an inventory system is maintained. The inventory system includes at a minimum: a) species, b) volumes, c) stocking, d) regeneration, and e) stand and forest composition and structure; and f) timber quality.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Reconnaissance completed in CY 2015 – 193,938 acres (WisFIRS Rpt. 115). WisFIRS is a comprehensive system for guiding the reconnaissance and inventory of forest compartments as well as for scheduling harvest and other management options of stands. All of the elements listed in this indicator are included in compartment reconnaissance (WDNR Public Forest Lands Handbook 2460.5).</p>
<p><b>8.2.a.2</b> Significant, unanticipated removal or loss or increased vulnerability of forest resources is monitored and recorded. Recorded information shall include date and location of occurrence, description of disturbance, extent and severity of loss, and may be both quantitative and qualitative.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Data on any such losses would be gathered by a special reconnaissance inventory and entered into WisFIRS before annual updates of harvest scheduling. Timber thefts reported under C1.5 were recorded per protocols for law enforcement. Sawyer County reported that significant theft may be reported to the local sheriff’s department via phone. The sheriff’s office works with county officials to investigate these matters.</p>
<p><b>8.2.b</b> The forest owner or manager maintains records of harvested timber and NTFPs (volume and product and/or grade). Records must adequately ensure that the requirements under Criterion 5.6 are met.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>As a whole, counties reported 659,317 cord equivalents harvested (rpt. 37A – CY15- FSC only). Records are kept of harvested timber and then entered into WisFIRS before annual updates on harvest scheduling. Records for harvest of firewood and NTFPs are maintained, as well as for any products harvested by members of tribes. Harvest data from TimberBase or other timber sale accounting software are manually entered into WisFIRS and the Timber Sale Notice &amp; Cutting Reports for long-term tracking.</p> <p>Reviewed scale tickets and harvest contracts for all counties visited in 2016.</p>
<p><b>8.2.c</b> The forest owner or manager</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Wildlife Surveys: Nesting bird surveys, grouse</p>

<p>periodically obtains data needed to monitor presence on the FMU of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Rare, threatened and endangered species and/or their <i>habitats</i>;</li> <li>2) Common and rare plant communities and/or habitat;</li> <li>3) Location, presence and abundance of invasive species;</li> <li>4) Condition of protected areas, set-asides and buffer zones;</li> <li>5) High Conservation Value Forests (see Criterion 9.4).</li> </ol>		<p>transects, summer deer observations, winter track surveys, bear surveys, and a variety of other wildlife and plant monitoring. Forest Health Monitoring which includes gypsy moth and EAB surveys. DNR partners with the general public in monitoring a number of wildlife species. Reports can be found at: <a href="http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/WildlifeHabitat/reports.html">http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/WildlifeHabitat/reports.html</a></p> <p>Plants: During routine forest reconnaissance foresters also are trained to assess sites for invasives. Invasives were added to the recon data sheet a few years back to allow for retention of this information.</p> <p>Over 75,000 acres currently have invasive plants listed as being present on the FSC-certified County Forests. Several counties also participate in Cooperative Weed Management Associations (CWMA).</p> <p>DNR also has a system for gathering invasives information (aquatic, wetland, terrestrial) from the general public available on their website. <a href="http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/Invasives/report.html">http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/Invasives/report.html</a></p>
<p><b>8.2.d.1</b> Monitoring is conducted to ensure that site specific plans and operations are properly implemented, environmental impacts of site disturbing operations are minimized, and that harvest prescriptions and guidelines are effective.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>In addition to regular monitoring of active harvests and close-out, BMP monitoring for water quality, soil disturbance monitoring, and vernal pond monitoring was reported by the Counties since the last audit. The County Forest committee meetings for each Forest are also a regular opportunity for the public to participate in the management of the County Forest and provide a good means of keeping tabs on social issues on the forests. Recently the Forest Stewards Guild completed a study on the impacts of harvest constraints in Wisconsin (<a href="http://www.forestguild.org/WFPS">http://www.forestguild.org/WFPS</a>) as part of the Wisconsin Forest Practices Study.</p>
<p><b>8.2.d.2</b> A monitoring program is in place to assess the condition and environmental impacts of the forest-road system.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>BMP monitoring for water quality, soil disturbance monitoring, and vernal pond monitoring was reported by the Counties since the last audit. WCFP requires annual reports and annual work plans for each county. AWP's routinely include information on the system of forest roads and make annual requests</p>

