

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

*Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Managed Forest Law Tree Farm Group*

SCS-FM/COC-004622

CERTIFIED	EXPIRATION
Day Month Year	Day Month Year

DATE OF FIELD AUDIT
June 10-14, 2013
DATE OF LAST UPDATE
October 17, 2013

SCS Contact:
Brendan Grady | Director
Forest Management Certification
+1.510.452.8000
bgrady@scsglobalservices.com

SCSglobal
SERVICES
Setting the standard for sustainability™

Foreword

SCS Global Services (SCS) is a certification body accredited by the Forest Stewardship Council to conduct forest management and chain of custody evaluations. Under the FSC / SCS certification system, forest management enterprises (FMEs) meeting international standards of forest stewardship can be certified as “well managed,” thereby permitting the FME’s use of the FSC endorsement and logo in the marketplace subject to regular FSC / SCS oversight.

SCS deploys interdisciplinary teams of natural resource specialists and other experts in forested regions all over the world to conduct evaluations of forest management. SCS evaluation teams collect and analyze written materials, conduct interviews with FME staff and key stakeholders, and complete field and office audits of subject forest management units (FMUs) as part of certification evaluations. Upon completion of the fact-finding phase of all evaluations, SCS teams determine conformance to the FSC Principles and Criteria.

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 30 days after issue of the certificate. Section B contains more detailed results and information for the use of by the FME.

Table of Contents

- SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY 4
- 1. GENERAL INFORMATION 4
 - 1.1 Certificate Registration Information 4
 - 1.2 FSC Data Request 5
 - 1.3 Areas Outside of the Scope of Certification (Partial Certification and Excision) 10
 - 1.4 Social Information 10
 - 1.5 Pesticide and Other Chemical Use 10
 - 1.6 Standards Used 11
 - 1.7 Conversion Table English Units to Metric Units 11
- 2. DESCRIPTION OF FOREST MANAGEMENT 12
 - 2.1 Management Context 12
 - 2.2 Forest Management Plan 13
 - 2.3 Monitoring System 14
- 3. CERTIFICATION EVALUATION PROCESS 15
 - 3.1 Evaluation Schedule and Team 15
 - 3.2 Evaluation of Management System 27
 - 3.3 Stakeholder Consultation Process 27
- 4. RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION 30
 - 4.1 Notable Strengths and Weaknesses of the FME Relative to the FSC P&C 30
 - 4.2 Process of Determining Conformance 32
- 5. CERTIFICATION DECISION 42
- SECTION B – APPENDICES (CONFIDENTIAL) 44
 - Appendix 1 – Current and Projected Annual Harvest for Main Commercial Species 44
 - Appendix 2 – List of FMUs Selected for Evaluation 44
 - Appendix 3 – List of Stakeholders Consulted 44
 - Appendix 4 – Additional Evaluation Techniques Employed 47
 - Appendix 5 – Certification Standard Conformance Table 47
 - Appendix 6 – Tracking, Tracing and Identification of Certified Products 93
 - Appendix 8 – SLIMF Eligibility Criteria 97
 - Appendix 9 – Group Management Programs 97

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY

1. General Information

1.1 Certificate Registration Information

1.1.1.a Name and Contact Information

Organization name	Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources		
Contact person	Mark Heyde		
Address	101 S. Webster St. Madison, WI 53703	Telephone	608-267-0565
		Fax	608-266-8576
		e-mail	mark.heyde@wisconsin.gov
		Website	dnr.wi.gov

1.1.1.b FSC Sales Information

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FSC Sales contact information same as above.			
FSC salesperson			
Address		Telephone	
		Fax	
		e-mail	
		Website	

1.1.2 Scope of Certificate

Certificate Type	<input type="checkbox"/> Single FMU	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple FMU
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Group	
SLIMF (if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/> Small SLIMF certificate	<input type="checkbox"/> Low intensity SLIMF certificate
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Group SLIMF certificate	
# Group Members (if applicable)	36,912 as of Jan 25 th 2013	
Number of FMU's in scope of certificate	46,028 mfl parcels as of May 2013	
Geographic location of non-SLIMF FMU(s)	Latitude & Longitude:	
Forest zone	<input type="checkbox"/> Boreal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Temperate
	<input type="checkbox"/> Subtropical	<input type="checkbox"/> Tropical
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is: 2,491,669		
Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac		
privately managed	2,491,669	
state managed		
community managed		

Number of FMUs in scope that are:			
less than 100 ha in area	45,770	100 - 1000 ha in area	258
1000 - 10 000 ha in area		more than 10 000 ha in area	
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is included in FMUs that:			Units: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac
are less than 100 ha in area	964,840		
are between 100 ha and 1000 ha in area	45,221		
meet the eligibility criteria as <i>low intensity</i> SLIMF FMUs	1,010,061		
Division of FMUs into manageable units:			
Managed Forest Law order numbers			

1.2 FSC Data Request

1.2.1 Production Forests

Timber Forest Products	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)	2,284,871
Area of production forest classified as 'plantation'	0
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by replanting or by a combination of replanting and coppicing of the planted stems	157,940 (PR, SW and 2/3 PJ)
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by natural regeneration, or by a combination of natural regeneration and coppicing of the naturally regenerated stems	2,126,955
Silvicultural system(s)	Area under type of management
Even-aged management	
Clearcut (clearcut size range)	429,246 (A, OX, 1/3 PJ)
Shelterwood	585,404 (PW and O)
Other:	88,725 (BW and MR)
Uneven-aged management	
Individual tree selection	518,683 (NH)
Group selection	331,422 (BH, CH and SH)
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)	Each land owner has their own harvest intervals based on inventory data.
Non-timber Forest Products (NTFPs)	
Area of forest protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for the production of NTFPs or services	Owners may designate productive forest NTFPs not to exceed 20% of total acreage
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	We don't collect data on NTFPs on private lands.

Explanation of the assumptions and reference to the data source upon which AAH and NTFP harvest rates estimates are based:	
Aggregated AAH or NTFB Harvest Rate does not apply to SLIMFs. Harvest intervals are included in the Managed Forest Law Stewardship Plans which use property specific inventory data.	
Species in scope of joint FM/COC certificate: <i>Scientific/ Latin Name (Common/ Trade Name)</i>	
Species	Scientific Name
Aspen/Popple:	<i>Populus tremuloides</i> <i>Populus grandidentata</i>
Balsam poplar	<i>Populus balsamifera</i>
Bottomland hardwoods:	
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> <i>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</i>
Green ash	
White birch	<i>Betula papyrifera</i>
Northern white cedar	<i>Thuja occidentalis</i>
Central hardwoods:	
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>
Hackberry	<i>Celtis occidentalis</i>
Balsam fir	<i>Abies balsamea</i>
Eastern hemlock	<i>Tsuga canadensis</i>
Miscellaneous conifers:	
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>
Miscellaneous deciduous:	
	<i>Acer</i>
Norway maple	<i>platanoides</i>
Boxelder	<i>Acer negundo</i>
	<i>Robinia</i>
Black locust	<i>pseudoacacia</i>
Honey locust	<i>Gleditsia triacanthos</i>
Eastern Hophornbeam, Ironwood	<i>Ostrya virginiana</i>
Musclewood, Bluebeech	<i>Carpinus caroliniana</i>
Northern hardwoods:	
Sugar maple	<i>Acer saccharum</i>
	<i>Betula</i>
Yellow birch	<i>alleghaniensis</i>
White ash	<i>Fraxinus americana</i>
American beech	<i>Fagus grandifolia</i>
American basswood	<i>Tilia americana</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>
Tamarack	<i>Larix laricina</i>
Black ash	<i>Fraxinus nigra</i>
White spruce	<i>Picea glauca</i>

1.2.2 FSC Product Classification

Timber products			
	Product Level 1	Product Level 2	Species
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	W1 Rough Wood	W1.1 Roundwood (logs)	Aspen/Popple, Balsam poplar, Eastern Cottonwood, Swamp white oak, Siver maple, American elm, River birch, Green ash, White birch, Northern white cedar, White oak, Bur oak, Black oak, Northern pin oak, Black walnut, Butternut, Shagbark hickory, Bitternut hickory,

<input type="checkbox"/>			Black cherry, Red maple, Hackberry, Balsam fir, Eastern hemlock, Scotch pine, European larch, Norway spruce, Eastern redcedar, Blue spruce, Norway maple, Boxelder, Black locust, Honey locust, Eastern Hophornbeam, Ironwood Musclemwood, Bluebeech, Sugar maple, Yellow birch, White ash, American beech, American basswood, Northern red oak, Red Pine Jack Pine, Eastern white pine, Black spruce Tamarack, Black ash, White spruce
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		W1.2 Fuel Wood	Aspen/Popple, Balsam poplar, Eastern Cottonwood, Swamp white oak, Silver maple, American elm, River birch, Green ash, White birch, Northern white cedar, White oak, Bur oak Black oak, Northern pin oak, Black walnut, Butternut, Shagbark hickory, Bitternut hickory, Black cherry, Red maple, Hackberry, Balsam fir, Eastern hemlock, Scotch pine, European larch, Norway spruce, Eastern redcedar, Blue spruce, Norway maple, Boxelder, Black locust, Honey locust, Eastern Hophornbeam, Ironwood Musclemwood, Bluebeech, Sugar maple, Yellow birch, White ash, American beech, American basswood, Northern red oak, Red Pine Jack Pine, Eastern white pine, Black spruce Tamarack, Black ash, White spruce
<input type="checkbox"/>		W1.3 Twigs	
<input type="checkbox"/>	W2 Wood charcoal		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	W3 Wood in chips or particles	W3.1 Wood chips	Aspen/Popple, Balsam poplar, Eastern Cottonwood, Swamp white oak, Silver maple, American elm, River birch, Green ash, White birch, Northern white cedar, White oak, Bur oak Black oak, Northern pin oak, Black walnut, Butternut, Shagbark hickory, Bitternut hickory, Black cherry, Red maple, Hackberry, Balsam fir, Eastern hemlock, Scotch pine, European larch, Norway spruce, Eastern redcedar, Blue spruce, Norway maple, Boxelder, Black locust, Honey locust, Eastern Hophornbeam, Ironwood Musclemwood, Bluebeech, Sugar maple, Yellow birch, White ash, American beech, American basswood, Northern red oak, Red Pine Jack Pine, Eastern white pine, Black spruce Tamarack, Black ash, White spruce
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other*	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"/>	N6 Plants and parts of plants	N6.1 Flowers	
<input type="checkbox"/>		N6.2 Grasses, ferns, mosses and lichens	

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		N6.3 Whole trees or plants	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N6.3.1 Christmas trees
<input type="checkbox"/>		N6.4 Pine cones	

1.2.3 Conservation Areas

Total area of forest and non-forest land protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for conservation objectives	HCVF are not designated on private lands, however animals, plants, and habitats of significance are identified through the Natural Heritage Inventory database. This information is used to craft the stewardship plan and design harvesting operations that mitigate disruptions to these elements.
---	--

High Conservation Value Forest/ Areas

High Conservation Values present and respective areas:

Units: ha or ac

	Code	HCV Type	Description & Location	Area
<input type="checkbox"/>	HCV1	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g. endemism, endangered species, refugia).		
<input 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.		
<input type="checkbox"/>	HCV3	Forests or areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems.		
<input type="checkbox"/>	HCV4	Forests or areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g. watershed protection, erosion control).		
<input type="checkbox"/>	HCV5	Forests or areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g. subsistence, health).		
<input 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).		

Total Area of forest classified as 'High Conservation Value Forest/ Area'	
--	--

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A – All forestland owned or managed by the applicant is included in the scope.		
<input 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.		
Explanation for exclusion of FMUs and/or excision:		
Control measures to prevent mixing of certified and non-certified product (C8.3):		
Description of FMUs excluded from or forested area excised from the scope of certification:		
Name of FMU or Stand	Location (city, state, country)	Size (<input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac)

1.4 Social Information

Number of forest workers (including contractors) working in forest within scope of certificate (differentiated by gender): These numbers include DNR private lands foresters along with Cooperating Foresters (private consultants)	
384 male workers	23 female workers

1.5 Pesticide and Other Chemical Use

FME does not use pesticides.

Commercial name of pesticide/ herbicide	Active ingredient	Quantity applied annually (kg or lbs)	Size of area treated annually (ha or ac)	Reason for use
a. Clopyralid (Transline)			21	Control of competing vegetation, invasive control, or disease prevention (annossum)
b. Glyphosate (Accord, Roundup, etc.)			280	
c. Metsulfuron methyl (Escort, Patriot)			31	
d. Sulfometuron methyl (Oust, Spyder)			457	
e. Triclopyr (Garlon, Tahoe, etc.)			278	
f. 2,4-D (Hi-Dep, Patron, etc.)			30	
g. Borax (Sporax)			868	
h. Other: evade, Cell-u-treat			288	

1.6 Standards Used

1.6.1 Applicable FSC-Accredited Standards

Title	Version	Date of Finalization
FSC US Forest Management Standard with SLIMF Indicators	1=0	8 – July – 2010
FSC standard for group entities in forest management groups (FSC-STD-30-005)	1-0	31 – August – 2009
All standards employed are available on the websites of FSC International (www.fsc.org), the FSC-US (www.fscus.org) or the SCS Standards page (www.scsglobalservices.com/certification-standards-and-program-documents). Standards are also available, upon request, from SCS Global Services (www.SCSGlobalServices.com).		

1.7 Conversion Table English Units to Metric Units

Length Conversion Factors		
To convert from	To	multiply by
Mile (US Statute)	Kilometer (km)	1.609347
Foot (ft)	Meter (m)	0.3048
Yard (yd)	Meter (m)	0.9144
Area Conversion Factors		
To convert from	To	multiply by
Square foot (sq ft)	Square meter (m ²)	0.09290304
Acre (ac)	Hectare (ha)	0.4047
Volume Conversion Factors		
To convert from	To	multiply by
Cubic foot (cu ft)	Cubic meter (m ³)	0.02831685
Gallon (gal)	Liter (l)	4.546
Quick reference		
1 acre	= 0.404686 ha	
1,000 acres	= 404.686 ha	
1 board foot	= 0.00348 cubic meters	
1,000 board feet	= 3.48 cubic meters	
1 cubic foot	= 0.028317 cubic meters	

2. Description of Forest Management

2.1 Management Context

2.1.1 Regulatory Context

<p>Pertinent Regulations at the National Level</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clean Water Act (Section 404 wetland protection) • Occupational Safety and Health Act • National Historic Preservation Act • Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act • Americans with Disabilities Act • U.S. ratified treaties, including CITES • Endangered Species Act
<p>Pertinent Regulations at the State / Local Level</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wisconsin BMPs for Water Quality • <i>Chapter 26, Stats.-Protection of Forest Lands</i> • Statutory authority to engage in forest certification (broadly interpreted): §§23.11, 28.01, 28.07, and 77.80 • DNR Manual Codes and Handbooks • Wisconsin Pesticide Law (Chapter 94, WI Statutes) • Use of Pesticides on Land and Water Areas of the State of Wisconsin (WI Administrative Code, Chapter NR 80) • Wild Animals and Plants Law (Chapter 29, WI Statutes) and WI Administrative Code NR 10 • Wisconsin Water Law: UW Booklet • Wisconsin Groundwater Law (Chapter 160, WI Statutes) • Navigable Waters (Chapter 30, WI Statutes) • Water Quality Standards for Wetlands (Chapter NR 103, WI Administrative Code) • Wisconsin Shoreland Management Program (Chapter NR 115, WI Administrative Code) • Endangered and Threatened Species (Chapter NR 27, WI Administrative Code) • Wisconsin Historic Preservation Laws

Regulatory Context Description

Federal and State laws and administrative codes most pertinent to MFL management are listed above. Adherence to management planning templates and guidelines is the primary method of ensuring legal compliance.

2.1.2 Environmental Context

Environmental safeguards:
<p>WI DNR has numerous safeguards in place to minimize impacts of forest management. The safeguards are described in the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wisconsin BMPs for Water Quality • NHI Database for RTE species • Forest Management Guidelines • Silviculture Handbook (habitat and diversity considerations) • Statewide Forest Plan • Ecological Landscapes Handbook • Wisconsin Bird Conservation Initiative • Wisconsin Wildlife Action Plan • Wisconsin Land Legacy Report
Management strategy for the identification and protection of rare, threatened and endangered (RTE) species and their habitats:
<p>The MFL program uses the following strategies for protecting threatened and endangered species.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training of foresters on RTE species and use of Natural Heritage Inventory search. RTE species are identified as part of the plan writing and prior to timber harvests. • When RTE species are known to occur (by querying the Natural Heritage Inventory), staff will determine appropriate steps to protect the species. These steps will include use of RTE species guidelines and a consultation with the biologist or ecologist, as needed.

2.1.3 Socioeconomic Context

Timber production and tourism contribute significantly to the state’s overall economy. In Wisconsin, more than 1,400 wood-using companies produce over 20 billion dollars of forest products every year. More than 2200,000 Wisconsin jobs rely on the forest products industry. Given the importance of forestry to the Wisconsin economy and the fact that individual, private owners manage the majority (56 percent) of Wisconsin forests the MFL program plays a key role in defining the socioeconomic context.

2.1.4 Land use, Ownership, and Land Tenure

As reported in the Wisconsin Forest Management Guidelines (PUB-FR-226-2011),

“Individual, private owners own the majority of Wisconsin forests – 56 percent. The state owns just seven percent, and the federal government, 10 percent. In the public sector, counties and municipalities own the largest – 15 percent, followed by private corporations and other groups (six percent), forest industry (four percent), and tribal lands (two percent).”

2.2 Forest Management Plan

Management Objectives:
<p>The management objectives as stated in the document Wisconsin’s Managed Forest Law Program Summary are include “timber harvesting, wildlife management, water quality and recreation to maintain a healthy and productive forest. Sustainable forest management benefits Wisconsin’s economy, hunting, fishing, wildlife, recreation, soils, waterways, and air quality, and renews our beautiful forests for everyone to</p>

<p>enjoy.” Additional management objectives are described in the Management Plan for each property.</p>
<p>Forest Composition and Rationale for Species Selection:</p>
<p>Forest composition and species selection are reported in the Wisconsin Forest Management Guidelines (PUB-FR-226-2011). <i>Forest Composition</i> “Oak-hickory, maple-basswood, and aspen-birch are the most common. Oak-hickory accounts for 4.2 million acres followed by maple-basswood forest type with 3.7 million acres, and aspen-birch forest type with almost 3.2 million acres. While 80 percent of Wisconsin’s forests are hardwood types, there are also significant softwood types occupying large areas, especially in the north. Red pine, black spruce, white pine, tamarack, northern white cedar, and Jack pine are the most common types.”</p> <p>Rationale for Species Selection All of the major tree species are eligible for harvesting on MFL lands. Some of the more difficult to regenerate species (e.g., northern white cedar and hemlock) are not selected for harvest in order to maintain the existing populations until more favorable regeneration conditions exist.</p>
<p>General Description of Land Management System(s):</p>
<p>Land management systems are described in the Wisconsin Forest Management Guidelines (PUB-FR-226-2011) and the Silviculture Handbook.</p>
<p>Harvest Methods and Equipment used:</p>
<p>Harvesting methods for Wisconsin Forests are described in detail in the DNR publication “Logging Methods for Wisconsin Woodlands (FR-788)” http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/forestmanagement/documents/pub/FR-778.pdf</p>
<p>Explanation of the management structures:</p>
<p>DNR serves as the primary regulatory entity and group manager for the non-industrial lands enrolled in this certificate.</p>

2.3 Monitoring System

<p>Growth and Yield of all forest products harvested:</p>
<p>Monitored on each MFL property by DNR and Cooperating Foresters during plan writing and mandatory practices. Monitored systematically across the State. See WI DNR Statewide Forest Assessment 2010 http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/ForestPlanning/conclusions.asp?id=1</p>
<p>Forest dynamics and changes in composition of flora and fauna:</p>
<p>Monitored on each MFL property by DNR and Cooperating Foresters during plan writing and mandatory practices. Monitored systematically across the State. See WI DNR Statewide Forest Assessment 2010 http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/ForestPlanning/conclusions.asp?id=1</p>
<p>Environmental Impacts:</p>
<p>Monitored on each MFL property by DNR and Cooperating Foresters during plan writing and mandatory practices. Monitored systematically across the State. See WI DNR Statewide Forest Assessment 2010 http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/ForestPlanning/conclusions.asp?id=1</p>
<p>Social Impacts:</p>
<p>Not applicable to individual MFL properties because they all qualify as SLIMF. Monitored at the State level. See WI DNR Statewide Forest Assessment 2010 http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/ForestPlanning/conclusions.asp?id=1</p>
<p>Costs, Productivity, and Efficiency:</p>
<p>Not applicable to individual MFL properties because they all qualify as SLIMF. Monitored at the State</p>

level. See WI DNR Statewide Forest Assessment
2010 <http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/ForestPlanning/conclusions.asp?id=1>

3. Certification Evaluation Process

3.1 Evaluation Schedule and Team

3.1.1 Evaluation Itinerary and Activities

Monday June 10, 2013 3:30 pm – Opening Meeting and Review of Group Manager Requirements Audit

8:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m. DNR Central Office, Madison WI

Marinette County MFL Audit

Gary & Barbara Grom (MFL #38-053-2007) - SWNE, NESW, NWSE, Section 26, T31N R22E, Town of Porterfield. Established by Cooperating Forester Tom Jacobs, Trees & Trails Forestry Consulting. Met Tom Jacobs on tract. Bids for sale required logger training, roads groomed, Winter harvest only. 35 acres cut. Insurance and bond required from logger with 10% down – Workman's Comp. and Contractor's Liability. Contract includes BMPs, protection of residual stand, and requirements of bid. Logger training includes first aid and PPE. Payment is made on consultants scale as wood leaves site. Property lines flagged. Gravel placed on haul road where intersects public road for aesthetics and stabilization. Sale lines flagged. Logger was fit to job needed – Ponzi crew. Good job. No issues.

Linda Tarmann (MFL #38-052-2007) - SWNW, Section 27 and NENE, SENE Section 28, T32N R21E, Town of Lake. Established by Cooperating Forester Tom Jacobs, Trees & Trails Forestry Consulting. Met with Tom Jacobs. Cutting of hardwood ridges with swamp. Winter time logging. Marked by Tom Jacobs. Landowner selected logger. Partially harvested. Ongoing problem with logger and landowner to get harvested. No contract. Sheriff help with enforcement. Poor harvesting. Enforcement action may be necessary with landowner.

Mary Ann DalSanto (MFL #38-104-2004) - SENW, Section 18, T31N R21E, Town of Lake. Marked by a logger, re-marked for approval by DNR Foresters. Invasive grass. Treatment recommended. Goal is for Hemlock and Northern Hardwoods. Good harvesting. Harvesting meets plan.

Jerry Kotecki (MFL #38-016-1994) - NENE, NWNE, Section 12, T31N R19E, Town of Beaver. Established by a Marinette County Forester. Upon landowner and logger request, DNR Foresters re-marked a few areas during harvesting. Oak wilt removed in declining Oak patches. Removed older Aspen and White Birch. BA of 80-90. Release of crop trees. Legacy trees, den trees left.

Perrault Revocable Trust (MFL #38-013-2007) - SWNE, NWSE, NESE, SWSE, Section 06, T31N R19E, Town of Beaver. Established by Cooperating Forester Todd McCourt, Wild Rivers Forestry, Inc. Met with landowner. Third thinning in Red Pine. Red Pine and Spruce removed. Food plot maintained. Round-up used prior to planting. Fomes treatment for stumps. Restriction for wildlife management in plan.

Tuesday June 11, 2013

Lafayette County MFL Audit

8:30 a.m. Property 1: Oomens. 21+22-4N-1E

38-acre improvement harvest in walnut/central hardwood type. Prescription and logging conformed with requirements. Skid trails seeded with pasture mix from local coop. No waterbars on skid trails per the owners request (erosion not yet a problem- but could develop). Multiflora rose prevalent throughout the stand. Poor markets on this sale as there was only one bidder and there were no pulp markets available. Landowner is using some tops and limbs for firewood.

10:00 a.m. Property 2: Moody. 20 + 29-4N-2E

40-acre diverse tract with savannah, ironwood brush, aspen, northern hardwoods, pine plantation, oak, and walnut. White pine planted in 1993. Small salvage harvest of cherry and maple taking out ~20 wind damaged trees. Logging was low impact. Used WWOA contract that includes BMPs, liability insurance requirements, etc. Restoration activities on tract include treatment of garlic mustard, oak savannah/prairie restoration with prescribed fire, brush hog removal of iron wood and planting in openings.

11:00 a.m. Property 3: Wright. 20-4N-2E

80-acre property with oak, walnut, and central hardwoods. Salvage from July 2011 windstorm. Prescription and logging conformed with requirements. One ford crossing had some exposed soil near intermittent creek, but re-seeding was done. Outdated management plan (per certification requirements) with no timeline to update it. NHI information sparse for mammal habitat as it just states "mammal- leave snags or trees with holes". High risk for invasive problems with heavy infestation of honeysuckle, multi-flora rose, and garlic mustard. Some treatment done, but more will be necessary.

1:30 p.m. Property 4: Silent Springs. 29-4N-R3E

60-acre property with oak and central hardwoods. 50 year plan. 2011 Improvement harvest removal of overmature walnut and cherry. Prescription and logging conformed with requirements. 2007 harvest of pulp was started but suspended because pulp markets deteriorated. Heavily infested with invasive plants (multi-flora rose, garlic mustard, honeysuckle). Strategy is to just focus on treating invasive plants in regeneration openings.

3:00 p.m. Property 5: Brunkow. 7-3N-4E

16-acre property with oak, walnut, and central hardwoods. 2012 selection harvest with regeneration openings. Prescription and logging conformed with requirements. Very low level of residual stand damage. Garlic mustard beyond control. Follow-up garlon backpack spray of ironwood, box elder, and elm to help regeneration of competing vegetation in opening. Applying Garlon at approximately ½ the recommended rate with good success. Active spray operation- required PPE were being used. Interviewed Cooperating Forester responsible for harvest.

Northern Polk County MFL Audit

DeMaster Order # 49-003-1989 80 acres Closed

Northern hardwood (NH) timber stand improvement harvest favoring oak, completed winter 2012. Paperwork includes a 1988 management plan, an updated Land Exam and Practices Report, a Cutting Notice with minimal description of the new required elements. Good harvest with minimal damage to residuals or BMP issues. Interview with timber buyer Jeff Norris/New Page.

Miller Order # 49-019-1993 38 acres Open

Northern hardwood (NH) timber stand improvement harvest favoring oak, completed winter 2012. Paperwork includes a 1992 management plan, an updated Land Exam and Practices Report, a Cutting Notice with minimal description of the new required elements. Good harvest with minimal damage to residuals or BMP issues.

Severson Order # 49-054-2004 38 acres Closed

Consultant sale - Northern hardwood (NH) timber stand improvement harvest, aspen regeneration harvest and white pine release completed winter/spring/summer 2012. Paperwork includes a 2009 management plan, an updated Land Exam and Practices Report, a Cutting Notice with a better description of the new required elements. Good harvest with minimal damage to residuals or BMP issues and a very healthy mosquito population.

Filkins Order # 49-014-2011 40 acres Open

Consultant sale - Northern hardwood (NH) timber stand improvement harvest, aspen regeneration harvest and white pine release completed winter 2012 Paperwork includes a 2011 management plan, an updated Land Exam and Practices Report, a Cutting Notice with better description of the new required elements. Good harvest with minimal damage to residuals or BMP issues.

Southern Polk County Audit MFL Audit

8am –Balsam Lake DNR Office (715-485-3518) 941 Mallard Lane #104, Balsam Lake, WI

9am – Property 1- Sherwood Johnston MFL (Black Brook Township sec. 34)

Selection harvest, hardwoods, completed December 2012 by Jeff Nordby Logging. Harvested on frozen, snow-covered ground. Good utilization and no observed damage to residual stand.

10:30am – Property 2 – Glen Clausen (Black Brook Township sec. 9)

Landowners present. 38-year old red pine plantation thinned in 2010. Stand was marked by consulting forester to a target basal area of 100 square feet of basal area per acre, and then checked by DNR forester. Contract used; good results. Property has considerable buckthorn and some non-native honeysuckle. Owners regularly treat by cutting and treating the stumps with Tordon, but it appears that the buckthorn in particular is spreading and increasing.

1pm – Property 3 – Howard Stindle (Black Brook Township sec. 2)

48 acres of plantation thinning (red pine, white spruce, some white pine) row thinned in 2012. Geoff Morris, New Page procurement forester bought the wood and set up the sale. Reviewed contract, which includes requirements to follow BMPs and to use a FISTA-trained logger. Good quality harvest including utilization and residual stand. New Page uses following: Pre-harvest environmental plan; Timbersale Checklist; Timber Harvest Inspection form. Site has many buckthorn seedlings, mostly quite small, but a problem is developing.

2:30pm – Property 4 – David Loguidice (Clear Lake Township sec. 22)

Completed two-aged regeneration harvest in an Aspen/swamp hardwood stand. Harvested on frozen, snow-covered ground winter of 2010-2011; no site impacts. Cut birch and Aspen over 5 inches dbh and left small aspen and all other hardwoods, in part to avoid flooding the site. Aspen suckering sufficient in numbers to regenerate the site is present and vigorous. Also a small area of selective thinning in an oak-dominated stand.

3:30 pm – Property 5 – Janet Krueger (Black Brook Township sec 16)

Partially completed harvest. Selection portion completed, but regeneration in declining Aspen stand and thinning in a 3-acre Red Pine plantation have not been done, and DNR is concerned that the logger may not be willing to return to complete the project. Utilization of large hardwood tops for pulpwood is not very good, but otherwise logging quality is good.

Marinette County MFL Audit

Joseph & Linda Charlier Trust (MFL# 38-076-1993) - NENE, Section 6, T33N R20E – Town of Wausaukee. Established by Cooperating Forester Tom Jacobs, Trees & Trails Forestry Consulting. Met with landowner and consultant. District 7 Tree Farmer of the Year. Red Pine thinning met requirements of plan. Non-mandatory practice of TSI for storm damage. Legacy White Pine and White Oak found maintained during harvesting. Burned snags remain. Salvage of lightning strike.

Mark Mullins (MFL# 38-099-2003) - NWSE, SWSE, Section 10, T34N R19E, Town of Athelstane. Established by Cooperating Forester Tom Jacobs, Trees & Trails Forestry Consulting. Met with consultant. Winter logging using Ponzi. Match logger to stand condition. Regeneration cut for Aspen and Oak. Den and legacy trees left. No SMZ left along 10 yards of stream. Banks and area stabilized by natural vegetation. No erosion has occurred.

Steve Sansone (MFL# 38-013-1995) - NESW, SESW, Section 11, T34N R19E – Town of Athelstane. Established by Cooperating Forester Todd McCourt, Wild Rivers Forestry, Inc. Met with consultant. 100' SMZ left on River. No enter into zone. Oak wilt removed. Poplar regeneration in harvested stand. Marked 6 acre retention area. No issues.

Helen Drake Muirhead Living Trust (MFL# 38-036-2007) - Numerous legal descriptions, Section 35, T34N R19E, Town of Athelstane. Established by Cooperating Forester Jesse Sebero, Pomeroy Forest Products. Maintained small openings of native grass for wildlife. Stumps treated in thinning. Stand #5 Scrub oak removal. Maple regeneration planned. Retention trees present. Bur Oaks retained (rare). Stand #2 - 3rd row thinning. Stand #1 – Leave trees marked. No issues.

Wednesday June 12, 2013

Lafayette County MFL Audit

8:00 a.m. DNR Darlington Forestry Office: Record review and phone interview with Matt Singer (DNR Forester)

8:30 a.m. Property 1: Ohnstad. 14-2N-3E

40-acre property with oak and central hardwoods. Many of the better quality trees were harvested before enrolling in MFL. Mandatory TSI planting in gaps and removal of undesirable brush (box elder

and ironwood) required to ensure woodlot continues to produce merchantable timber. Landowner planted approx 800 oak, walnut, and maple seedlings. Planting had a low level of success due to deer browse and may further decline with summer heat. Additional planting may be needed, additional TSI of ironwood and box elder is needed. Good example of DNR forester ensuring adequate investment for timber production occurs.

10:00 a.m. Property 2: Lancaster. 32-3N-4E

37-acre property of oak and walnut/central hardwoods. 2011 selection harvest removed declining bur oak and less describable species such as elm and bitternut hickory. Due to elm and bitternut die-off, the stand had some large opening where regeneration should be monitored to ensure desirable regeneration. Minor residual damage to one walnut tree. Prescription and logging conformed with applicable requirements. Many good quality walnut trees were left for seed sources and future economic value. MFL forester required a change to the originally proposed harvest that would have removed too many walnut trees. Landowner had completed some plantings in openings. Heavily infested with garlic mustard. Small area of rutting had been repaired.

11:00 a.m. Property 3: Kane. 34-4N-5E

77-acre property with central hardwoods, walnut, and some conifer plantations. Property had won Wisconsin Tree Farm property of the year. Property owners had planted 43,000 trees. Viewed 2-acre walnut/cherry (16 tree) roadside harvest.

1:30 p.m. Property 4: Ramsayer/Hovda. 35-4N-5E

20-acre central hardwoods with oak and white pine. Viewed landowner thinning of pine plantation and selection of over-mature/low quality trees in central hardwood stand. Prescription and logging conformed with applicable requirements. Property has significant amounts of buckthorn, ironwood, garlic mustard and other invasives. Landowner has manually removed honeysuckle with good success. Portable sawmill on-site but wood is not sold as FSC certified. Landowner has received FISTA training and had proper PPE.

Burnett County MFL Audit

Paulin Order # 07-010-1989 21 acres Open

Consultant sale - Northern hardwood (NH) timber stand improvement harvest completed winter 2013. Paperwork includes a 1988 management plan and a Cutting Notice with minimal description of the new required elements. Good harvest with minimal damage to residuals or BMP issues. This MFL expires in 2013 – reviewed the new management plan and it contained all the required elements. Interview landowner, Donn Paulin.

Pine Valley Farm Order # 07-022-2012 160 acres Closed

Consultant sale – Aspen clearcut and red pine thin completed August 2012. Paperwork includes a 2011 management plan and a Cutting Notice with a better description of the new required elements. Good harvest with minimal damage to residuals or BMP issues. The harvest included a temporary intermittent stream crossing which was removed.

Danberry Order # 07-005-2010 115 acres Closed

Consultant sale – Aspen clearcut leaving oaks and red pine, complete winter 2012. Paperwork includes a 2010 management plan and a Cutting Notice with a minimal description of the new required elements. Good harvest with minimal damage to residuals or BMP issues.

Perkins Order # 07-004-2010 133 acres Closed

Consultant sale – Aspen clearcut leaving oaks, complete winter 2012. Paperwork includes a 2010 management plan and a Cutting Notice with a minimal description of the new required elements. Good harvest with minimal damage to residuals or BMP issues.

Grever Order # 07-017-2003 170 acres Open

Northern hardwood (NH) timber stand improvement harvest with small aspen regeneration cuts completed winter 2013. Very wet stand. Paperwork includes a 2002 management plan and a Cutting Notice with a minimal description of the new required elements. Good harvest with minimal damage to residuals or BMP issues.

St. Croix County MFL Audit

Site Z: Herman and Delores Heinbuch, Pleasant Valley, St. Croix County, Section 5,6; 10 acres.

Active Red Pine thinning, Chad Summit Logging, New Page set up harvest and is buying the wood. Prescribed thinning to 100 square feet of basal area per acre, but many of the red pine trees have significant browning foliage and some have died. DNR has obtained agreement of landowner for heavier harvest, will follow-up with a letter and will update in the “Plan Trac” system.

Site A: Dane Rasmussen, T28, R 17 Eau Galle, Section 19, 22 acres

Completed selection harvest in a 14-acre northern hardwood/mixed wood stand in the winter of 2011-2012. Aspen was the primary species removed, mostly in pockets, and it has re-sprouted. Small pond well-buffered from harvest. Owner Dale Rasmussen interviewed regarding boundaries, land tenure, etc. He has cleaned up very minor dumping. Land is open for hunting in MFL but position of house and outbuildings makes it unattractive for outsiders.

Site B: Betty Monicken, Eau Galle, T28, R16, Section 16, 10 acres

10-acre Northern hardwood stand harvested winter 2011-2012. DNR checked NHI portal and cultural/archeological database; no hits. This is a textbook example of uneven-aged northern hardwood management. Harvest meets handbook prescription (gaps, varied sizes of trees, multiple age classes) and there is ample sugar maple regeneration.

Site C: Larson, Raash, Bakke, Springfield T29, R15, Section 24, 20 acres

First harvest in a white pine plantation and second harvest in a small spruce plantation completed during 2011-2012 winter. Serious, on-going legal dispute between landowner and logger over volumes and products harvested and payments made. Logger wasted some timber and cut some not prescribed in the MFL Management Plan.

Site D: Emerald Land, Inc., T30N, R15W, Sections 17 & 18, 26 acres (plan sold and divided, properly documented. MFL Order 56-004-2007

Delayed but completed November 2011 regeneration harvest in a 26-acre Aspen stand. Harvested on frozen ground according to DNR. Some scattered retention of large-crowned oaks. Harvest was set up in November, 2010, prior to the August 3, 2011 email describing a more robust retention policy for MFL harvests. Hutton Creek was protected by multiple corduroy crossings, but the wood has not yet been

removed (DNR is tracking this; logger awaiting suitable ground conditions). BMP Issue: A 26-acre clearcut has a three to five-foot wide intermittent stream (Hutton Creek) with a nearly 1,000 foot long section in the clearcut. There is no riparian buffer; the clearcut was done to the stream edge on both sides. Wisconsin BMPs for Water Quality (2010) specify a 100 foot RMZ on each side. BMPs provide for narrower (but some width) RMZ when adjacent area is not-sloping, has undisturbed soil, and is well-vegetated, which is the case here, but there is no documentation of a decision to have a smaller or no RMZ. The site is rapidly reforesting with hardwood trees, including Aspen which are 6 to 8 foot tall already.

Site E at Logan et al, T31N, R15W, Section 5, 64 acres

Selection harvest with overstory removal patches and third-row thinning in an irregularly-stocked white pine stand. MFL plan prescribed harvests in stands 1 and P3, but not 2. Harvest included some portions of Stand 2.

Florence County MFL Audit

Fay Lake Forestry Association (MFL#19-012-1989) - Section 8 & 9, T39N, R15E, Town of Long Lake. Established by Cooperating Forester John Force. Met John Force. **(Several LLC's in association)**

Timberdoodle Woods LLC (MFL# 19-025-2007) - Section 9, T39N, R15E, Town of Long Lake. Established by Cooperating Forester John Force.

Ridgcrest LLC (MFL# 19-007-2008) - Section 8, T39N, R15E, Town of Long Lake. Established by Cooperating Forester John Force.

Loon Haven, LLC (MFL# 19-006-20008) - Section 9, T39N, R15E, Town of Long Lake. Established by Cooperating Forester John Force.

Properties adjacent to member's lots on Fay Lake. Several hundred members of association. Forestry Committee works with John Force to manage forest. Road maintenance budget \$20,000/yr. No issues found with road maintenance. Selection cut in Northern Hardwood. DNR contract used with logger. Includes BMP language. Harvesting by Master Loggers. Aesthetics practiced by lopping tops to ground. Small logging decks located off roads.

William Borden (MFL# 19-228-1996) - NESE Section 31, T38N, R16E, Town of Fence. Established by Cooperating Forester Pat Smith

Thomas Borden (MFL# 19-002-2008) - SENW Section 31, T38N, R16E, Town of Fence. Established by Cooperating Forester Pat Smith. **(Adjoining sites view together. No issues)**
Seeded road. CC with Aspen regeneration (2 years old). Machine cut with over story removal. Coppice regeneration with Aspen. Good regeneration. Legacy trees remain. Diversity for wildlife – Game birds and song birds. 10-15 year age differences. SMZ along lake. 150' no equipment. Marked to cut. No issues. Red Pine stand thinning – removed competition and some Red Pine to 80-90 BA. Small cabin and storage building meets MFL guidelines.

Thursday June 13, 2013 –

Dodge County MFL Audit

8:30 a.m. Property 1: Dukelow. Section 9 Rubicon Township

17-acre northern hardwoods with small white pine plantation. 1st thinning of 35 year old pine plantation. Every 3rd row removed. Prescription and logging conformed with applicable requirements. Stream crossing using existing fjord. Excellent sugar maple regeneration throughout the stand.

10:00 a.m. Property 2: Beine. Section 9 Rubicon Township

22-acre northern hardwood property with large beech component. Selection harvest basal area reduced to 80 from 115 sq ft. 35 ft RMZ maintained as equipment was kept out no slash in stream. Prescription and logging conformed with applicable requirements.

11:00 a.m. Property 3: Wiedenhoefer. Section 10 Ashippun Township

50-acre property with central and northern hardwoods. 2011 selection harvest with basal area target of 85 sq ft. Landowner did not trust logger so decided to harvest the site himself. Harvest was not fully completed as marked trees were still present- however, it was closed out. Also, some merchantable timber was deteriorating on the ground. One area of deep ruts apparently happened after sale was closed out. Stream crossing with fjord after culvert had been removed. Site indicative of problems that can arise when landowner tries to complete harvest themselves.