		for road improvements and maintenance. The Wisconsin's Forest Practices Study (WFPS) will include information on roads in its examination of the impacts of Wisconsin's forestry practices.
<b>8.2.d.3</b> The landowner or manager monitors relevant socio-economic issues (see Indicator 4.4.a), including the social impacts of harvesting, participation in local economic opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.g), the creation and/or maintenance of quality job opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.b), and local purchasing opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.e).	C	See County Forest Comprehensive Land Use Plans Ch 500. Additional monitoring information is available through WCFA ( <a href="http://www.wisconsincountyforests.com">http://www.wisconsincountyforests.com</a> ) and WDNR ( <a href="http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/CountyForests/monitoring.html">http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/CountyForests/monitoring.html</a> ). WCFA is sponsoring a forestry practices study that is expected to cover the information required in this indicator for long-term socioeconomic impacts ( <a href="http://www.wisconsinforestry.org/initiatives/current/forestry-practices-study">http://www.wisconsinforestry.org/initiatives/current/forestry-practices-study</a> ).
<b>8.2.d.4</b> Stakeholder responses to management activities are monitored and recorded as necessary.	C	Meeting minutes with the public and Citizen Advisory Council serve as a record of stakeholder interaction.
<b>8.2.d.5</b> Where sites of cultural significance exist, the opportunity to jointly monitor sites of cultural significance is offered to tribal representatives (see Principle 3).	C	Communication with tribal representatives is on-going, assuring that any opportunities for joint monitoring of cultural sites are made available to tribes.
<b>8.2.e</b> The forest owner or manager monitors the costs and revenues of management in order to assess productivity and efficiency.	C	Quarterly and annual accomplishment reports show progress throughout the year for various work goals (timber sale establishment, reforestation, etc.). Timber sale inspections monitor at sale level.
<b>8.3 Documentation shall be provided by the forest manager to enable monitoring and certifying organizations to trace each forest product from its origin, a process known as the "chain of custody."</b>	NE	
<b>8.4 The results of monitoring shall be incorporated into the implementation and revision of the management plan.</b>	C	
<b>8.4.a</b> The forest owner or manager monitors and documents the degree to which the objectives stated in the management plan are being fulfilled, as well as significant deviations from the plan.	C	Annual work plans detail current activities to be carried out, while annual reports include a review of implemented activities. AWP's are based on management objectives detailed in the CLUP's and field data available in WisFIRS for classified stands. Any stands that have not been harvested are included as part of the next year's annual allowable