1:30 p.m. Property 4: Ziebell. Section 11 Lebanon Township

25-acre property with bottomland and northern hardwoods. 2011 selection harvest to reduce basal area to 90 sq ft. Landowner completed harvest (hand felling and skidding with small tractor). Prescription and logging conformed with applicable requirements. Taking advantage of opportunity to regenerate silver maple. Landowner taps trees for maple syrup. Treatment of garlic mustard with 2,4-d appeared to be effective.

3:00 p.m. Property 5: Watertown Archers. Section 12 Emmet Township

37-acre property with central hardwoods. Thinning and group selection harvest to release advanced hickory, regenerate aspen, and recover some of the ash value. Basal area reduced to 80-90 sq ft. Prescription and logging conformed with applicable requirements.

Burnett County MFL Audit

Carlson Order # 07-008-2010 106 acres Closed

Straight line wind salvage of white and red pine, aspen and oak completed winter 2012 with good aspen regen. Paperwork includes a 2010 management plan and a Cutting Notice with a minimal description of the new required elements. Good harvest with no BMP issues.

Measner Order # 07-004-1998 40 acres Open

Straight line wind salvage of jack pine and aspen, completed winter 2012 with good aspen regen. Paperwork includes a 1997 management plan and a Cutting Notice with a minimal description of the new required elements (except for NHI which had a good write up). Good harvest with no BMP issues.

Imme Order # 07-002-2012 82 acres Closed

Aspen/birch clearcut leaving oaks, complete winter 2012. Good aspen/oak/maple regen. Paperwork includes a 2010 management plan and a Cutting Notice with a minimal description of the new required elements. Good harvest with minimal damage to residuals or BMP issues.

Swedberg Order # 07-007-1993 71 acres Closed

Straight line wind salvage of red pine plantation and, completed summer 2012. Red pine plantation area was sprayed, trenched and planted with cost share funding. Herbicides used included 2 quarts/acre Garlon XT+. 1 ½ quarts/acre Rodeo and 10 oz/acre Entry. Paperwork includes a 2013 management plan which contains all of the required elements and a Cutting Notice with a minimal description of the new required elements. Good harvest with no BMP issues. Interview with landowner Ellen Swedberg.

Petelinsek Order # 07-022-1998 80 acres Closed

Red pine plantation thin, complete winter 2012. Paperwork includes a 2013 management plan which contains all of the required elements and a Cutting Notice with a minimal description of the new required elements. Good harvest with minimal damage to residuals or BMP issues.

St. Croix County MFL Audit

Site F1 and F2 (two separate orders): Robert and Lorraine Peller, T31N, R19W, Section 13; 12/19 acres.

Interviewed Landowner Lorraine Peller who confirmed no issues with boundaries/tenure. In 2012 completed row thinning in 3 plantations of varied ages and species mixtures. Approved pine thinning not done, as is generally the case unless cost-share funding is available.

Site G: Elaine Quinn, T31N, R19W, Section 12

Completed harvest in mature, declining Oak stand that has oak wilt. Patch cuts removing Aspen or to regenerate oak and selection thinning also to promote oak, which can be a challenge. DNR forester keeps a list of such challenging regeneration treatments for follow-up review about 5 years following harvest. Also reviewed Aspen/pine stand prescribed for treatment in 2015; heavily-stocked but decision to allow more time for growth to improve merchantability is valid.

Site H: Joel LaMirande, T30N, R19W, Section 1, 40 acres

Marked group selection set up and harvested January 2012 on frozen ground by Schmidt Timber Corporation. Timber buyers Jeff Schmidt and Brian Brynne confirmed safety program including FISTA-trained loggers. Targeted oak wilt pockets for removal. Oak stumps sprouting but being browsed back; DNR forester will monitor. Little need for BMPs on this well-drained, gently-rolling site, but roads were graded post-harvest. Equipment cleaned before and after job.

Site I: Hudson Rod, Gun, and Archery Club, T29N, R19W, Section 18

Interviewed Don Simpson, Treasurer. Property has a high-quality modern survey and many monuments have been set, is posted, and is monitored by members. Neighbors are allowed to use lands when ranges are closed. Harvested challenging declining Oak stands along with helpful biomass harvest of dense invasive Buckthorn understory.

Site J: Michael and Rebecca Blaiser, T29N, R19W, Section 18

Interviewed landowners who confirmed no issues with boundaries/tenure but were not fully satisfied with logging done to meet planned harvest; may not reenroll lands in MFL when order expires in 2014. Reported boundary issues in nearby Willow State Park. Selection harvest targeted large, mature trees.

Florence County MFL Audit

Timmreck Trust (MFL# 10-011-2006) - NWNE, NENW, Section 24, T39N, R16E, Town of Florence. Established by Cooperating Forester New Page. Diversity for wildlife. Small impact of deer on regeneration – Maple, Ash, Aspen. Adequate regeneration for harvest cut in future. Retention of Hardwood and Hemlock.

Albert Schafer (MFL# 19-002-2013) - NWNW Section 24, T39N, R16E, Town of Florence. Established by Cooperating Forester Dennis Eskritt.

Albert Schafer (MFL# 19-015-2001) - SWNW Section 24, T39N, R16E, Town of Florence. Established by Cooperating Forester Dennis Eskritt. (**Adjacent tracts**) Retention trees in regeneration. Small stand of Aspen regeneration. Most of ownership in Sugar Maple-Ash. Will remove in 10-15 years. Road was built for harvesting. No issues. Harvested by Master Logger. Storage building on site.

Alan Walker (MFL# 19-029-2004) - Govt. Lots 3 & 4, Section 18, T40N, R19E, Town of Florence. Harvested by Master Logger. Aspen regeneration area has Legacy Trees remaining. Buffer strips along seeps and Menominee River. No issues. Diversity and hardwood retention provide habitat for Gold Wing Warbler (Young Forest Initiative). Aesthetics around home. Drum logs for Grouse. Legacy Tree are White Pine and Oaks. Slash lopped to ground for aesthetics, nutrients, soil stabilization, and hold moisture for amphibians. Red property lines. Area around neighbor's home buffered for aesthetics.

Albert Kemp (MFL# 19-013-1994) - NENE Section 26, T40N, R18E, Town of Florence. Harvested by Master Logger. Diversity patches. Aesthetics. Winter harvest. Poplar regeneration. Snags and live trees left for retention. Clover in food plot.

Dan Boardman (MFL# 19-011-1989) - NESE, Section 26, T40N, R18E, Town of Florence. Heavy soil and shallow water. Tamarack salvage cut. Aesthetics along road for visibility. Diversity for wildlife. Crossing established through wet area. Shelterwood cut – leave trees marked.

Patricia Bovee (MFL# 19-229-2000) - S1/2SE1/4, Section 16, T39N, R18E, Town of Commonwealth. Road built for access. No issues. Age class diversity & Aspen for wildlife – Golden Warbler & Grouse. Retention trees left in Aspen cuts. SMZ in steep area along stream. Good job in following contour of slope.

Jerome Paulson (MFL# 19-007-2004) - N1/2NE1/4, Section 2, T38N, R18E, Town of Homestead. Met with landowner. Small cuts with habitat diversity for Woodcock and Golden Warbler across landscape (Young Forest Initiative). Marked SMZ. No issues. Retention of Legacy Trees.

3.1.2 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:	4
C. Additional days spent on preparation, stakeholder consultation, and post-site follow-up:	2
D. Total number of person days used in evaluation:	16

3.1.3 Evaluation Team

FSC Lead Auditor: Dave Wager (Missoula, Montana)

Dave Wager is a FSC Lead Auditor for Forest Management and Chain-of-Custody Certification. As Forest Management Director for SCS, Dave spent ten years managing and/or leading Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) endorsed certification assessments on more than 100 forest management operations covering over 25 million acres of forestland across 16 countries. As a certification practitioner, Dave Wager has led FSC forest management and chain-of-custody assessments on a range of private and public operations across North America, Asia, and Latin America. Dave has 18 years’ experience working in forestry and the environmental field. He has expertise in forest ecology and business (B.S. business, Skidmore College; M.S. Forest Resources, Utah State University).

Forester: Mike Ferrucci (Northford, CT)

Mike Ferrucci is the SFI Program Manager for NSF – International Strategic Registrations and is responsible for all aspects of the firm’s SFI Certification programs. He is qualified as a Lead Auditor to conduct Chain of Custody, Procurement System or Sustainable Forest Management audits under the Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard® (SFI), the Forest Stewardship Program (FSC), and the Tree Farm Group Certification programs. Mike is also credentialed as a Lead Auditor under RAB-QSA (ISO 14001 Environmental Management Systems).

Mike meets all of the requirements as a Tree Farm Group Certification Lead Auditor, and has participated in several Tree Farm Group audits including the original scoping audit for the Wisconsin MFL program. Mike developed the NSF procedures for ATFS audits. Over the past ten years he has conducted Sustainable Forest Initiative (SFI) certification and precertification reviews on lands throughout the United States. He has also led or participated in joint SFI and Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) certification projects in Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, Maryland, Maine, and Connecticut 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. He is qualified as a RAB EMS Lead Auditor (ISO 14001 Environmental Management Systems), as an SFI Lead Auditor, as an FSC Team Leader.

Mike has also led Chain of Custody audits for all segments of the forest products industry, including corrugated and box producers, integrated paper companies, paper distributors, solid

wood mills, engineered wood products facilities, brokers, and distributors. In audits with pulp mills, corrugated producers, and box plants Mike has addressed the issues involving recycled content.

Mike Ferrucci has 31 years of forest industry experience. His expertise is in forest certification, 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. He has also developed expertise in the conservation of forest biodiversity at multiple spatial scales through his involvement in the founding and administration of The Conservation Forestry Network and through his work with the Northern Forest Protection Fund.

Forester: Norman Boatwright (Florence, SC)

Norman Boatwright is the president of Boatwright Consulting Services, LLC located in Florence, South Carolina. BCS handles typical forestry consulting, SFI, ATF and FSC Audits, Phase I Environmental Site Assessments, Forest Soil Mapping, Wetland Delineation, and other Biological Services. Norman has over twenty-nine years' experience in intensive forest management, eighteen years' experience in environmental services and ten years' experience in forest certification auditing. He has conducted Phase I Assessments on over three hundred and fifty projects covering 3,000,000 acres, Endangered Species Assessments on timberland across the South, and managed soil mapping projects on over 1.3 million acres. From 1985-1999, he was Division Manager at Canal Forest Resources, Inc. and was responsible for all forest management activities on about 90,000 acres of timberland in eastern South Carolina. Duties included budgeting and implementing land and timber sales, site preparation, planting, best management practices, road construction, etc. Norman is a RABQSA Qualified Lead Auditor with extensive experience auditing SFI, procurement and land management organizations and American Tree Farm Group Certification Programs. He is also a Lead Auditor for Chain of Custody Audits under SFI, PEFC, and FSC.

Forester: Tucker Watts, ATFS, SFI, FSC Forestry and Chain of Custody Lead Auditor (Mississippi)

Tucker Watts has over 30 years' experience in forest management, primarily in the southern U.S. He worked for many years for International Paper Company, first as a land management and procurement forester, then as an analyst, and finally as an environmental manager with considerable involvement in forest certification. Tucker has a BS in Forestry from Louisiana Tech, and MS in Forestry from Mississippi State University, and an MBA from Centenary College. He has participated in many forestry organizations, notably as a Trainer in the Louisiana Master Logger Program, as a team member for "Recommended Forestry Best Management Practices for Louisiana" and on various SFI State Implementation Committees. Tucker is trained as a Tree Farm Group Certification Auditor and has experience in SFI and FSC auditing from both sides, as an auditor and as the management representative of an organization being audited. Audit experience includes audits of pulp and paper mills, container and box companies, printers, distributors, and audits of recovered fiber and recycled content.

3.2 Evaluation of Management System

3.2.1 Methodology and Strategies Employed

SCS deploys interdisciplinary teams with expertise in forestry, social sciences, natural resource economics, and other relevant fields to assess the 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.

3.2.2 Pre-evaluation

A pre-evaluation of the FME *was not* required by FSC norms.

A pre-evaluation of the FME was conducted as required by and in accordance with FSC norms.

3.3 Stakeholder Consultation Process

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 the pre-evaluation (if one was conducted), 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:

3.3.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted During Evaluation for Certification

FME Management and staff	Pertinent Tribal members and/or representatives
Consulting foresters	Members of the FSC National Initiative

Contractors	Members of the regional FSC working group
Lease holders	FSC International
Adjacent property owners	Local and regionally-based environmental organizations and conservationists
Local and regionally-based social interest and civic organizations	Forest industry groups and organizations
Purchasers of logs harvested on FME forestlands	Local, state, and federal regulatory agency personnel
Recreational user groups	Other relevant groups

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. A public notice was sent to stakeholders at least 6 weeks prior to the audit notifying them of the audit and soliciting comments. Additionally, stakeholders were sent a survey to complete. 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.

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

Stakeholder Comments	SCS Response
Economic Comments	
Timber harvesting is set at a level that appropriately balances ecological, economic, and social factors.	Duly noted.
Red pine thinning schedules as prescribed in the Silviculture Handbook are too aggressive and should leave more trees to accumulate growth and value.	Auditors visited numerous red pine stands during the assessment and found an appropriate balance between stocking levels, maximizing growing stock, and minimizing forest health risks. No non-conformance is warranted.
MFL program is the most important tool in Wisconsin for encouraging responsible forestry, and DNR MFL foresters are heroes.	Duly noted.
Mandatory training sessions for CPW and Cooperating Foresters are costly (from a loss of work time perspective) and not that useful.	WI MFL Internal Audit identified the opportunity to add some more useful training topics to the annual training such as road alignment and construction. Annual meetings between DNR and MFL cooperating foresters (i.e., consulting foresters approved to work on MFL) ensure that training topics are identified, and, if necessary, adapted to changing circumstances.
As reported in the final report of the MFL Efficiencies Project (Nov 2012), WI DNR should:	Interviews with DNR senior staff members showed that WisFIRS

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Expediting the implementation of WisFIRS - Limit major program changes to every 3, or ideally 5, years to allow for system stability <p>http://council.wisconsinforestry.org/pdf/MFL_AssessmentFinalReport.pdf</p>	<p>implementation is being prioritized.</p> <p>At the time of this audit, the 2013 legislature was discussing several program changes. However, it was unclear what if any changes might be implemented that would alter system stability.</p>
Social Comments	
<p>There is an opportunity to improve the level of consultation between Chippewa Tribes and the MFL Program regarding exercising treaty reserved hunting and fishing rights on MFL Lands classified as “Open”</p>	<p>See Observation 02</p>
<p>MFL provides economic benefits to the local community</p>	<p>Duly noted.</p>
<p>MFL Program maintains good relationships with employees and contractors.</p>	<p>Duly noted.</p>
<p>The forest management operation maintains good relationships with adjacent landowners and neighbors.</p>	<p>Duly noted.</p>
Environmental Comments	
<p>Forest management operations are doing an adequate job of addressing invasive species given the immense challenges.</p>	<p>Duly noted.</p>
<p>In many cases oak stands are too difficult to regenerate given lack of fire disturbance and present levels of competing vegetation and deer.</p>	<p>Audit team found that foresters are becoming increasingly aware of where it makes sense to invest in oak regeneration and where allowing the stand to succeed to northern hardwood is more appropriate.</p>
<p>Cooperating foresters are turning a blind eye to the level of invasive plants on MFL tracts so that they are not required to carry out expensive pre- or post-harvest invasive plant control work.</p>	<p>Invasive plant problems on the properties sampled during the 2013 audit had been identified. Audit team concluded that invasive plants are for the most part being identified by Cooperating Foresters and control efforts to occur where control is feasible (e.g., funding availability, willing landowner, and plant levels conducive to a control treatment).</p>
<p>There is an opportunity to improve upon foresters understanding of NHI data.</p>	<p>See OBS 04</p>
<p>Lack of currency of NHI data and relevancy to a specific MFL property is resulting in foresters brushing over some of the findings.</p>	
<p>DNR MFL field staff are maintaining high standards in review and approval of cutting prescriptions. Concerned that streamlining of MFL oversight that is currently being discussed will reduce overall quality of forestry and environmental protection on MFL.</p>	<p>This will be reviewed during future audits. If the quality of forestry and protection is reduced because of a lower level of DNR oversight, this will be identified and addressed in subsequent</p>

	internal and external audits of the program. The FSC standard for group manager oversight is results driven and does not specify a minimum level of review. At this time, there is no indication of non-conformity.
Concern that MFL program is not updating management plans and inventory information frequently enough, and the WisFIRS plan templates reduce quality of the management plan. Updating stand/forest conditions post-harvest when the DNR forester evaluates the treatment would provide more accurate and useful data than doing so at the time of the Cutting Notice.	CAR 08

4. Results of The Evaluation

Table 4.1 below, contains the evaluation team’s findings as to the strengths and weaknesses of the subject forest management operation relative to the FSC Principles of forest stewardship. Weaknesses are noted as Corrective Action Requests (CARs) related to each principle.

4.1 Notable Strengths and Weaknesses of the FME Relative to the FSC P&C.

Principle / Subject Area	Strengths Relative to the Standard	Weaknesses Relative to the Standard
P1: FSC Commitment and Legal Compliance	MFL demonstrated strong legal conformance and commitment to FSC during 2013 field audit.	No weaknesses
P2: Tenure & Use Rights & Responsibilities	There is clear legal tenure for the private lands that make up the MFL Group Certificate.	See Observation 02
P3: Indigenous Peoples’ Rights	WI DNR uses a variety of mechanisms to consult with the six federally recognized Chippewa tribes regarding forest management and off-reservation hunting rights. These mechanisms include designating individual tribal liaisons to consult with each Chippewa tribes on forestry related topics including MFL, specific inclusion and communications with Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission on important forestry management protocols (e.g., biomass harvest guidelines, BMPs for water quality, Invasive Species BMPs, Silviculture	

	<p>Handbook, and Forest Management Guidelines). In addition, all Chippewa tribes were consulted on the Division of Forestry’s “Strategic Direction”. Finally, Chippewa tribes participate in the following DNR management committees that relate to forest and wildlife management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A) The Wild Plant Management and Policy Committee (WPMPC) B) Wildlife Management Committees for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Bear (2) Deer (3) Elk (4) Furbearer (5) Invasives (6) Marten Advisory (7) Migratory Game Bird 	
<p>P4: Community Relations & Workers’ Rights</p>	<p>Results of a stakeholder survey for this audit showed that MFL Program maintains good relationships with employees and contractors and adjacent landowners and other neighbors.</p>	<p>See Observation O3</p>
<p>P5: Benefits from the Forest</p>	<p>MFL program contributes to local communities across the State. The approximate 46,000 MFL certified properties distributed across every county produce timber for the wood markets of Wisconsin and the region. Additionally, the portion of MFL properties that are open to public recreation help provide great opportunities for tourism, recreation, and hunting/fishing related commerce.</p>	<p>No weaknesses</p>
<p>P6: Environmental Impact</p>	<p>By encouraging long-term forest management the MFL program helps keep lands maintained as working forests across Wisconsin and reduces the risk of conversion and development.</p> <p>DNR programs for maintain water quality (BMPs), protecting RTE species (NHI and Species Guidance),</p>	<p>See Minor CAR 06; Major CAR 07 Observations 04 and 05;</p>

	maintaining stand level habitat (Silviculture Handbook- Chap 24) ensures environmental impacts are minimized.	
P7: Management Plan	Management plans meet the FSC requirements for Family Forests.	Minor CAR 08
P8: Monitoring & Assessment	Given the small scale and intensity of non-industrial forestry monitoring is sufficient. The combination of property specific monitoring by MFL and Cooperating Forests along with comprehensive monitoring at the statewide level produces the needed results for adaptive management.	No weaknesses
P9: High Conservation Value Forests	NA – no HCVF on MFL properties.	No HCVF on MFL properties
P10: Plantations	NA	NA
Chain of custody	CoC number is consistently applied to timber sale Cutting Notice.	See CAR 01
Group Management	DNR provides sufficient day-to-day oversight of the group. Additionally, DNR conducts a comprehensive internal audit annually.	No weaknesses

4.2 Process of Determining Conformance

4.2.1 Structure of Standard and Degrees of Nonconformance

FSC-accredited forest stewardship standards consist of a three-level hierarchy: principle, the criteria that correspond to that principle, and the performance indicators that elaborate each criterion. Consistent with SCS Forest Conservation Program evaluation protocols, the team collectively determines whether or not the subject forest management operation is in conformance with every applicable indicator of the relevant forest stewardship standard. Each nonconformance must be evaluated to determine whether it constitutes a major or minor nonconformance at the level of the associated criterion or sub-criterion. Not all indicators are equally important, and there is no simple numerical formula to determine whether an operation is in nonconformance. The team therefore must use their collective judgment to assess each criterion and determine if the FME is in conformance. If the FME is determined to be in nonconformance at the criterion level, then at least one of the applicable indicators must be in major nonconformance.

Corrective action requests (CARs) are issued for every instance of a nonconformance. Major nonconformances trigger Major CARs and minor nonconformances trigger Minor CARs.

4.2.1 Interpretations of Major CARs, Minor CARs and Observations

Major CARs: Major nonconformances, either alone or in combination with nonconformances of all other applicable indicators, result (or are likely to result) in a fundamental failure to achieve the objectives of the relevant FSC Criterion given the uniqueness and fragility of each forest resource. These are corrective actions that must be resolved or closed out before a certificate can be awarded. If Major CARs arise after an operation is certified, the timeframe for correcting these nonconformances is typically shorter than for Minor CARs. Certification is contingent on the certified FME’s response to the CAR within the stipulated time frame.

Minor CARs: These are corrective action requests in response to minor nonconformances, which are typically limited in scale or can be characterized as an unusual lapse in the system. Most Minor CARs are the result of nonconformance at the indicator-level. Corrective actions must be closed out within a specified time period of award of the certificate.

Observations: These are subject areas where the audit team concludes that there is conformance, but either future nonconformance may result due to inaction or the FME could achieve exemplary status through further refinement. Action on observations is voluntary and does not affect the maintenance of the certificate. However, observations can become CARs if performance with respect to the indicator(s) triggering the observation falls into nonconformance.

4.2.2 Major Nonconformances

<input type="checkbox"/>	No Major CARs were issued to the FME during the evaluation. Any Minor CARs from previous surveillance audits have been reviewed and closed prior to the issuance of a certificate.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Major CARs were issued to the FME during the evaluation, which have all been closed to the satisfaction of the audit team and meet the requirements of the standards. Any Minor CARs from previous surveillance audits have been reviewed and closed prior to the issuance of a certificate.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Major CARs were issued to the FME during the evaluation and the FME has not yet satisfactorily closed all Major CARs.

4.2.3 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations

There were no open CARs at the time of this audit.

4.2.4 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations

Finding Number: 01	
Select one: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU): All	
Deadline	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	SCS FSC Chain of Custody Indicators for Forest Management Enterprises, Version 5-0; Requirement 2.3 (based on FSC-STD-40-004 V2-1 Clause 6.1.1 and 6.1.2)
Non-Conformity: Contracts and shipping documents between landowner and log purchaser do not include an FSC claim. Evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Contracts viewed by audit team in Marinette County) - WI DNR CoC Procedures in Forest Tax Handbook, Chapter 21-13 C lack requirement for including FSC Claim. 	
Corrective Action Request: Evidence of corrective action and conformance with applicable requirements must be submitted by the deadline stated above.	
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Cutting Notice and Report of Wood Products from Forest Crop and Managed Forest Lands from (2450-032) has been modified to include the statement that "All harvested products are FSC 100%." See the public web site at http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/ForestLandowners/documents/2450032.pdf. 2. The Forest Tax Law Handbook, Chapter 21-13 is being updated to require that the FSC claim that wood is FSC 100% is to be included on all timber sale prospectuses, timber sale contracts, shipping documents and invoices if the landowner or purchaser intends to market harvested products as certified. <div style="text-align: center;">  24505 21_September_2013. </div> 3. Wisconsin Woodland Owners Association (WWOA) will be updating their sample timber sale to include claims of FSC 100%. The additional wording in blue (see below) would be inserted into the sample timber sale contract. <p>FOREST CERTIFICATION (if applicable) 50. CERTIFICATION STANDARD AND CERTIFICATE. The land management area encompassed by this timber sale is certified to the following forest certification standards (mark as applicable and provide valid certificate numbers):</p>

	<p>___ American Tree Farm System (ATFS) Certificate # ___</p> <p>___ Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) Certificate # ___ <i>Wood sold under FSC is claimed to be FSC 100%.</i></p> <p>___ Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI) Certificate # ___</p> <p>___ _____ (Other Standard) Certificate # ___</p>
SCS review	<p>Of the three actions that MFL describes, only action 1 has been completed, which includes the FSC claim as required. The other two are in draft form and require updating (i.e., certificate codes) and approval. However, since the “Cutting Notice and Report of Wood Products from Forest Crop and Managed Forest Lands from (2450-032)” accompanies all timber sales, MFL has ensured that the FSC claim is mentioned in sales records. As such, this CAR is closed.</p>
Status of CAR:	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i></p>

Finding Number: 02	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU): All	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	2.2.b
<p>Observation Background:</p> <p>Per the requirements of Indicator 2.2.b and 3.2.a, there is an opportunity for the MFL program to improve consultation with the Chippewa Tribes regarding off-reservation hunting and fishing rights. This finding is based on audit stakeholder consultations with a representative from the Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission (GLFWC), who communicated a desire for additional consultation efforts specific to forest management on MFL properties as it relates to Chippewa hunting and fishing rights. The SCS audit team, DNR, and GLFWC all recognize the challenge of consulting directly with MFL property owners regarding Chippewa hunting and fishing rights. Furthermore, the Note in Indicator 3.2.a. of the FSC standard recognizes this challenge.</p> <p>Note from FSC US Standard Guidance: <i>For family forests that meet the eligibility requirements of having a small forest, direct consultation between small private landowners and tribal representatives is encouraged but may not be feasible. Instead, small landowners may rely on consultation between appropriate state and federal agencies and tribes and then abide by the outcome of those government to government negotiations or settlements.</i></p> <p>Given the recognized challenge and the existing consultation mechanisms described below, the audit team concludes there is sufficient consultation to justify conformance with Indicators 2.2.b and 3.2.a. However, this Observation has been issued to encourage additional consultation.</p> <p>WI DNR uses a variety of mechanisms to consult with the six federally recognized Chippewa tribes regarding forest management and off-reservation hunting rights. These mechanisms include designating individual tribal liaisons to consult with each Chippewa tribes on forestry related topics including MFL, specific inclusion and communications with Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission on important forestry management protocols (e.g., biomass harvest guidelines, BMPs for water quality, Invasive Species BMPs, Silviculture Handbook, and Forest Management Guidelines). In addition, all Chippewa tribes were consulted on the Division of Forestry’s “Strategic Direction”. Finally, Chippewa tribes participate in the following DNR management committees that relate to forest and wildlife management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> C) The Wild Plant Management and Policy Committee (WPMPC) D) Wildlife Management Committees for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Bear (2) Deer (3) Elk (4) Furbearer (5) Invasives 	

(6) Marten Advisory (7) Migratory Game Bird (7) Pheasant (8) Prairie Grouse (9) Ruffed Grouse / Woodcock (10) Turkey (11) Upland Small Game (Sub-committee of Pheasant Committee) (12) Wildlife Health (13) Wolf	
Observation: The MFL should work with GLIFWC to improve consultation opportunities related to executing hunting and fishing rights on open MFL lands in the Ojibwe ceded territory.	
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 03	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to Group Manager and MFL Group Members within the Chippewa ceded territory	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	4.2.b
Observation Background: In counties of Lafayette and Dodge several of the selected audit sites were logged by the MFL landowner, and not by a trained logger. When the landowner conducts his/her own logging, the MFL program has little capability to ensure a safe work environment. The audit did not uncover any safety violations, thus, this is issued as an Observation.	
Observation: The WI DNR should consider efforts to improve safety when properties are being logged by a landowner who is not a trained logger.	
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	
SCS review	

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

Finding Number: 04	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU): All	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	6.2.a
<p>Observation Background: NHI is not functioning optimally because there is a lack of clarity about the “likely presence of RTE species”. Details of the program not functioning optimally include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The NHI information for each MFL property lacks a description of and evidence for how occurrences are being protected. Rather, many Cutting Notices simply had blanket statements that species protection would be achieved by frozen ground logging or by following BMPs. One Cutting Notice stated RTE species “most likely are not there” and that “keeping soil disturbance to a minimum is necessary to prevent damage if it is there.” • The large percentage of outdated NHI data and the vagueness of the occurrence location relative to the MFL property that is being harvested (i.e., occurrences are only provided based a 1 mile buffer) results in less attention being paid to the system. Previously, NHI provided information about whether an occurrence was actually on a specific MFL property, but it now only provides information about it being within a one mile buffer. Consultations with Cooperative and MFL foresters suggests that less attention is being paid to NHI results because of the old data and lack of specificity on location. • There was little evidence of foresters reporting new occurrences to NHI 	
<p>Observation: The MFL Program should take actions to improve the use of NHI data to avoid potential future nonconformances to the requirements of indicator 6.2.a.</p>	
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i>

Finding Number: 05	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU): All	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	6.3.f
<p>Observation Background: The following findings related to maintaining, enhancing, or restoring habitat components and associated stand structures triggered this Observation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cutting Notices and Management Plans systematically lacked information about numbers of den / cavity trees per acre relative to Silviculture Handbook requirements (e.g, a guideline of three or more cavity trees and as many snag trees as possible per acre should meet the requirements of most cavity-dwelling wildlife) • MFL Order 33-012-1999 stated that 28 cull trees (trees with possible decay) were marked with an “x” giving the logger the option to fell those trees. Yet there was no discussion or marking of wildlife trees on the sale. MFL Order 33-005-2003 allowed for “All standing dead and downed trees in the sale to be harvested”, again, without a discussion about wildlife trees. 	
<p>Observation: The MFL program should consider how it systematically and practically maintains, enhances, or restores habitat components and associated stand structures.</p>	
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 06	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU): All	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	6.5.b
<p>Non-Conformity: Two site visits identified a BMP/Water Quality issue. Both involved clear cutting the RMZs along intermittent streams. Wisconsin BMPs for Water Quality (2010) specify a one hundred (100) foot RMZ on each side. BMPs provide for narrower (but some width) RMZ when adjacent area is not-sloping, has undisturbed soil, and is well-vegetated, which is the case here, but there is no documentation of a decision to have a smaller or no RMZ.</p> <p>Evidence: MFL Order 56-004-2007 MFL# 38-099-2003</p>	
Corrective Action Request: Evidence of corrective action and conformance with applicable requirements must be submitted by the deadline stated above.	
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 07	
Select one: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<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):
FSC Indicator:	6.8.d.
Non-Conformity: WI MFL is not in conformance with the requirement of not using Genetically Modified Organisms for any purpose. GMO crops were found on wildlife food plots in Marinette County.	
Corrective Action Request: Evidence of corrective action and conformance with applicable requirements must be submitted by the deadline stated above.	
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	WI DNR decided to remove the food plots from the scope of the certificate. The following MFL properties (approximately 3770 acres) are explicitly excluded or excised from the certificate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wildlife food plots (intensive non-forest use) Wildlife food plot – defined as an area that is planted to an agricultural or human food crop or non-native vegetation (e.g. clover) for the purpose of providing food for wildlife.
SCS review	SCS agreed with the approach of excising the food plots to ensure no GMOs are within the scope of the certificate. Food plots are non-forested, and do not belong within the scope of an FSC forest management certificate. Also, in 2010 this same approach was approved by FSC International Director of Policy for food plots on WI DNR State Lands.
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i>

Finding Number: 08	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	7.2.a
Non-Conformity: Updates to the management plan occur infrequently and inconsistently across the MFL program. The MFL Management Plan is the key property specific planning tool; however, it does not have a regular revision schedule within its 25 or 50 year term. Rather the MFL program currently focuses on updating the Cutting Notice to reflect changing conditions specific to an MFL Property. Auditors determined that the Cutting Notice is not being updated adequately and consistently across the MFL program to fulfill management plan update requirements.	
Corrective Action Request: Evidence of corrective action and conformance with applicable requirements must be submitted by the deadline stated above.	
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

5. Certification Decision

Certification Recommendation	
FME be awarded FSC certification as a “Well-Managed Forest” subject to the minor corrective action requests stated in Section 4.2.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
The SCS evaluation team makes the above recommendation for certification based on the full and proper execution of the SCS Forest Conservation Program evaluation protocols. If certification is recommended, the FME has satisfactorily demonstrated the following without exception:	
FME has addressed any Major CAR(s) assigned during the evaluation.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
FME has demonstrated that their system of management is capable of ensuring that all of the requirements of the applicable standards (see Section 1.6 of this report) are met over the forest area covered by the scope of the evaluation.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
FME has demonstrated that the described system of management is being implemented consistently over the forest area covered by the scope of the	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>

certificate.	
Comments:	

SECTION B – APPENDICES (CONFIDENTIAL)

Appendix 1 – Current and Projected Annual Harvest for Main Commercial Species

Each of the 46,000 land owners has their own harvest intervals based on inventory data.

Appendix 2 – 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.

The RMU for this audit is set at the County level. Seven Counties were selected primarily based on the fact that these Counties were not audited during the first 5 years of the certificate. Section 3.1.1 of this report details the individual properties that were selected for each of the 7 counties. All individual properties in the group qualify as a SLIMF. The audit team selected half of the individual property sample randomly. The remaining portion of the sample was selected based on proximity, ease of access, and likelihood to improve the overall representation of the sample so we covered the full array of forest types and activities.

Appendix 3 – List of Stakeholders Consulted

List of FME Staff Consulted

Name	Title	Consultation method
Mark Heyde	WIDNR Forest Certification Coordinator	In-person meeting
Sue Crowley	WIDNR Mississippi River Area Leader	In-person meeting
Dahn Borh	WIDNR Forester Baldwin County	In-person meeting
Aaron Young	WIDNR Dodgeville Area Forestry Leader	In-person meeting
Jim Warren	WIDNR Public & Private Forestry Section Chief	In-person meeting

Brian Spencer	WIDNR Woodruff Area Forestry Staff Specialist	In-person meeting
Nicole Potvin	WIDNR Private Forestry Team Leader	In-person meeting
Paul Heimstead	WIDNR Forester (CFL) Balsam Lake	In-person meeting
Bob Hartshorn	WIDNR Burnett/Polk Team Leader	In-person meeting
Jay Riewestahl	WIDNR Forester Grantsburg	In-person meeting
Mark Grossman	WIDNR Forester Burnett	In-person meeting
Jim Ulmaniec	WIDNR Tech Grantsburg	In-person meeting
Aaron Wallace	WIDNR Forestry Tech Webster	In-person meeting
John Furr	WIDNR Forester Webster	In-person meeting
Jim Becker	WIDNR Forestry Tech Webster	In-person meeting
Janette Cain	DNR Forester Polk and Baron Counties office phone # 715-485—3518	In-person meeting
Don Moore	St. Croix Forester	In-person meeting
Keith Krajueski	Private Lands Forester, Pepin County	In-person meeting
Steve Courtney	West-Central District Forestry Leader	In-person meeting
Carol Nielsen	WI DNR Private Forestry Specialist	In-person meeting
Janel Pike	WI DNR Section Chief, WisFIRS Lead	In-person meeting
Ryan Conner	WI DNR Operations Program Associate (MFL Records)	In-person meeting
Drew Feldkirchner	WI DNR Conservation Biologist (NHI Lead)	In-person meeting
Randy Hoffman	WI DNR Conservation Biologist (State Natural Areas)	In-person meeting
Andrew Stoltman	WI DNR Specialist (Inventory)	In-person meeting
Andrea Diss-Torrance	WI DNR Plant Pest and Disease Specialist	In-person meeting
Becky Gray	WI DNR NR Program Supervisor (Forest Health)	In-person meeting

Eric Grudzinski	WI DNR NR Staff Specialist (Law Enforcement)	In-person meeting
Kristin Lambert	WI DNR Specialist (CPW and MFL Enforcement)	In-person meeting
Tom Boos	WI DNR Plant Pest and Disease Specialist (Invasive Plants)	In-person meeting
Bernadette Williams	WI DNR Conservation Biologist (Invasive plants)	In-person meeting
Adrian Wydeven	WI DNR Wildlife Biologist	In-person meeting
Scott Walter	WI DNR Staff Specialist	In-person meeting
Mike Zeckmeister	WI DNR Regional Manager	In-person meeting
Mary Ann Buenzow	Fitchburg Area Team Leader	In-person meeting
Jeff Weatherly	WI DNR Area Forest Leader	In-person meeting
Nick Koch	WI DNR Forester	In-person meeting

List of other Stakeholders Consulted

Name	Organization	Consultation method	Requests Cert. Notf.
Geoff Morris	Procurement Forester, New Page	In-person	No
Jeff Schmidt and Brian Brynne	Timber buyers, Schmidt Timber Corporation	In-person	No
Lorraine Peller,	Landowner	In-person	No
Don Simpson	Treasurer, Hudson Rod, Gun, and Archery Club	In-person	No
Michael and Rebecca Blaiser	MFL Landowner	In-person	No
Lorraine Peller	MFL Landowner	In-person	No
Dan Pubanz	Consulting Forester CPW	In-person	No
Bill Buckley	Consulting Forester CPW	In-person	No
Andy LeChance	Consulting Forester	In-person	No

Jonathon Gilbert	Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission	In-person	No
Fred Oomens	MFL Landowner	In-person	No
Russ Moody	MFL Landowner	In-person	No
Dave Ohnstad	MFL Landowner	In-person	No
Charles Ramsayer	MFL Landowner	In-person	No
Harold Beine	MFL Landowner	In-person	No
Jim Ziebell	MFL Landowner	In-person	No
Katie Fernholz	Dovetail Inc	In-person	No
Lynn Erickson	Procurement Forester Park Falls Hardwoods – A Midwest Hardwood Company	In-person	No
Brad Bautch	Harvester Operator, Chad Summit Logging	In-person	No

Appendix 4 – Additional Evaluation Techniques Employed

No additional techniques were employed.

Appendix 5 – Certification Standard Conformance Table

C= Conformance with Criterion or Indicator

NC= Nonconformance with Criterion or Indicator

NA= Not Applicable

REQUIREMENT	N/C	COMMENT/CAR
P1 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.		
C1.1 Forest management shall respect all national and local laws and administrative requirements.	C	
1.1.a. Forest management plans and operations demonstrate compliance with all applicable federal, state, county, municipal, and tribal laws, and administrative requirements (e.g., regulations). Violations, outstanding complaints or investigations are provided to the Certifying Body (CB) during the annual audit.	C	Verified conformance at all 67 MFL Properties inspected during the 2013 audit. Evidence reviewed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WI DNR Cutting Notice and Report for each MFL property inspected • MFL Stewardship Plan for each property inspected • WI DNR Forest Tax Law Handbook • WI DNR Silviculture Handbook • WI DNR Forest Management Guidelines • WI DNR Private Forestry Handbook • Timber sale contracts • WI BMPs for Water Quality
1.1.b. To facilitate legal compliance, the forest owner or manager ensures that employees and contractors, commensurate with their responsibilities, are duly informed about applicable laws and regulations.	C	DNR addresses this requirement through training opportunities and adherence to procedures described in handbooks. Training includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cooperating Foresters are required to complete 10 hours of training per year. • Through FISTA, DNR provides many training sessions for loggers/ • Certified Plan Writers, DNR Foresters, supervisors and other DNR staff who administer the MFL program must attend the annual MFL Recertification training.
C1.2. All applicable and legally prescribed fees, royalties, taxes and other charges shall be paid.		
1.2.a. The forest owner or manager provides written evidence that all applicable and legally prescribed fees, royalties, taxes and other charges are being paid in a timely manner. If payment is beyond the control of the landowner or manager, then there is evidence that every attempt at payment was made.	NA	All group members qualify as a SLIMF.
FF 1.2.a: Low risk of negative social or environmental impact.	C	Verified low risk through a sample review of DNR’s correspondences with landowner including yield tax payment evidence.