		harvest or delayed until the stands are ready for harvest.
<b>8.4.b</b> Where monitoring indicates that management objectives and guidelines, including those necessary for conformance with this Standard, are not being met or if changing conditions indicate that a change in management strategy is necessary, the management plan, operational plans, and/or other plan implementation measures are revised to ensure the objectives and guidelines will be met. If monitoring shows that the management objectives and guidelines themselves are not sufficient to ensure conformance with this Standard, then the objectives and guidelines are modified.	C	<p>In 2016, significant deviations from management plans or guidelines were not reported.</p> <p>Each County’s CLUP references monitoring and monitoring results in Chapter 3000.</p> <p>Most recently, WCFP had the <i>Wisconsin Forest Practices and Harvesting Constraints Assessment</i> published in early 2016 (<a href="http://www.foreststewardsguild.org/publications">www.foreststewardsguild.org/publications</a>). This publication provides an overview of how forestry practices as a whole in the state are affecting environmental and socioeconomic values. The conclusion of this report does not indicate that any state or county entities are failing to meet objectives; however, it includes some recommendations for forest managers to consider based on literature review and analysis of field data.</p>
<b>8.5 While respecting the confidentiality of information, forest managers shall make publicly available a summary of the results of monitoring indicators, including those listed in Criterion 8.2.</b>	C	
<b>8.5.a</b> While protecting landowner confidentiality, either full monitoring results or an up-to-date summary of the most recent monitoring information is maintained, covering the Indicators listed in Criterion 8.2, and is available to the public, free or at a nominal price, upon request.	C	<p>Annual reports and annual work plans present summaries of monitoring and are usually available on county web sites, or by request in offices. The public also is welcome to visit County Forest Administrator’s offices anytime and request monitoring information. Additional monitoring information is available through WCFA (<a href="http://www.wisconsincountyforests.com">http://www.wisconsincountyforests.com</a>) and WDNR (<a href="http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/CountyForests/monitoring.html">http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/CountyForests/monitoring.html</a>). Observed annual reports for both Washburn and Sawyer Counties.</p>
<p><b>Principle #9: Management activities in high conservation value forests shall maintain or enhance the attributes which define such forests. Decisions regarding high conservation value forests shall always be considered in the context of a precautionary approach.</b></p> <p><b>High Conservation Value Forests are those that possess one or more of the following attributes:</b></p>		

<p>a) <b>Forest areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant: concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g., endemism, endangered species, refugia); and/or large landscape level forests, contained within, or containing the management unit, where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance</b></p> <p>b) <b>Forest areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems</b></p> <p>c) <b>Forest areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g., watershed protection, erosion control)</b></p> <p>d) <b>Forest areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g., subsistence, health) and/or critical to local communities' traditional cultural identity (areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in cooperation with such local communities).</b></p>		
<p><b>9.1 Assessment to determine the presence of the attributes consistent with High Conservation Value Forests will be completed, appropriate to scale and intensity of forest management.</b></p>	NE	
<p><b>9.2 The consultative portion of the certification process must place emphasis on the identified conservation attributes, and options for the maintenance thereof.</b></p>	NE	
<p><b>9.3 The management plan shall include and implement specific measures that ensure the maintenance and/or enhancement of the applicable conservation attributes consistent with the precautionary approach. These measures shall be specifically included in the publicly available management plan summary.</b></p>	NE	
<p><b>9.4 Annual monitoring shall be conducted to assess the effectiveness of the measures employed to maintain or enhance the applicable conservation attributes.</b></p>	C	
<p><b>9.4.a</b> The forest owner or manager monitors, or participates in a program to annually monitor, the status of the specific HCV attributes, including the effectiveness of the measures employed for their maintenance or enhancement. The monitoring program is designed and implemented consistent with the requirements of Principle 8.</p>	C	Periodic reconnaissance updating and targeted monitoring visits to some HCVFs each year as needed. In 2014 field season a contracted (UW-Superior) biological survey team completed releve plot sampling across HCVFs to establish some baseline vegetation monitoring data. In counties visited in 2016, HCV areas mostly undergo passive management. Interviews with staff indicate that these are visited periodically to ensure that there is little to no visible anthropogenic disturbance. HCVs within harvest units are mostly within sensitive areas that are identified during pre-harvest recon and monitored during post-harvest close-out to ensure
<p><b>9.4.b</b> When monitoring results indicate increasing risk to a specific HCV attribute, the forest owner/manager re-evaluates the measures taken to maintain or enhance that attribute, and adjusts the management</p>	C	

measures in an effort to reverse the trend.		effective protection measures. According to FME staff, no increasing risks to HCVs have been detected.
---	--	--

## Appendix 6 – Chain of Custody Indicators for FMEs

Chain of Custody indicators were not evaluated during this annual audit.