C1.3. In signatory countries, the provisions of all binding international agreements such as CITES, ILO Conventions, ITTA, and Convention on Biological Diversity, shall be respected.	C	
1.3.a. Forest management plans and operations comply with relevant provisions of all applicable binding international agreements.	NA	All group members qualify as a SLIMF.
FF Indicator 1.3.a: Low risk of negative social or environmental impact	C	Determined low risk of negative social or environmental impact due to U.S. Federal Law requirements covering most of Criterion 1.3
C1.4. 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.	C	
1.4.a. Situations in which compliance with laws or regulations conflicts with compliance with FSC Principles, Criteria or Indicators are documented and referred to the CB.	C	Confirmed DNR is aware of requirement. No conflict between laws, regulations, and the FSC P&C were identified at any of the properties audited.
C1.5. Forest management areas should be protected from illegal harvesting, settlement and other unauthorized activities.	C	
1.5.a. The forest owner or manager supports or implements measures intended to prevent illegal and unauthorized activities on the Forest Management Unit (FMU).	C	WI DNR helps facilitate boundary marking and provides law enforcement resources where needed. DNR has increased the number of wardens from 150 to 209, and is creating a new category of enforcement staff called Deputy Forest Rangers, who will be able to issue citations.
1.5.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 available resources.	C	Illegal or unauthorized activities were not observed during 2013 audit. Confirmed adequate boundary marking at all properties reviewed. Interviews with landowners indicated that illegal/unauthorized activities were not an issue of significant concern.
C1.6. Forest managers shall demonstrate a long-term commitment to adhere to the FSC Principles and Criteria.		
1.6.a. The forest owner or manager demonstrates a long-term commitment to adhere to the FSC Principles and Criteria and FSC and FSC-US policies, including the FSC-US Land Sales Policy, and has a publicly available statement of commitment to manage the FMU in conformance with FSC standards and policies.	C	Forest Tax Law Handbook documents commitment to the FSC Principles and Criteria (Chapter 21-1).
1.6.b. If the certificate holder does not certify	C	Partial certification is covered in the Forest Tax Law

<p>their entire holdings, then they document, in brief, the reasons for seeking partial certification referencing FSC-POL-20-002 (or subsequent policy revisions), the location of other managed forest units, the natural resources found on the holdings being excluded from certification, and the management activities planned for the holdings being excluded from certification.</p>		<p>Handbook (Chapter 21)</p>
<p>1.6.c. The forest owner or manager notifies the Certifying Body of significant changes in ownership and/or significant changes in management planning within 90 days of such change.</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>All group members qualify as a SLIMF.</p>
<p>FF Indicator 1.6.c The forest owner, manager or group manager notifies the Certifying Body of significant changes in ownership, the certified land base and/or significant changes in management planning prior to the next scheduled annual audit, or within one year of such change, whichever comes first.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>DNR communicated required information to SCS on 5.23.13</p>
<p>P2 Long-term tenure and use rights to the land and forest resources shall be clearly defined, documented and legally established.</p>		
<p>C2.1. Clear evidence of long-term forest use rights to the land (e.g., land title, customary rights, or lease agreements) shall be demonstrated.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>2.1.a. 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>Long-term use rights confirmed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forest Tax Law handbook, 2450.5. • Evidence of deed maintained in each property file. • Clear legal ownership is a precondition of MFL enrollment.
<p>2.1.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>Legally established use/access rights are in each case file (MFL order #). Verified at all 7 of the RMUs of this audit.</p> <p>Confirmed that properties classified as Open to public recreation are documented as such. MFL law (Forest Tax Law Handbook chapter 20-36) requires open status on parcels above 160 acres per municipality (80 acres in entries dated 2004 and earlier). WI DNR is currently building an on-line mapping resource to provide the public with better information about access to Open properties.</p>

<p>2.1.c. 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>Observed systematic boundary marking of MFL properties across 67 properties inspected.</p>
<p>C2.2. 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.</p> <p><i>Applicability Note: For the planning and management of publicly owned forests, the local community is defined as all residents and property owners of the relevant jurisdiction.</i></p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>2.2.a. The forest owner or manager allows the exercise of tenure and use rights allowable by law or regulation.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Confirmed that properties classified as Open to public recreation are documented as such. WI DNR is currently building on-line mapping resources to provide the public with better information on Open properties.</p>
<p>2.2.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>Per the requirements of Indicator 2.2.b and 3.2.a, there is an opportunity for the MFL program to improve consultation with the Chippewa Tribes regarding off-reservation hunting and fishing rights. This finding is based on audit stakeholder consultations with a representative from the Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission (GLFWC), who communicated a desire for additional consultation efforts specific to forest management on MFL properties as it relates to Chippewa hunting and fishing rights. The SCS audit team, DNR, and GLFWC all recognize the challenge of consulting directly with MFL property owners regarding Chippewa hunting and fishing rights. Furthermore, the Note in Indicator 3.2.a. of the FSC standard recognizes this challenge.</p> <p><i>Note from FSC US Standard Guidance: For family forests that meet the eligibility requirements of having a small forest, direct consultation between small private landowners and tribal representatives is encouraged but may not be feasible. Instead, small landowners may rely on consultation between appropriate state and federal agencies and tribes and then abide by the outcome of those government to government negotiations or</i></p>

		<p><i>settlements.</i></p> <p>Given the recognized challenge and the existing consultation mechanisms described below, the audit team concludes there is sufficient consultation to justify conformance with Indicators 2.2.b and 3.2.a. However, this Observation has been issued to encourage additional consultation.</p> <p>WI DNR uses a variety of mechanisms to consult with the six federally recognized Chippewa tribes regarding forest management and off-reservation hunting rights. These mechanisms include designating individual tribal liaisons to consult with each Chippewa tribes on forestry related topics including MFL, specific inclusion and communications with Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission on important forestry management protocols (e.g., biomass harvest guidelines, BMPs for water quality, Invasive Species BMPs, Silviculture Handbook, and Forest Management Guidelines). In addition, all Chippewa tribes were consulted on the Division of Forestry’s “Strategic Direction”. Finally, Chippewa tribes participate in the following DNR management committees that relate to forest and wildlife management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A) The Wild Plant Management and Policy Committee (WPMPC) B) Wildlife Management Committees for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Bear (2) Deer (3) Elk (4) Furbearer (5) Invasives (6) Marten Advisory (7) Migratory Game Bird (7) Pheasant (8) Prairie Grouse (9) Ruffed Grouse / Woodcock (10) Turkey (11) Upland Small Game (Sub-committee of Pheasant Committee) (12) Wildlife Health (13) Wolf
<p>C2.3. Appropriate mechanisms shall be employed to resolve disputes over tenure</p>	<p>C</p>	

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.		
2.3.a. If disputes 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.	NA	All group members qualify as a SLIMF
FF Indicator 2.3.a Low risk of negative social or environmental impact.	C	Audit team concludes low risk of negative social or environmental impact.
2.3.b. The forest owner or manager documents any significant disputes over tenure and use rights.	NA	All group members qualify as a SLIMF
FF Indicator 2.3.b Low risk of negative social or environmental impact.	C	Audit team concludes low risk of negative social or environmental impact.
P3 The legal and customary rights of indigenous peoples to own, use and manage their lands, territories, and resources shall be recognized and respected.		
C3.1. Indigenous peoples shall control forest management on their lands and territories unless they delegate control with free and informed consent to other agencies.	NA	
3.1.a. Tribal forest management planning and implementation are carried out by authorized tribal representatives in accordance with tribal laws and customs and relevant federal laws.	NA	MFL is a voluntary tax incentive program for non-industrial private lands. While some small tribal owned parcels have enrolled into the MFL Program, they have done so entirely at their discretion and in-accordance with tribal laws and customs.
3.1.b. The manager of a tribal forest secures, in writing, informed consent regarding forest management activities from the tribe or individual forest owner prior to commencement of those activities.	NA	MFL is a voluntary tax incentive program for non-industrial private lands. While some small tribal owned parcels have enrolled into the MFL Program they have done so entirely at their discretion and in-accordance with tribal laws and customs.
C3.2. Forest management shall not threaten or diminish, either directly or indirectly, the resources or tenure rights of indigenous peoples.	C	C
3.2.a. During management planning, the forest owner or manager consults with American	C	Wisconsin Tribes are involved in numerous aspects

<p>Indian groups that have legal rights or other binding agreements to the FMU to avoid harming their resources or rights.</p>		<p>of forest management planning across the State of Wisconsin.</p>
<p>3.2.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.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Audit confirmed that appropriate steps are taken to protect resources of sensitive sites once they have been identified.</p> <p>WI DNR uses a variety of mechanisms to consult with the six federally recognized Chippewa tribes regarding forest management and off-reservation hunting rights. These mechanisms include designating individual tribal liaisons to consult with each Chippewa tribes on forestry related topics including MFL, specific inclusion and communications with Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission on important forestry management protocols (e.g., biomass harvest guidelines, BMPs for water quality, Invasive Species BMPs, Silviculture Handbook, and Forest Management Guidelines). In addition, all Chippewa tribes were consulted on the Division of Forestry’s “Strategic Direction”.</p> <p>Cutting Notices for all 67 properties included a survey of Wisconsin Historic Preservation Database that includes tribal resources. Most DNR and some Cooperating Foresters have had training on archeological site identification.</p>
<p>C3.3. 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.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>3.3.a. The forest owner or manager invites consultation with tribal representatives in identifying sites of current or traditional cultural, archeological, ecological, economic or religious significance.</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>All group members qualify as a SLIMF</p>
<p>FF Indicator 3.3.a: The forest owner or manager maintains a list of sites of current or traditional cultural, archeological, ecological, economic or religious significance that have been identified by state conservation agencies and tribal governments on the FMU or that could be impacted by management activities.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Audit confirmed that appropriate steps are taken to protect resources of sensitive sites once they have been identified.</p> <p>WI DNR consults with Tribes in a number of areas (Silviculture Handbook, Forest Management Guidelines, wildlife management policies) that do direct MFL property management.</p> <p>Cutting Notices for all 67 properties included a</p>

		survey of Wisconsin Historic Preservation Database that includes tribal resources. Most DNR and some Cooperating Foresters have had training on archeological site identification.
3.3.b. In consultation with tribal representatives, the forest owner or manager develops measures to protect or enhance areas of special significance (see also Criterion 9.1).	C	WI DNR’s tribal liaisons and staff consult with Tribes to develop strategies to protect from damage or interference those areas of cultural or historical interest. Upon identification of sites of special significance State archeologists engage tribal representatives to ensure adequate protection measures.
C3.4. 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.	C	
3.4.a. The forest owner or manager identifies whether <i>traditional knowledge</i> in forest management is being used.	C	WI DNR is not aware of any use of protected <i>traditional knowledge</i> being used in their forest management.
3.4.b. When traditional knowledge is used, written protocols are jointly developed prior to such use and signed by local tribes or tribal members to protect and fairly compensate them for such use.	NA	
3.4.c. The forest owner or manager respects the confidentiality of tribal traditional knowledge and assists in the protection of such knowledge.	NA	
P4 Forest management operations shall maintain or enhance the long-term social and economic well-being of forest workers and local communities.		
C4.1. The communities within, or adjacent to, the forest management area should be given opportunities for employment, training, and other services.	C	
4.1.a. Employee compensation and hiring practices meet or exceed the prevailing <i>local</i> norms within the forestry industry.	NA	All group members qualify as a SLIMF.
FF Indicator 4.1.a Low risk of negative social or environmental impact.	C	SCS auditors determined low risk of negative social or environmental impact.
4.1.b. Forest work is offered in ways that create high quality job opportunities for employees.	NA	All group members qualify as a SLIMF.
FF Indicator 4.1.b Low risk of negative social or environmental impact.	C	SCS auditors determined low risk of negative social or environmental impact.

4.1.c. Forest workers are provided with fair wages.	NA	All group members qualify as a SLIMF.
FF Indicator 4.1.c: Low risk of negative social or environmental impact.	C	SCS auditors determined low risk of negative social or environmental impact.
4.1.d. Hiring practices and conditions of employment are non-discriminatory and follow applicable federal, state and local regulations.	C	
FF Indicator 4.1.d: Low risk of negative social or environmental impact.	C	SCS auditors determined low risk of negative social or environmental impact.
4.1.e. 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.	NA	All group members qualify as a SLIMF.
FF Indicator 4.1.e: The forest owner or manager, as feasible, contributes to the local community.	C	MFL program is a great contributor to local communities across Wisconsin. The approximate 46,000 MFL certified properties distributed across every county produce timber for the wood markets of Wisconsin and the region. Additionally, the portions of MFL properties that are open to public recreation help provide great opportunities for tourism, recreation, and hunting/fishing related commerce.
4.1.f. 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	All group members qualify as a SLIMF.
FF Indicator 4.1.f: Inapplicable (pertinent requirements incorporated into Indicator 4.1.e)	NA	
4.1.g. The forest owner or manager participates in local economic development and/or civic activities, based on scale of operation and where such opportunities are available.	NA	All group members qualify as a SLIMF.
FF Indicator 4.1.g: Inapplicable (pertinent requirements incorporated into Indicator 4.1.e)	NA	
C4.2. Forest management should meet or exceed all applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of employees and their families.	C	
4.2.a. 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).	NA	All group members qualify as a SLIMF.
FF Indicator 4.2.a Low risk of negative social or environmental impact.	C	Determined low risk because of State and Federal health and safety requirements.

<p>4.2.b. The forest owner or manager and their employees and contractors demonstrate a safe work environment. Contracts or other written agreements include safety requirements.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>WI DNR sponsors FISTA training (4 trainings in 2012) as well as recreational safety education classes.</p> <p>Contracts between landowners and loggers include safety requirements. Wisconsin Woodland Owner’s Association (WWOA) logging contract template is the most common contract form for MFL timber sales. Confirmed safety requirements were included on all of the contracts reviewed.</p> <p>Logging contractors observed during the 2013 audit were in conformance with safety requirements. Note: The number of active operations reviewed was limited because of audit timing during a wet spring.</p> <p>In counties of Lafayette and Dodge several of the selected audit sites were logged by the MFL landowner, and not by a trained logger. When the landowner does his/her own logging, the MFL program has minimal abilities to ensure a safe work environment. Although, the audit did not uncover any safety violations, an Observation is issued for WI DNR to consider efforts to improve safety when the landowner is logging (Observation 03).</p>
<p>4.2.c. The forest owner or manager hires well-qualified service providers to safely implement the management plan.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>All group members qualify as a SLIMF.</p>
<p>FF Indicator 4.2.c Low risk of negative social or environmental impact.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Given training opportunities/requirements of Cooperating Foresters, Certified Plan Writers (CPW), loggers (via FISTA), audit confirms low risk of negative social or environmental impact.</p>
<p>C4.3 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).</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>4.3.a. Forest workers are free to associate with other workers for the purpose of advocating for their own employment interests.</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>All group members qualify as a SLIMF.</p>
<p>FF Indicator 4.3.a Low risk of negative social or environmental impact.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>U.S. labor laws provide adequate protection to confirm low risk.</p>
<p>4.3.b. The forest owner or manager has effective and culturally sensitive mechanisms to</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>All group members qualify as a SLIMF.</p>

<p>resolve disputes between workers and management.</p>		
<p>FF Indicator 4.3.b Low risk of negative social or environmental impact.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Auditor confirmed low risk because of dispute resolution process outlined in Private Forestry Handbook as well as other dispute resolution processes available through the State of Wisconsin.</p>
<p>C4.4. 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.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>4.4.a. 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"> • Archeological sites and sites of cultural, historical and community significance (on and off the FMU); • Public resources, including air, water and food (hunting, fishing, collecting); • Aesthetics; • Community goals for forest and natural resource use and protection such as employment, subsistence, recreation and health; • Community economic opportunities; • Other people who may be affected by management operations. <p>A summary is available to the CB.</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>All group members qualify as a SLIMF.</p>
<p>FF Indicator 4.4.a The forest owner of manager understands the likely social impacts of management activities, and incorporates this understanding into management planning and operations.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Social impact assessment are covered by the following WI DNR procedures and guidance documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Goals, Economic Opportunities, and Other People Affected by Management Operations are addressed in the 2010 Wisconsin Statewide Forest Strategy; http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/ForestPlanning/strategy2010.asp • Historically significant sites and archeological sites are identified using the Archeological and Historical Database • Public Resources (primarily water) are identified and protected through BMPs for Water Quality

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aesthetics- covered under chapter 4 of Forest Management Guidelines.
4.4.b. The forest owner or manager seeks and considers input in management planning from people who would likely be affected by management activities.	NA	
FF Indicator 4.4.b: Low risk of negative social or environmental impact.	C	Low risk, see response to 4.4.a
4.4.c. 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.	C	Before a timber harvest can occur, there is a 30 day period for WI DNR to review the harvest plan that is described in a Cutting Notice. Review includes elements listed in 4.4.a to ensure that adverse effects do not occur. In addition, during 2013, auditors observed coordination between abutting properties on timber harvests.
<p>4.4.d. For public forests, consultation shall include the following components:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clearly defined and accessible methods for public participation are provided in both long and short-term planning processes, including harvest plans and operational plans; 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; 3. An accessible and affordable appeals process to planning decisions is available. <p>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>	NA	
C4.5. 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.	C	
4.5.a. The forest owner or manager does not engage in negligent activities that cause damage to other people.	C	<p>Implementation of WI DNR’s MFL management system ensures negligent activities do not occur.</p> <p><u>Evidence</u></p> <p>Observed conformance with following plans and procedures at selected field sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WI DNR Cutting Notice and Report for each

		<p>MFL property</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MFL Stewardship Plan • WI DNR Forest Tax Law Handbook • WI DNR Silviculture Handbook • WI DNR Forest Management Guidelines • WI DNR Private Forestry Handbook • Timber sale contracts • BMPs for Water Quality
4.5.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.	C	Process for voicing and resolving grievances are detailed in the WI DNR Forest Tax Law handbook.
4.5.c. Fair compensation or reasonable mitigation is provided to local people, communities or adjacent landowners for substantiated damage or loss of income caused by the landowner or manager.	NA	All group members qualify as a SLIMF.
FF Indicator 4.5.c Low risk of negative social or environmental impact	C	Given strong conformance with 4.5.b, auditor confirmed low risk of negative social or environmental impact.
P5 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.		
C5.1. 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.	C	
5.1.a. The forest owner or manager is financially able to implement core management activities, including all those environmental, social and operating costs, required to meet this Standard, and investment and reinvestment in forest management.	C	<p>Requirement primarily met through core strategy of MFL that encourages long-term management (i.e., 25-50 year contracts) by offering considerable reduced property tax rates.</p> <p>Confirmed a reasonable amount of continued investment such as cost sharing for tree planting and invasive plant control through Wisconsin Forest landowner Grant Program on properties inspected in 2013.</p>

		DNR hired 17 new foresters in 2012, and is maintaining an 8% vacancy rate- which is the lowest in some time.
5.1.b. Responses to short-term financial factors are limited to levels that are consistent with fulfillment of this Standard.	C	Confirmed that all harvest sites visited used sound silviculture that was not based on short-term financial factors. In selection harvests, high quality trees capable of future growth were systematically retained for future harvests.
C5.2. Forest management and marketing operations should encourage the optimal use and local processing of the forest’s diversity of products.	C	
5.2.a. Where forest products are harvested or sold, opportunities for forest product sales and services are given to local harvesters, value-added processing and manufacturing facilities, guiding services, and other operations that are able to offer services at competitive rates and levels of service.	NA	All group members qualify as a SLIMF.
FF Indicator 5.2.a Low risk of negative social or environmental impact.	C	Confirmed low risk given typical small size of timber sales on MFL properties.
5.2.b. The forest owner or manager takes measures to optimize the use of harvested forest products and explores product diversification where appropriate and consistent with management objectives.	C	2013 audit results showed a broad diversification of products (e.g., sawlogs, pulpwood, veneer logs, maple syrup, etc) across the 67 group members inspected. The southern part of Wisconsin typically has little opportunity for pulpwood sales, however, that is beyond the control of the certificate holder.
5.2.c. On public lands where forest products are harvested and sold, some sales of forest products or contracts are scaled or structured to allow small business to bid competitively.	NA	Certificate is made up of private lands.
C5.3. Forest management should minimize waste associated with harvesting and on-site processing operations and avoid damage to other forest resources.	C	
5.3.a. Management practices are employed to minimize the loss and/or waste of harvested forest products.	C	Observed acceptable levels of utilization and minimizing loss across the 67 group member properties. Confirmed contracts and Forest Management Guidelines contain utilization requirements.
5.3.b. Harvest practices are managed to protect residual trees and other forest resources, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • soil compaction, rutting and erosion are minimized; • residual trees are not significantly 	C	Verified conformance at all of the 67 MFL properties inspected during 2013 audit. Verified use of the following procedures/systems to minimize damage: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WI DNR Cutting Notice approval process - WI DNR Silviculture handbook

<p>damaged to the extent that health, growth, or values are noticeably affected;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • damage to NTFPs is minimized during management activities; and • techniques and equipment that minimize impacts to vegetation, soil, and water are used whenever feasible. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WI DNR Forest Management Guidelines - WI DNR Private Forestry Handbook - Timber sale contracts with BMP and minimal damage requirements - BMPs for Water Quality
<p>C5.4. Forest management should strive to strengthen and diversify the local economy, avoiding dependence on a single forest product.</p>		
<p>5.4.a. The forest owner or manager demonstrates knowledge of their operation’s effect on the local economy as it relates to existing and potential markets for a wide variety of timber and non-timber forest products and services.</p>	C	<p>Entire MFL program fully recognizes importance that managed forest lands have on the local economy of Wisconsin. The approximate 46,000 MFL properties that have enrolled into this group are required to sustainably produce timber for the wood markets of Wisconsin.</p>
<p>5.4.b The forest owner or manager strives to diversify the economic use of the forest according to Indicator 5.4.a.</p>	C	<p>Landowner uses of the forest include diverse recreational opportunities (e.g., hunting, skiing, bird watching, etc.). Enrollment into MFL program, with its timber management requirements) ensures that the economic use of wood products occurs.</p>
<p>C5.5. Forest management operations shall recognize, maintain, and, where appropriate, enhance the value of forest services and resources such as watersheds and fisheries.</p>		
<p>5.5.a. In developing and implementing activities on the FMU, the forest owner or manager identifies, defines and implements appropriate measures for maintaining and/or enhancing forest services and resources that serve public values, including municipal watersheds, fisheries, carbon storage and sequestration, recreation and tourism.</p>	C	<p>By using the following management systems and resources MFL Program ensures conformance with Indicator 5.5.a</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BMPs for Water Quality • MFL Stewardship Plan for each property inspected • WI DNR Silviculture Handbook • WI DNR Forest Management Guidelines • Timber sale contracts with BMP requirements
<p>5.5.b The forest owner or manager uses the information from Indicator 5.5.a to implement appropriate measures for maintaining and/or enhancing these services and resources.</p>	C	<p>By using the following management systems and resources detailed in 5.5.a, MFL Program ensures conformance with Indicator 5.5.b.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BMPs=
<p>C5.6. The rate of harvest of forest products shall not exceed levels which can be permanently sustained.</p>	C	
<p>5.6.a. 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</p>	NA	<p>All group members qualify as a SLIMF.</p>

<p>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 for each planning unit is based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • documented growth rates for particular sites, and/or acreage of forest types, age-classes and species distributions; • mortality and decay and other factors that affect net growth; • areas reserved from harvest or subject to harvest restrictions to meet other management goals; • silvicultural practices that will be employed on the FMU; • management objectives and desired future conditions. <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>FF Indicator 5.6.a On family forests, a sustained yield harvest level analysis shall be completed. Data used in the analysis may include but is not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - regional growth data; - age-class and species distributions; - stocking rates required to meet management objectives; - ecological and legal constraints; - empirical growth and regeneration data; and, - validated forest productivity models. 	C	<p>5.6.a is addressed through the property specific Management Plan, the Silviculture Handbook, and pre- and post-harvest cruises. Harvest timing is estimated via projected growth data (based on growth and yield data from FIA and the State of Wisconsin) and only occurs if estimated volume is available for harvest. Because of this type of regulation system, there is no need for each individual small parcel in the MFL to have a sustained yield harvest level. Other WIDNR requirements such as BMPs, NHI searches, Ecological Landscape considerations, Invasive BMPs ensure ecological and legal constraints are factored into harvest levels for each property. Property specific inventory and yield information is maintained in each landowner file.</p>
<p>5.6.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>FF Indicator 5.6.b. On family forests, harvest levels and rates do not exceed growth rates</p>	C	<p>Regulation system implemented as described in 5.6.a ensures harvest levels are sustained over</p>

<p>over successive harvests, contribute directly to achieving desired future conditions as defined in the forest management plans, and do not diminish the long term ecological integrity and productivity of the site.</p>		<p>successive harvests.</p>
<p>5.6.c. 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>Silviculture Handbook mandates conformance with 5.6.c. Observed conformance with Silviculture Handbook prescriptions across all 67 properties inspected in 2013.</p>
<p>5.6.d. For NTFPs, calculation of quantitative sustained yield harvest levels is required only in cases where products are harvested in 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>C</p>	<p>NTFPs are seldom harvested and significant commercial operations of NTFPs do not occur on MFL properties.</p>
<p>P6 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.</p>		
<p>C6.1. 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.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>6.1.a. Using the results of <i>credible scientific analysis, best available information</i> (including relevant databases), and local knowledge and experience, an assessment of conditions on the FMU is completed and includes:</p> <p>1) Forest community types and development,</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Requirements 1-6 are covered by the property specific Management Plan and Cutting Notice that is required prior to each timber sale. DNR must review and approve each Cutting Notice.</p>

<p>size class and/or successional stages, and associated natural disturbance regimes;</p> <p>2) Rare, Threatened and Endangered (RTE) species and rare ecological communities (including plant communities);</p> <p>3) Other habitats and species of management concern;</p> <p>4) Water resources and associated riparian habitats and hydrologic functions;</p> <p>5) Soil resources; and</p> <p>6) Historic conditions on the FMU related to forest community types and development, size class and/or successional stages, and a broad comparison of historic and current conditions.</p>		
<p>6.1.b. Prior to commencing site-disturbing activities, the forest owner or manager assesses and documents the potential short and long-term impacts of planned management activities on elements 1-5 listed in Criterion 6.1.a.</p> <p>The assessment must incorporate the best available information, drawing from scientific literature and experts. The impact assessment will at minimum include identifying resources that may be impacted by management (e.g., streams, habitats of management concern, soil nutrients). Additional detail (i.e., detailed description or quantification of impacts) will vary depending on the uniqueness of the resource, potential risks, and steps that will be taken to avoid and minimize risks.</p>	C	<p>MFL procedures require an environmental assessment before site disturbing activities. Evidence: Forest Tax Handbook appendix 15, BMPs for Water Quality Cutting Notice</p> <p>All timber sales viewed during 2013 audit conformed to MFP procedures for environmental assessments.</p>
<p>6.1.c. Using the findings of the impact assessment (Indicator 6.1.b), management approaches and field prescriptions are developed and implemented that: 1) avoid or minimize negative short-term and long-term impacts; and, 2) maintain and/or enhance the long-term ecological viability of the forest.</p>	C	<p>All harvest activities and management systems reviewed during the 2013 audit conformed to MFL procedures for minimizing negative impacts. Evidence: Forest Tax Handbook appendix 15, BMPs for Water Quality Cutting Notice</p>
<p>6.1.d. On public lands, assessments developed in Indicator 6.1.a and management approaches developed in Indicator 6.1.c are made available to the public in draft form for review and comment prior to finalization. Final assessments are also made available.</p>	NA	
<p>C 6.2. Safeguards shall exist which protect rare, threatened and endangered species and their habitats (e.g., nesting and feeding areas).</p>	C	

<p>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.</p>		
<p>6.2.a. 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 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>NA</p>	<p>All group members qualify as a SLIMF.</p>
<p>FF Indicator 6.2.a 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. Surveys are conducted by biologists with the appropriate expertise in the species of interest and with appropriate qualifications to conduct the surveys. A secondary review of the survey does not need to be included in the process. If a species is determined to be present, its location should be reported to the manager of the appropriate database.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Per MFL procedures, Natural Heritage Inventory (NHI) surveys are completed prior to preparing an MFL Management Plan and prior to a harvest (via the Cutting Notice). If the NHI query indicates possible presence of forest dwelling RTE species, management occurs with the assumption that they are present. Auditors observed an overall level of conformance with these requirements; however, the NHI is not functioning optimally. In some cases there is a lack of clarity about the “likely presence of RTE species”. Details of the program not functioning optimally include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The NHI information for each MFL property lacks a description of and evidence for how occurrences are being protected. Rather, many Cutting Notices simply had blanket statements that species protection would be achieved by frozen ground logging or by following BMPs. One Cutting Notice stated RTE species “most likely are not there” and that “keeping soil disturbance to a minimum is necessary to prevent damage if it is there.” • The large percentage of outdated NHI data and the vagueness of the occurrence location relative to the MFL property that is being harvested (i.e., occurrences are only provided based a 1 mile buffer) results in less attention

		<p>being paid to the system. Previously, NHI provided information about whether an occurrence was actually on a specific MFL property, but it now only provides information about it being within a one mile buffer. Consultations with Cooperative and MFL foresters suggests that less attention is being paid to NHI results because of the old data and lack of specificity on location.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was very little evidence of foresters reporting new occurrences to NHI. <p>Observation 04</p>
<p>6.2.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. Conservation zones and/or protected areas 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>	C	See 6.2.a
<p>6.2.c. 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>	NA	All group members qualify as a SLIMF.
<p>6.2.d. 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>	C	Controlled through DNR Law Enforcement.
<p>C6.3. Ecological functions and values shall be maintained intact, enhanced, or restored, including: a) Forest regeneration and succession. b) Genetic, species, and ecosystem diversity. c) Natural cycles that affect the productivity of the forest ecosystem.</p>	C	
<p>6.3.a.1. The forest owner or manager maintains, enhances, and/or restores under-represented successional stages in the FMU that would naturally occur on the types of sites found on the FMU. Where old growth of different</p>	C	Maintaining and enhancing under-represented successional stages occurs through implementation of WI DNR Silviculture Handbook. Additionally, NHI covers some under-represented communities.

<p>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>6.3.a.2. When a rare ecological community 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, conservation zones and/or protected areas are established where warranted.</p>	C	<p>Rare ecological communities are identified through NHI and by following the Silviculture Handbook. Additionally, Ecological Landscapes Handbook is used by MFL and Cooperating Foresters to identify and manage for rare community types.</p>
<p>6.3.a.3. When they are present, management maintains the area, structure, composition, and processes of all Type 1 and Type 2 old growth. 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>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</p>	C	<p>If identified, Type 1 and Type 2 old growth is to be managed in accordance with WI DNR Old Growth and Old Forests Handbook. This handbook is designed to meet 6.3.a.3 requirements for ensuring protection of old growth. Old growth is very rare in Wisconsin and occurrences on MFL properties have not been identified.</p>

<p>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"> 1. Old growth forests comprise a significant portion of the tribal ownership. 2. A history of forest stewardship by the tribe exists. 3. High Conservation Value Forest attributes are maintained. 4. Old-growth structures are maintained. 5. Conservation zones representative of old growth stands are established. 6. Landscape level considerations are addressed. 7. Rare species are protected. 		
<p>6.3.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>	<p>NA</p>	<p>All properties qualify as a SLIMF.</p>
<p>6.3.c. Management maintains, enhances and/or restores the plant and wildlife habitat of Riparian Management Zones (RMZs) to provide:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) habitat for aquatic species that breed in surrounding uplands; b) habitat for predominantly terrestrial species that breed in adjacent aquatic habitats; c) habitat for species that use riparian areas for feeding, cover, and travel; d) habitat for plant species associated with riparian areas; and, e) stream shading and inputs of wood and leaf litter into the adjacent aquatic ecosystem. 	<p>C</p>	<p>Observed good conformance with WI DNR BMPs for riparian habitat requirements of this indicator and Water Quality with the one exception noted under Criterion 6.5.</p>
<p>Stand-scale Indicators</p> <p>6.3.d Management practices maintain or enhance plant species composition, distribution and frequency of occurrence similar to those</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Species composition, distribution, and frequency of occurrence are covered by the WI DNR Silviculture Handbook. MFL properties are required to implement the Silviculture Handbook, and during</p>

<p>that would naturally occur on the site.</p>		<p>the 2013 audit we observed an acceptable level of conformance with these requirements. DNR completed a comprehensive study (Deer Trustee Report) on deer population levels across the State. As part of this study forest impacts were investigated and the recommendation of the report is to introduce some new approaches for managing the deer herd at levels improve regeneration of native tree species that have been adversely impacted by an overabundant deer population.</p>
<p>6.3.e. 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. Native species suited to the site are normally selected for regeneration.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Nearly all seedlings are obtained from the WI DNR State Nurseries. Local sources are used when available, and the DNR forester must approve tree planting species lists.</p> <p>Observed good conformance with planting of red oak, black walnut, red pine, and other species from the State Nursery using local sources of known provenance.</p>
<p>6.3.f. 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: a) large live trees, live trees with decay or declining health, snags, and well-distributed coarse down and dead woody material. Legacy trees where present are not harvested; and b) vertical and horizontal complexity. Trees selected for retention are generally representative of the dominant species found on the site.</p>		<p>Covered by Chapter 24 of Silviculture Handbook. Observed overall conformance with requirements for stand level habitat- though there is an opportunity to improve the level of documentation and in some cases attention to habitat elements. The following findings result in Observation 05.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cutting Notices and Management Plans often lacked information about inventories of den / cavity trees per acre relative to Silviculture Handbook requirements (e.g. A guideline of three or more cavity trees and as many snag trees as possible per acre should meet the requirements of most cavity-dwelling wildlife) • MFL Order 33-012-1999 stated that 28 cull trees (trees with possible decay) were marked with an “x” giving the logger the option to fell those trees. Yet there was no discussion or marking of wildlife trees on the sale. MFL Order 33-005-2003 allowed for “All standing dead and downed trees in the sale to be harvested”, again, without a discussion about wildlife trees. <p>Observation 05</p>
<p>6.3.g.1 In the Southeast, Appalachia, Ozark-Ouachita, Mississippi Alluvial Valley, and Pacific Coast Regions, when even-aged systems are employed, and during salvage harvests, live</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Requirement is covered by Chapter 24 of Silviculture Handbook. Observed overall conformance with this requirement in even-aged management treatments.</p>

<p>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>		
<p>6.3.g.2 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 described in Indicator 6.3.g.1. A qualified plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is developed by qualified experts in ecological and/or related fields (wildlife biology, hydrology, landscape ecology, forestry/silviculture). 2. Is based on the totality of the best available information including peer-reviewed science regarding natural disturbance regimes for the FMU. 3. Is spatially and temporally explicit and includes maps of proposed openings or areas. 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. 5. Is reviewed by independent experts in wildlife biology, hydrology, and landscape ecology, to confirm the preceding findings. 	<p>NA</p>	<p>This scenario has not yet arisen.</p>
<p>6.3.h. The forest owner or manager assesses the risk of, prioritizes, and, as warranted, develops and implements a strategy to prevent or control invasive species, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. a method to determine the extent of invasive species and the degree of 	<p>C</p>	<p>Invasive species are assessed during Management Plan writing and prior to a timber sale. Interviews with foresters indicated a high level of awareness about invasive plant problems. For example, during the audit in Lafayette County DNR staff identified a possible new occurrence of Himalayan Blackberry.</p>

<p>threat to native species and ecosystems;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. implementation of management practices that minimize the risk of invasive establishment, growth, and spread; 3. eradication or control of established invasive populations when feasible: and, 4. monitoring of control measures and management practices to assess their effectiveness in preventing or controlling invasive species. 		<p>The possibility of this occurrence was announced via a recent invasive plant alert newsletter.</p> <p>Nearly all Cutting Notices reviewed included a discussion of invasive plants. On a significant number of the properties some herbicide treatment of invasives was being conducted. On some MFL properties eradication or even control is not feasible. If such properties reach the point where productive timber values are lost, then those properties will have to be removed from the certified group.</p>
<p>6.3.i. 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>	C	<p>Occurs by following Silviculture Handbook and DNR Forest Management Guidelines. Observed good conformance with fuels management practices.</p>
<p>C6.4. 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.</p>	C	
<p>6.4.a. The forest owner or manager documents the ecosystems that would naturally exist on the FMU, and assesses the adequacy of their representation and protection in the <i>landscape</i> (see Criterion 7.1). The assessment for medium and large forests include some or all of the following: a) GAP analyses; b) collaboration with state natural heritage programs and other public agencies; c) regional, landscape, and watershed planning efforts; d) collaboration with universities and/or local conservation groups.</p> <p>For an area that is not located on the FMU to qualify as a Representative Sample Area (RSA), it should be under permanent protection in its natural state.</p>	NA	<p>All group members qualify as a SLIMF</p>
<p>FF Indicator 6.4.a For family forests, the forest owner or manager documents the ecosystems that would naturally exist on the FMU, and assesses the adequacy of their representation and protection in the landscape (see Criterion 7.1). The consultation and assessment process</p>	C	<p>A GAP analysis has been completed and Wisconsin’s State Natural Area (SNA) program has documented locations of native ecosystems. Representative sites are adequately protected across the State through SNA’s on public lands and lands owned by conservation organizations.</p>

<p>may be more informal; however, on all FMUs, outstanding examples of common community types (e.g., common types with Natural Heritage viability rankings of A and B) are identified in the assessment to be protected or managed to maintain their conservation value.</p>		<p>If additional outstanding examples arise on MFL, these would be protected through the NHI process. Evidence: Interview Randy Hoffman, WI DNR lead for SNA establishment</p>
<p>6.4.b. Where existing areas within the landscape, but external to the FMU, are not of adequate protection, size, and configuration to serve as representative samples of existing ecosystems, forest owners or managers, whose properties are conducive to the establishment of such areas, designate ecologically viable RSAs to serve these purposes.</p> <p>Large FMUs are generally expected to establish RSAs of purpose 2 and 3 within the FMU.</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>All group members qualify as a SLIMF.</p>
<p>FF Indicator 6.4.b: Low risk of negative social or environmental impact. However, on all FMUs where outstanding examples of common community types exist (see Guidance for 6.4.a.), they should be protected or managed to maintain their conservation value.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Low risk because Criterion 6.4 is covered on lands outside of the MFL program.</p>
<p>6.4.c. Management activities within RSAs are limited to low impact activities compatible with the protected RSA objectives, except under the following circumstances:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) harvesting activities only where they are necessary to restore or create conditions to meet the objectives of the protected RSA, or to mitigate conditions that interfere with achieving the RSA objectives; or b) road-building only where it is documented that it will contribute to minimizing the overall environmental impacts within the FMU and will not jeopardize the purpose for which the RSA was designated. 	<p>NA</p>	<p>No RSAs on MFL</p>
<p>6.4.d. The RSA assessment (Indicator 6.4.a) shall be periodically reviewed and if necessary updated (at a minimum every 10 years) in order to determine if the need for RSAs has changed; the designation of RSAs (Indicator 6.4.b) is revised accordingly.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Representative sites are adequately protected across the State through SNA's on public lands and lands owned by conservation organizations. If additional outstanding examples arise on MFL, these would be protected through the NHI process that occurs on an ongoing basis.</p>

<p>6.4.e. Managers of large, contiguous public forests establish and maintain a network of representative protected areas sufficient in size to maintain species dependent on interior core habitats.</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>All properties are private.</p>
<p>C6.5. Written guidelines shall be prepared and implemented to control erosion; minimize forest damage during harvesting, road construction, and all other mechanical disturbances; and to protect water resources.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>6.5.a. The forest owner or manager has written guidelines outlining conformance with the Indicators of this Criterion.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Wisconsin BMPs for Water Quality</p>
<p>6.5.b. Forest operations meet or exceed Best Management Practices (BMPs) that address components of the Criterion where the operation takes place.</p>	<p>NC</p>	<p>Observed excellent familiarity with BMPs and overall very good conformance. The two notable exceptions, resulting in minor CAR 06. Two site visits identified a BMP/Water Quality issue. Both involved clear cutting the RMZs along intermittent streams. Wisconsin BMPs for Water Quality (2010) specify a one hundred (100) foot RMZ on each side. BMPs provide for narrower (but some width) RMZ when adjacent area is not-sloping, has undisturbed soil, and is well-vegetated, which is the case here, but there is no documentation of a decision to have a smaller or no RMZ</p>
<p>6.5.c. Management activities including site preparation, harvest prescriptions, techniques, timing, and equipment are selected and used to protect soil and water resources and to avoid erosion, landslides, and significant soil disturbance. Logging and other activities that significantly increase the risk of landslides are excluded in areas where risk of landslides is high. The following actions are addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slash is concentrated only as much as necessary to achieve the goals of site preparation and the reduction of fuels to moderate or low levels of fire hazard. • Disturbance of topsoil is limited to the minimum necessary to achieve successful regeneration of species native to the site. • Rutting and compaction is minimized. • Soil erosion is not accelerated. • Burning is only done when consistent with natural disturbance regimes. 	<p>C</p>	<p>MFL's implementation of BMPs, Biomass Harvest Guidelines, and Silviculture Handbook result in conformance with the bulleted requirements of 6.5.c.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural ground cover disturbance is minimized to the extent necessary to achieve regeneration objectives. • Whole tree harvesting on any site over multiple rotations is only done when research indicates soil productivity will not be harmed. • Low impact equipment and technologies is used where appropriate. 		
<p>6.5.d. The transportation system, including design and placement of permanent and temporary haul roads, skid trails, recreational trails, water crossings and landings, is designed, constructed, maintained, and/or reconstructed to reduce short and long-term environmental impacts, habitat fragmentation, soil and water disturbance and cumulative adverse effects, while allowing for customary uses and use rights. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • access to all roads and trails (temporary and permanent), including recreational trails, and off-road travel, is controlled, as possible, to minimize ecological impacts; • road density is minimized; • erosion is minimized; • sediment discharge to streams is minimized; • there is free upstream and downstream passage for aquatic organisms; • impacts of transportation systems on wildlife habitat and migration corridors are minimized; • area converted to roads, landings and skid trails is minimized; • habitat fragmentation is minimized; • unneeded roads are closed and rehabilitated. 	C	MFL’s implementation of BMPs, Forest Management Guidelines, Silviculture Handbook result in conformance with the bulleted requirements of 6.5.d.
<p>6.5.e.1. In consultation with appropriate expertise, the forest owner or manager implements written Streamside Management Zone (SMZ) buffer management guidelines that are adequate for preventing environmental impact, and include protecting and restoring water quality, hydrologic conditions in rivers and stream corridors, wetlands, vernal pools, seeps and springs, lake and pond shorelines,</p>	C	MFL’s implementation of BMPs for Water Quality covers this requirement.

<p>and other hydrologically sensitive areas. The guidelines include vegetative buffer widths and protection measures that are acceptable within those buffers.</p> <p>In the Appalachia, Ozark-Ouachita, Southeast, Mississippi Alluvial Valley, Southwest, Rocky Mountain, and Pacific Coast regions, there are requirements for minimum SMZ widths and explicit limitations on the activities that can occur within those SMZs. These are outlined as requirements in Appendix E.</p>		
<p>6.5.e.2. Minor variations from the stated minimum SMZ widths and layout for specific stream segments, wetlands and other water bodies are permitted in limited circumstances, provided the forest owner or manager demonstrates that the alternative configuration maintains the overall extent of the buffers and provides equivalent or greater environmental protection than FSC-US regional requirements for those stream segments, water quality, and aquatic species, based on site-specific conditions and the best available information. The forest owner or manager develops a written set of supporting information including a description of the riparian habitats and species addressed in the alternative configuration. The CB must verify that the variations meet these requirements, based on the input of an independent expert in aquatic ecology or closely related field.</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>No variations from minimum SMZ widths.</p>
<p>6.5.f. Stream and wetland crossings are avoided when possible. Unavoidable crossings are located and constructed to minimize impacts on water quality, hydrology, and fragmentation of aquatic habitat. Crossings do not impede the movement of aquatic species. Temporary crossings are restored to original hydrological conditions when operations are finished.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>MFL’s implementation of BMPs for Water Quality. Stream crossings reviewed during 2013 audit conformed with 6.5.f.</p>
<p>6.5.g. Recreation use on the FMU is managed to avoid negative impacts to soils, water, plants, wildlife and wildlife habitats.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Given their small size and that recreational use is typically limited to family and friends of landowner, MFL properties conform to 6.5.g. Observed no instances of damage arising from recreation during 2013 audit.</p>
<p>6.5.h. Grazing by domesticated animals is controlled to protect in-stream habitats and water quality, the species composition and</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Grazing is prohibited by statute on MFL properties.</p>

<p>viability of the riparian vegetation, and the banks of the stream channel from erosion.</p>		
<p>C6.6. 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.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>6.6.a. No products on the FSC list of Highly Hazardous Pesticides are used (see FSC-POL-30-001 EN FSC Pesticides policy 2005 and associated documents).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Based on records reviewed in 2013, no highly hazardous pesticides were used in 2013.</p>
<p>6.6.b. All toxicants used to control pests and competing vegetation, including rodenticides, insecticides, herbicides, and fungicides are used only when and where non-chemical management practices are: a) not available; b) prohibitively expensive, taking into account overall environmental and social costs, risks and benefits; c) the only effective means for controlling invasive and exotic species; or d) result in less environmental damage than non-chemical alternatives (e.g., top soil disturbance, loss of soil litter and down wood debris). If chemicals are used, the forest owner or manager uses the least environmentally damaging formulation and application method practical. Written strategies are developed and implemented that justify the use of chemical pesticides. Whenever feasible, an eventual phase-out of chemical use is included in the strategy. The written strategy shall include an analysis of options for, and the effects of, various chemical and non-chemical pest control strategies, with the goal of reducing or eliminating chemical use.</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>All group members qualify as a SLIMF.</p>
<p>FF Indicator 6.6.b All toxicants used to control pests and competing vegetation, including rodenticides, insecticides, herbicides, and</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>MFL program has a demonstrated record of implementing non-chemical options whenever feasible.</p>

<p>fungicides are used only when and where non-chemical management practices are: a) not available; b) prohibitively expensive, taking into account overall environmental and social costs, risks and benefits; c) the only effective means for controlling invasive and exotic species; or d) result in less environmental damage than non-chemical alternatives (e.g., top soil disturbance, loss of soil litter and down wood debris). If chemicals are used, the forest owner or manager uses the least environmentally damaging formulation and application method practical.</p> <p>Written strategies are developed and implemented that justify the use of chemical pesticides. Family forest owners/managers may use brief and less technical written procedures for applying common over-the-counter products. Any observed misuse of these chemicals may be considered as violation of requirements in this Indicator. Whenever feasible, an eventual phase-out of chemical use is included in the strategy.</p>		<p>Evidence: http://dnr.wi.gov/invasives/fact/loosecontrol.htm</p> <p>All chemical applications by landowners requires a Chemical Use Reporting Form to be completed: Evidence: http://dnr.wi.gov/forestry/certification/chemical_use.htm 2012 Chemical Use forms</p> <p>FSC’s highly hazardous pesticides are prohibited and least toxic chemicals (e.g., glyphosate) are generally the recommended choice. Application methods are typically done via backpack and the written prescription typically follows the label rate (unless justified at alternative rate). MSDS recommended safety procedures and equipment are required. Observed proper use of safety equipment during herbicide application in Lafayette County.</p>
<p>6.6.c. Chemicals and application methods are selected to minimize risk to non-target species and sites. When considering the choice between aerial and ground application, the forest owner or manager evaluates the comparative risk to non-target species and sites, the comparative risk of worker exposure, and the overall amount and type of chemicals required.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>See 6.6.b</p>
<p>6.6.d. Whenever chemicals are used, a written prescription is prepared that describes the site-specific hazards and environmental risks, and the precautions that workers will employ to avoid or minimize those hazards and risks, and includes a map of the treatment area. Chemicals are applied only by workers who have received proper training in application methods and safety. They are made aware of the risks, wear proper safety equipment, and are trained to minimize environmental impacts on non-target species and sites.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>See 6.6.b</p>
<p>6.6.e. If chemicals are used, the effects are monitored and the results are used for adaptive management. Records are kept of pest occurrences, control measures, and incidences</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Follow-up monitoring is done by Cooperating Foresters and/or MFL Foresters. Evidence: Interviews with MFL Foresters</p>

of worker exposure to chemicals.		Interview with Cooperating Forester in Lafayette County who after numerous application trials optimized herbicide usage rates at approximately ½ label rate.
C6.7. 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.	C	
6.7.a. The forest owner or manager, and employees and contractors, have the equipment and training necessary to respond to hazardous spills	C	Loggers interviewed had spill kits and had undergone FISTA training that covers hazardous spills.
6.7.b. In the event of a hazardous material spill, the forest owner or manager immediately contains the material and engages qualified personnel to perform the appropriate removal and remediation, as required by applicable law and regulations.	C	Based on interviews with Foresters and loggers, proper spill containment occurs.
6.7.c. Hazardous materials and fuels are stored in leak-proof containers in designated storage areas, that are outside of riparian management zones and away from other ecological sensitive features, until they are used or transported to an approved off-site location for disposal. There is no evidence of persistent fluid leaks from equipment or of recent groundwater or surface water contamination.	C	Covered by BMPs. Observed overall conformance with this requirement.
C6.8. 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.	C	
6.8.a. Use of biological control agents are used only as part of a pest management strategy for the control of invasive plants, pathogens , insects, or other animals when other pest control methods are ineffective, or are expected to be ineffective. Such use is contingent upon peer-reviewed scientific evidence that the agents in question are non-invasive and are safe for native species.	C	WI DNR uses <i>Bacillus thuringiensis kurstaki</i> (Btk) and Nucleopolyhedrosis Virus (Gypchek) to control gypsy moth and other forest pests. The safety and effectiveness of these treatments has been substantiated by the scientific literature.
6.8.b. If biological control agents are used, they are applied by trained workers using proper equipment.	C	Btk and Gypchek are applied aerially by trained WI DNR contractors.
6.8.c. If biological control agents are used, their use shall be documented, monitored and strictly	C	Use of Btk and Gypchek follows USDA protocols and plans.

controlled in accordance with state and national laws and internationally accepted scientific protocols. A written plan will be developed and implemented justifying such use, describing the risks, specifying the precautions workers will employ to avoid or minimize such risks, and describing how potential impacts will be monitored.		
6.8.d. Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) are not used for any purpose	C	There is no use of GMO trees. However, at least one MFL property was planting GMO round-up ready crops on wildlife food plots. See response to Major CAR 07.
C6.9. The use of exotic species shall be carefully controlled and actively monitored to avoid adverse ecological impacts.	C	
6.9.a. 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.	C	Exotic tree species are not used on MFL properties. Although, exotic seed mixes are used for erosion control, these are not considered invasive.
6.9.b. If exotic species are used, their provenance and the location of their use are documented, and their ecological effects are actively monitored.	C	Some exotic seed mixes are used on wildlife food plots. However, there is no indication that such species are invasive or pose risk to biodiversity.
6.9.c 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	No impacts from exotic species have been identified.
C6.10. Forest conversion to plantations or non-forest land uses shall not occur, except in circumstances where conversion: 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.	C	
6.10.a Forest <i>conversion</i> to non-forest land uses does not occur, except in circumstances where conversion entails a very limited portion of the forest management unit (note that Indicators 6.10.a, b, and c are related and all need to be conformed with for conversion to be allowed).	C	Conversions from natural forest to plantation or non-forest do not occur on the MFL properties. Field audits by the previous certification body (Rainforest Alliance) over the first 5 years of the certificate have not uncovered any such conversions. No such conversions were observed during the 2013 audit.
6.10.b Forest <i>conversion</i> to non-forest land uses does not occur on high conservation value forest areas (note that Indicators 6.10.a, b, and	NA	No conversion

c are related and all need to be conformed with for conversion to be allowed).		
6.10.c Forest <i>conversion</i> to non-forest land uses does not occur, except in circumstances where conversion will enable clear, substantial, additional, secure, long term conservation benefits across the forest management unit (note that Indicators 6.10.a, b, and c are related and all need to be conformed with for conversion to be allowed).	NA	No conversions
6.10.d Natural or semi-natural stands are not converted to plantations. Degraded, semi-natural stands may be converted to restoration plantations.	NA	Conversions do not occur.
6.10.e Justification for land-use and stand-type conversions is fully described in the long-term management plan, and meets the biodiversity conservation requirements of Criterion 6.3 (see also Criterion 7.1.l)	C	Silviculture Handbook management of red pine and jack pine.
6.10.f Areas converted to <i>non-forest use</i> for facilities associated with subsurface mineral and gas rights transferred by prior owners, or other conversion outside the control of the certificate holder, are identified on maps. The forest owner or manager consults with the CB to determine if removal of these areas from the scope of the certificate is warranted. To the extent allowed by these transferred rights, the forest owner or manager exercises control over the location of surface disturbances in a manner that minimizes adverse environmental and social impacts. If the certificate holder at one point held these rights, and then sold them, then subsequent conversion of forest to non-forest use would be subject to Indicator 6.10.a-d.	NA	Such conversions are not permitted in the MFL program.
P7 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.		
C7.1. The management plan and supporting documents shall provide: 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. c) Description of silvicultural and/or other	C	

<p>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. h) Maps describing the forest resource base including protected areas, planned management activities and land ownership. i) Description and justification of harvesting techniques and equipment to be used.</p>		
<p>7.1.a. 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>NA</p>	<p>All group members qualify as a SLIMF</p>
<p>FF Indicator 7.1.a A written management plan exists for the property or properties for which certification is being sought. The management plan includes the following components:</p> <p>i. Management objectives (ecological, silvicultural, social, and economic) and duration of the plan.</p> <p>Guidance: Objectives relate to the goals expressed by the landowner within the constraints of site capability and the best available data on ecological, silvicultural, social and economic conditions.</p> <p>ii. Quantitative and qualitative description of the forest resources to be managed, including at minimum stand-level descriptions of the land cover, including species and size/age class and referencing inventory information.</p> <p>Guidance: In addition to stand-level descriptions of the land cover, information in site-level plans may include: landscape within which the forest is located; landscape-level considerations; past land uses of the forest; legal history and current status; socio-economic conditions; cultural, tribal and customary use issues and other relevant details that explain or</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The following collection of documents comprise the Management Plan for MFL Group Members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WI DNR Cutting Notice and Report - MFL Stewardship Plan (Management Plan) - WI DNR Forest Tax Law handbook - WI DNR Silviculture Handbook - WI DNR Forest Management Guidelines - WI DNR Private Forestry Handbook - Timber sale contracts - BMPs for Water Quality - Ecological Landscapes Handbook - BMPs for Invasive Species <p>This collection of documents covers the requirements of 7.1.a.</p>

<p>justify management prescriptions.</p> <p>iii. Description of silvicultural and/or other management system, prescriptions, rationale, and typical harvest systems (if applicable) that will be used.</p> <p>iv. Description of harvest limits (consistent with Criterion 5.6) and species selection. Also, description of the documentation considered from the options listed in Criterion 5.6 if the FMU does not have a calculated annual harvest rate.</p> <p>v. Description of environmental assessment and safeguards based on the assessment, including approaches to: (1) pest and weed management, (2) fire management, and (3) protection of riparian management zones; (4) protection of representative samples of existing ecosystems (see Criterion 6.4) and management of High Conservation Value Forests (see Principle 9).</p> <p>Guidance: Regional environmental assessments and safeguards or strategies to address pest and weed management, fire management, protection of rare, threatened, and endangered species and plant community types, protection of riparian management zones, and protecting representative samples of ecosystems and High Conservation Value Forests may be developed by state conservation agencies. Site specific plans for family forests should be consistent with such guidance and may reference those works for clarity.</p> <p>vi. Description of location and protection of rare, threatened, and endangered species and plant community types.</p> <p>vii. Description of procedures to monitor the forest, including forest growth and dynamics, and other components as outlined in Principle 8.</p> <p>viii. Maps represent property boundaries, use rights, land cover types, significant hydrologic features, roads, adjoining land use, and protected areas in a manner that clearly relates to the forest description and management prescriptions.</p>		
--	--	--

<p>Guidance: Property level maps for family forests may be simple and efficient to produce, and may cover only the necessary information needed for management to the FSC-US Family Forest Standard. At the group level, if GIS is used coverage should include protected areas, planned management activities, land ownership, property boundaries, roads, timber production areas, forest types by age class, topography, soils, cultural and customary use areas, locations of natural communities, habitats of species referred to in Criterion 6.2, riparian zones and analysis capabilities to help identify High Conservation Value Forests. Group managers may rely on state conservation agencies for complex GIS services.</p>		
<p>7.1.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>	NA	All group members qualify as a SLIMF
<p>FF Indicator 7.1.b Actions undertaken on the FMU are consistent with the management plan and help to achieve the stated goals and objectives of the plan.</p>	c	Observed conformance with the management plan across the inspected properties.
<p>C7.2. The management plan shall be 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.</p>	C/N C	
<p>7.2.a 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>	NC	<p>As detailed in 7.1.a, the following collection of documents comprise the Management Plan for MFL Group Members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WI DNR Cutting Notice and Report - MFL Stewardship Plan (Management Plan) - WI DNR Forest Tax Law handbook - WI DNR Silviculture handbook - WI DNR Forest Management Guidelines - WI DNR Private Forestry Handbook - Timber sale contracts

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - BMPs for Water Quality - Ecological Landscapes Handbook - BMPs for Invasive Species <p>Most of the above documents are periodically revised to respond to changing conditions at least every 10 years. The MFL Management Plan is the key property specific planning tool, however, it does not have a regular revision schedule within its 25 or 50 year term. Rather the MFL program focuses on updating the Cutting Notice to reflect changing conditions specific to an MFL Property. Auditors determined that the Cutting Notice is not being updated adequately and consistently across the MFL program (CAR 08).</p>
C7.3. Forest workers shall receive adequate training and supervision to ensure proper implementation of the management plans.	C	
7.3.a. 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.	C	<p>Observed good implementation of the management plan by well-trained forester and loggers. Evidence of training includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cooperating Foresters are required to complete 10 hours training per year. - Through FISTA, DNR provides many training sessions for loggers - Certified Plan Writers, DNR Foresters, supervisors and other DNR staff who administer the MFL program must attend the annual MFL Recertification training - DNR collaborates with Wisconsin Woodland Owner Association and UW-Extension to offer meetings and field days for landowners.
C7.4. 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.	C	
7.4.a. 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	<p>The collection of documents comprising the management plan and management planning process are part of the public record and as such are publically available.</p>
7.4.b. Managers of public forests make draft management plans, revisions and supporting documentation easily accessible for public	NA	

<p>review and comment prior to their implementation. Managers address public comments and modify the plans to ensure compliance with this Standard.</p>		
<p>P8 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.</p> <p><i>Applicability Note: On small and medium-sized forests (see Glossary), an informal, qualitative assessment may be appropriate. Formal, quantitative monitoring is required on large forests and/or intensively managed forests.</i></p>		
<p>C8.1. 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.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>8.1.a. Consistent with the scale and intensity of management, the forest owner or manager develops and consistently implements a regular, comprehensive, and replicable written monitoring protocol.</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>All group members qualify as a SLIMF.</p>
<p>FF Indicator 8.1.a For Family Forests, the forest owner or manager develops and consistently implements a regular, comprehensive, and replicable written monitoring protocol. Monitoring may be scaled to the size and intensity of the management operations that affect the resources identified in C8.2.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>MFL program implements a regular monitoring system. Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews with DNR MFL Foresters • Forest Tax Handbook, Chapter 50 (Section 2450.5); Chapter 21-11 • Public Lands Handbook Chapter 110-10 (Section 2460.5) • NR 46, Wis. Admin. Code • Ch. 77, Wis. Stats.
<p>8.2. Forest management should include the research and data collection needed to monitor, at a minimum, the following 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.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>8.2.a.1. For all commercially harvested products, an inventory system is maintained. The inventory system includes at a minimum: a)</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Topics a-f are monitored on MFL properties. Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews with MFL Foresters and review of

<p>species, b) volumes, c) stocking, d) regeneration, and e) stand and forest composition and structure; and f) timber quality.</p>		<p>MFL property records in selected County Offices.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forest Tax Handbook, Chapter 50 (Section 2450.5); Chapter 21-11 • Public Lands Handbook Chapter 110-10 (Section 2460.5) • NR 46, Wis. Admin. Code • Ch. 77, Wis. Stats.
<p>8.2.a.2. 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>Monitoring of unanticipated loss occurs through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WI DNR Forest Health Surveys (aerial surveys) • Landowner identification resulting in visit from MFL Forester and/or WI DNR forest health specialist. • Forest inventory prior to and following harvest activities <p>Unanticipated removal (i.e., timber theft) is uncommon and thus only monitored passively.</p>
<p>8.2.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>Per the Forest Tax Handbook, landowners are required to keep their own records of NTFPs. During 2013 audit observed only very limited use of NTFPs, e.g., sugar maple for personal consumption. Sustained yield of NTFPs is not a concern given the low level of use.</p>
<p>8.2.c. The forest owner or manager periodically obtains data needed to monitor presence on the FMU of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Rare, threatened and endangered species and/or their <i>habitats</i>; 2) Common and rare plant communities and/or habitat; 3) Location, presence and abundance of invasive species; 4) Condition of protected areas, set-asides and buffer zones; 5) High Conservation Value Forests (see Criterion 9.4). 	<p>C</p>	<p>Items 1-5 are monitored through the NHI data system, periodic timber cruises at time of writing management plan or pre/post-harvest, and various WIDNR flora and fauna research across the State.</p>
<p>8.2.d.1. 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>Such monitoring occurs and is described in Forest Tax Handbook, Chapter 50 (Section 2450.5); Chapter 21-11.</p>
<p>8.2.d.2. A monitoring program is in place to assess the condition and environmental impacts</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Such monitoring occurs and is described in Forest Tax Handbook, Chapter 50 (Section 2450.5);</p>

of the forest-road system.		Chapter 21-11.
8.2.d.3. 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).	NA	See Family Forest applicability note and WI DNR determination of NA.
8.2.d.4. Stakeholder responses to management activities are monitored and recorded as necessary.	NA	See Family Forest applicability note and WI DNR determination of NA.
8.2.d.5. Where sites of cultural significance exist, the opportunity to jointly monitor sites of cultural significance is offered to tribal representatives (see Principle 3).	C	See Principle 3.
8.2.e. The forest owner or manager monitors the costs and revenues of management in order to assess productivity and efficiency.	C	Timber management activities on non-industrial properties are structured and monitored to ensure revenue is sufficient to pay for the logging costs and the consulting forester. Since harvests typically only occur every 15-20 years there is little opportunity to assess productivity and efficiency of management on any regular basis. Land owners interviewed indicated that they use simple cost benefit calculations to determine efficiency of their overall management choices (i.e., enroll in MFL and manage for timber products). Such calculation include revenue from timber sales plus the tax savings compared with any costs of management and TSI work.
C8.3. 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."	C	
8.3.a. When forest products are being sold as FSC-certified, the forest owner or manager has a system that prevents mixing of FSC-certified and non-certified forest products prior to the point of sale, with accompanying documentation to enable the tracing of the harvested material from each harvested product from its origin to the point of sale.	C	See CoC section (Appendix 6)
8.3.b The forest owner or manager maintains documentation to enable the tracing of the harvested material from each harvested product from its origin to the point of sale.	C	See CoC section (Appendix 6)

<p>C8.4. The results of monitoring shall be incorporated into the implementation and revision of the management plan.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>8.4.a. 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.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Management plan objectives are primarily monitored by MFL Foresters prior to and/or following harvesting and as part of other mandatory practices (e.g., planting, TSI). Results are incorporated into revision and implementation of the plan. Additionally, WIDNR’s internal auditing of FSC conformance provides another opportunity to revise group management procedures and improve implementation.</p>
<p>8.4.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.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Interviews with field foresters and reviews of MFL property documents confirmed that monitoring is occurring and necessary revisions to plans are systematically implemented. During the 2013 audit, we observed evidence of Cutting Notices being revised, prior to harvest, after initial monitoring. A notable example was a walnut high grade that was averted in Lafayette County due to proper execution of MFL Forester’s monitoring and plan revision duties.</p>
<p>C8.5. 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.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>8.5.a. 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.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Monitoring results are tracked and can be summarized in PlanTrac. PlanTrac is being converted into an enhanced system called WisFIRS in the 2nd half of 2013 and 2014. Results are available to the public upon request.</p>
<p>P9 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.</p> <p>High Conservation Value Forests are those that possess one or more of the following attributes:</p> <p>a) 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</p>		

<p>b) Forest areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems</p> <p>c) Forest areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g., watershed protection, erosion control)</p> <p>d) 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).</p>		
<p>C9.1. 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.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>9.1.a. The forest owner or manager identifies and maps the presence of High Conservation Value Forests (HCVF) within the FMU and, to the extent that data are available, adjacent to their FMU, in a manner consistent with the assessment process, definitions, data sources, and other guidance described in Appendix F.</p> <p>Given the relative rarity of old growth forests in the contiguous United States, these areas are normally designated as HCVF, and all old growth must be managed in conformance with Indicator 6.3.a.3 and requirements for legacy trees in Indicator 6.3.f.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>WIDNR's assessment for HCVF concluded that to-date no HCVF has been identified on MFL properties. The assessment is ongoing because conservation values are assessed on every property at the time of enrollment (plan writing) and prior to timber harvests. The ongoing assessments for HCVF are done through use of the NHI databases, using RTE species guidance (http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/EndangeredResources/guidance.asp) use of WI DNR Ecological Landscapes http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/landscapes/, as well as observations made by DNR and Cooperating Foresters.</p>
<p>9.1.b. In developing the assessment, the forest owner or manager consults with qualified specialists, independent experts, and local community members who may have knowledge of areas that meet the definition of HCVs.</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>All properties qualify as a SLIMF</p>
<p>FF Indicator 9.1.b In developing the assessment, the forest owner or manager consults with databases, qualified experts, and/or best available research and literature.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>See 9.1.a</p>
<p>9.1.c. A summary of the assessment results and management strategies (see Criterion 9.3) is included in the management plan summary that is made available to the public.</p>	<p>NA</p>	
<p>C9.2. The consultative portion of the certification process must place emphasis on the identified conservation attributes, and options for the maintenance thereof.</p>	<p>NA</p>	
<p>9.2.a. The forest owner or manager holds consultations with stakeholders and experts to confirm that proposed HCVF locations and their attributes have been accurately identified, and that appropriate options for the maintenance of</p>	<p>NA</p>	

their HCV attributes have been adopted.		
9.2.b. On public forests, a transparent and accessible public review of proposed HCV attributes and HCVF areas and management is carried out. Information from stakeholder consultations and other public review is integrated into HCVF descriptions, delineations and management.	NA	All members are on private land.
C9.3. 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.	NA	
9.3.a. The management plan and relevant operational plans describe the measures necessary to ensure the maintenance and/or enhancement of all high conservation values present in all identified HCVF areas, including the precautions required to avoid risks or impacts to such values (see Principle 7). These measures are implemented.	NA	
9.3.b. All management activities in HCVFs must maintain or enhance the high conservation values and the extent of the HCVF.	NA	
9.3.c. If HCVF attributes cross ownership boundaries and where maintenance of the HCV attributes would be improved by coordinated management, then the forest owner or manager attempts to coordinate conservation efforts with adjacent landowners.	NA	
C9.4. Annual monitoring shall be conducted to assess the effectiveness of the measures employed to maintain or enhance the applicable conservation attributes.	NA	
9.4.a. 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.	NA	
FF Indicator 9.4.a Low risk of negative social or environmental impact for private family forests. Public lands must follow the requirements in Indicator 9.4.a.	NA	

<p>9.4.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 measures in an effort to reverse the trend.</p>	<p>NA</p>	
<p>Principle 10</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>Not applicable. WI DNR does not manage plantation forests as defined by FSC. Plantations that do exist on MFL properties are primarily red pine and jack pine plantations established to convert degraded agricultural lands or other non-forest land to forest. These pine plantations comprised of native species are managed at rotation lengths and intensity similar to natural forest management.</p>

Appendix 6 – Tracking, Tracing and Identification of Certified Products

SCS FSC Chain of Custody Indicators for Forest Management Enterprises, Version 5-0

REQUIREMENT	C/NC	COMMENT / CAR
1. Quality Management		
1.1 The organization shall appoint a management representative as having overall responsibility and authority for the organization’s compliance with all applicable requirements of this standard.	C	Certification Coordinator, Mark Heyde, has overall responsibility.
1.2 The FME shall maintain complete records of all FSC-related COC activities, including sales and training, for at least 5 years.	C	Maintained in each MFL Property file.
1.3 The FME shall define its forest gate(s) (check all that apply): <i>The forest gate is defined as the point where the change in ownership of the certified-forest product occurs.</i>		<p>Stump <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Stumpage sale or sales of standing timber; transfer of ownership of certified-forest product occurs upon harvest.</i></p> <p>On-site concentration yard <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Transfer of ownership of certified-product occurs at concentration yard under control of FME.</i></p> <p>Off-site Mill / Log Yard <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Transfer of ownership occurs when certified-product is unloaded at purchaser’s facility.</i></p> <p>Auction house / Brokerage <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Transfer of ownership occurs at a government-run or private auction house / brokerage.</i></p> <p>Lump-sum sale / Per Unit / Pre-Paid Agreement <input type="checkbox"/> <i>A timber sale in which the buyer and seller agree on a total price for marked standing trees or for trees within a defined area before the wood is removed — the timber is usually paid for before harvesting begins. Similar to a per-unit sale.</i></p> <p>Log landing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Transfer of ownership of certified-product occurs at landing / yarding areas.</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other (Please describe):</p>

<p>1.4 The FME shall have sufficient control over its forest gate(s) to ensure that there is no risk of mixing of FSC-certified forest products covered by the scope of the FM/COC certificate with forest products from outside of the scope prior to the transfer of ownership.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Forest Tax Handbook, Chapter 21-13</p>
<p>1.5 The FME and its contractors shall not process FSC-certified material prior to transfer of ownership at the forest gate without conforming to applicable chain of custody requirements. <i>NOTE: This does not apply to log cutting or debarking units, small portable sawmills or on-site processing of chips / biomass originating from the FMU under evaluation.</i></p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Forest Tax Handbook, Chapter 21-13</p>
<p>2. Product Control, Sales and Delivery</p>		
<p>2.1. Products from the certified forest area shall be identifiable as certified at the forest gate(s).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Forest Tax Handbook, Chapter 21-13</p>
<p>2.2 The FME shall maintain records of quantities / volumes of FSC-certified product(s).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Forest Tax Handbook, Chapter 21-13; Maintained in offices at each County. Incorporating it into central WisFIRs database.</p>
<p>2.3. The FME shall ensure that all sales documents issued for outputs sold with FSC claims include the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) name and contact details of the organization; b) name and address of the customer; c) date when the document was issued; d) description of the product; e) quantity of the products sold; f) the organization’s FSC Forest Management (FM/COC) or FSC Controlled Wood (CW/FM) code; g) clear indication of the FSC claim for each product item or the total products as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the claim “FSC 100%” for products from FSC 100% product groups; ii. the claim “FSC Controlled Wood” for products from FSC Controlled Wood product groups. h) If separate transport documents are 	<p>NC</p>	<p>All elements are present except FSC Claim. Major CAR 01.</p>

<p>issued, information sufficient to link the sales document and related transport documentation to each other.</p>		
<p>2.4 The FME shall include the same information as required in 2.3 in the related delivery documentation, if the sales document (or copy of it) is not included with the shipment of the product. Note: 2.3 and 2.4 above are based on FSC-STD-40-004 V2-1 Clause 6.1.1 and 6.1.2</p>	<p>NC</p>	<p>All elements are present except FSC Claim. Major CAR 01.</p>
<p>2.5 When the FME has demonstrated it is not able to include the required FSC claim as specified above in 6.1.1 and 6.1.2 in sales and delivery documents due to space constraints, through an exception, SCS can approve the required information to be provided through supplementary evidence (e.g. supplementary letters, a link to the own company’s webpage with verifiable product information). This practice is only acceptable when SCS is satisfied that the supplementary method proposed by the FME complies with the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) There is no risk that the customer will misinterpret which products are or are not FSC certified in the document; b) The sales and delivery documents contain visible and understandable information so that the customer is aware that the full FSC claim is provided through supplementary evidence; c) In cases where the sales and delivery documents contain multiple products with different FSC Claims, a clear identification for each product shall be included to cross-reference it with the associated FSC claim provided in the supplementary evidence. <p><i>FSC-ADVICE-40-004-05</i></p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>Forest Tax Handbook, Chapter 21-13</p>
<p>3. Labeling and Promotion</p>		<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>
<p>3.1 Describe where / how the organization uses the SCS and FSC trademarks for promotion.</p>		

3.2 The FME shall request authorization from SCS to use the FSC on-product labels and/or FSC trademarks for promotional use.		
3.3 Records of SCS and/or FSC trademark use authorizations shall be made available upon request.		
4. Outsourcing		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
4.1 The FME shall provide the names and contact details of all outsourced service providers.		
4.2 The FME shall have a control system for the outsourced process which ensures that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The material used for the production of FSC-certified material is traceable and not mixed with any other material prior to the point of transfer of legal ownership; b) The outsourcer keeps records of FSC-certified material covered under the outsourcing agreement; c) The FME issues the final invoice for the processed or produced FSC-certified material following outsourcing; d) The outsourcer only uses FSC trademarks on products covered by the scope of the outsourcing agreement and not for promotional use. 		
5. Training and/or Communication Strategies		
5.1 All relevant FME staff and outsourcers shall be trained in the FME’s COC control system commensurate with the scale and intensity of operations and shall demonstrate competence in implementing the FME’s COC control system.	C	Evidence: Annual MFL update training Forest Tax Handbook, Chapter 21-13
5.2 The FME shall maintain up-to-date records of its COC training and/or communications program, such as a list of trained employees, completed COC trainings, the intended frequency of COC training (i.e. training plan), and related program materials (e.g., presentations, memos, contracts, employee handbooks, etc).	C	Evidence: Annual MFL update training Forest Tax Handbook, Chapter 21-13

Appendix 8 – SLIMF Eligibility Criteria

An FMU qualifies as a 'SLIMF' if it is either a 'small' FMU OR managed as a 'low intensity' FMU. Any SLIMF FMU under the scope of the FME under evaluation must meet at least one of the following criteria:

<input type="checkbox"/> N/A – none of the FMU(s) under evaluation qualify as a SLIMF according to the criteria below.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 'Small' FMU(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> The scope of the certificate includes FMU(s) of 100 ha (247 acres) or less.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The scope of the certificate includes FMU(s) located in a country for which the definition for maximum size of "small" is larger than 100 ha (247 acres), but does not exceed 1,000 ha (2,471 acres).
	<input type="checkbox"/> The scope of the certificate includes FMU(s) of 1000 ha (2,471 acres) or less where there is no FSC-accredited national initiative and the national stakeholders support the larger size-limit proposed by the certification body.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 'Low intensity' FMU(s) – The scope of the certificate includes FMU(s) in which the rate of harvest is less than 20% of the mean annual increment (MAI) AND these FMUs meet one of the following additional criteria:	<input type="checkbox"/> The annual harvest from the total production forest area is less than 5000 cubic meters (2.1 million board feet).
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The average annual harvest from the total production forest is less than 5000 m ³ / year (2.1 million board feet / year) during the period of validity of the certificate as verified by harvest reports and surveillance audits.

Appendix 9 – Group Management Programs

SCS audits Group entities and group members to the FSC Group Management Standard with the same frequency. All Principles in the FSC Forest Management Standard are evaluated – during the full evaluation or reevaluation audit and once again over the course of validity of the certificate during annual surveillance audits. SCS will also audit group clients to the Group Management Standard if there have been substantial changes to group management or the scope of the certificate during the previous year, such as a large change in the number of group members or changes to the policies of administering the group.

Group Management Conformance Table

Requirement	C/NC	Comment / CAR
PART 1 QUALITY SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS		
C1 General Requirements		
1.1 The Group entity shall be an independent legal entity or an individual acting as a legal entity.	C	WI DNR is an established legal entity with proper authority to manage the group.

<p>1.2 The Group entity shall comply with relevant legal obligations, as registration and payment of applicable fees and taxes.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>WI DNR is an established legal entity with authority for registration and payment of applicable fees. Evidence: Forest Tax Law handbook. Deed and proof of ownership are kept in each case file (MFL order #)</p>
<p>1.3 The Group entity shall have a written public policy of commitment to the FSC Principles and Criteria.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Forest Tax Handbook</p>
<p>1.4 The Group entity shall define training needs and implement training activities and/or communication strategies relevant to the implementation of the applicable FSC standards.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Forest Tax Handbook, Private Forestry Handbook Chapter 10.-Training requirements for Cooperating Foresters. DNR collaborates with Wisconsin Woodland Owner Association and UW-Extension to offer meetings and field days to offer land owner training. For COC related training, see analysis of conformance to COC indicators for FMEs.</p>
<p>C2 Responsibilities</p>		
<p>2.1 The Group entity shall clearly define and document the division of responsibilities between the Group entity and the Group members in relation to forest management activities (for example with respect to management planning, monitoring, harvesting, quality control, marketing, timber sale, etc). <i>NOTE: The actual division of responsibilities may differ greatly between different group certification schemes. Responsibilities regarding compliance to the applicable Forest Stewardship Standard may be divided between the Group entity and Group members in order to take into account of a landscape approach.</i></p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Group Entity responsibilities: Forest Tax Handbook- Group Manager 21-4 DNR Service Foresters 21-4 Cooperating Foresters 21-5 SLIMF Group member responsibilities: Forest Tax Handbook- Group Members 21-6</p>
<p>2.2 The Group entity shall appoint a management representative as having overall responsibility and authority for the Group entity's compliance with all applicable requirements of this standard.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>WI DNR Forest Tax Law Program and Policy Chief. Currently held by Kathryn Nelson.</p>
<p>2.3 Group entity staff and Group members shall demonstrate knowledge of the Group's procedures and the applicable Forest Stewardship Standard.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Demonstrated knowledge was adequate with the exception of those topics covered by the CARs and Observations of this report.</p>
<p>C3 Group entity's procedures</p>		
<p>3.1 The Group entity shall establish,</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Forest Tax Handbook</p>

implement and maintain written procedures for Group membership covering all applicable requirements of this standard, according to scale and complexity of the group including:		
I. Organizational structure;	C	Forest Tax Handbook Chapter 21
II. Responsibilities of the Group entity and the Group members including main activities to fulfill such responsibilities (i.e. Development of management plans, sales and marketing of FSC products, harvesting, planting, monitoring, etc);	C	Forest Tax Handbook Chapter 21
III. Rules regarding eligibility for membership to the Group;	C	Forest Tax Handbook Chapter 21
IV. Rules regarding withdrawal / suspension of members from the Group;	C	Forest Tax Handbook Chapter 21
V. Clear description of the process to fulfill any corrective action requests issued internally and by the certification body including timelines and implications if any of the corrective actions are not complied with;	C	Forest Tax Handbook Chapter 21
VI. Documented procedures for the inclusion of new Group members;	C	Forest Tax Handbook Chapter 21
VII. Complaints procedure for Group members.	C	Forest Tax Handbook Chapter 21
3.2 The Group entity's procedures shall be sufficient to establish an efficient internal control system ensuring that all members are fulfilling applicable requirements.	C	Forest Tax Handbook Chapter 21
3.3 The Group entity shall define the personnel responsible for each procedure together with the qualifications or training measures required for its implementation.	C	Forest Tax Handbook Chapter 21
3.4 The Group entity or the certification body shall evaluate every applicant for membership of the Group and ensure that there are no major nonconformances with applicable requirements of the Forest Stewardship Standard, and with any additional requirements for membership of the Group, prior to being granted	C	Forest Tax Handbook Chapter 21

<p>membership of the Group. <i>NOTE: for applicants complying with SLIMF eligibility criteria for size, the initial evaluation may be done through a desk audit.</i></p>		
C4 Informed consent of Group members		
<p>4.1 The Group entity shall provide each Group member with documentation, or access to documentation, specifying the relevant terms and conditions of Group membership. The documentation shall include:</p>	C	Forest Tax Handbook Chapter 21
<p>i. Access to a copy of the applicable Forest Stewardship Standard;</p>	C	Forest Tax Handbook Chapter 21
<p>ii. Explanation of the certification body's process;</p>	C	Forest Tax Handbook Chapter 21
<p>iii. Explanation of the certification body's, and FSC's rights to access the Group members' forests and documentation for the purposes of evaluation and monitoring;</p>	C	Forest Tax Handbook Chapter 21
<p>iv. Explanation of the certification body's, and FSC's requirements with respect to publication of information;</p>	C	Forest Tax Handbook Chapter 21
<p>v. Explanation of any obligations with respect to Group membership, such as:</p> <p><i>NOTE: In some groups, it may be sufficient to provide individual members with a summary of these items, provided that full documentation is readily available on request at the Group entity's offices. The information should be presented in a way adapted to the language and knowledge of the Group members.</i></p>	C	Forest Tax Handbook Chapter 21
<p>a. maintenance of information for monitoring purposes;</p>	C	Forest Tax Handbook Chapter 21
<p>b. use of systems for tracking and tracing of forest products;</p>	C	Forest Tax Handbook Chapter 21
<p>c. requirement to conform with conditions or corrective Forest Tax Handbook Chapter 21 action requests issued by the certification body and the group entity</p>	C	Forest Tax Handbook Chapter 21

d. any special requirements for Group members related to marketing or sales of products within and outside of the certificate;	c	Forest Tax Handbook Chapter 21
e. other obligations of Group membership; and	C	Forest Tax Handbook Chapter 21
f. explanation of any costs associated with Group membership.	C	Forest Tax Handbook Chapter 21
4.2 A consent declaration or equivalent shall be available between the Group Entity and each Group member or the member’s representative who voluntarily wishes to participate in the Group. The consent declaration shall: <i>NOTE: A consent declaration does not have to be an individual document. It can be part of a contract or any other document (e.g. meeting minutes) that specifies the agreed relationship between the Group member and the Group entity.</i>	C	Forest Tax Handbook Chapter 21
i. include a commitment to comply with all applicable certification requirements;	C	Forest Tax Handbook Chapter 21
ii. acknowledge and agree to the obligations and responsibilities of the Group entity;	C	Forest Tax Handbook Chapter 21
iii. acknowledge and agree to the obligations and responsibilities of Group membership;	C	Forest Tax Handbook Chapter 21
iv. agree to membership of the scheme, and	C	Forest Tax Handbook Chapter 21
v. authorize the Group entity to be the primary contact for certification and to apply for certification on the member's behalf.	C	Forest Tax Handbook Chapter 21
C5 Group Records		
5.1 The group entity shall maintain complete and up-to-date records covering all applicable requirements of this standard. These shall include: <i>NOTE: The amount of data that is maintained centrally by the Group entity may vary from case to case. In order to reduce costs of evaluation by the certification body, and subsequent monitoring by FSC, data should be stored centrally wherever possible.</i>	C	Records maintained in forestry offices in each County. Verified in 7 Counties selected for this audit.
i. List of names and contact details	c	MFL Property Files at each county office. Verified

of Group members, together with dates of entering and leaving the Group scheme, reason for leaving, and the type of forest ownership per member;		for all 67 MFL properties visited in 2013 audit.
ii. Any records of training provided to staff or Group members, relevant to the implementation of this standard or the applicable Forest Stewardship Standard;		<p>Training records verified for MFL foresters at 7 DNR offices that were subject of this audit.</p> <p>Forest Tax Handbook, Private Forestry Handbook Chapter 10.-Training requirements for Cooperating Foresters. DNR collaborates with Wisconsin Woodland Owner Association and UW-Extension to offer meetings and field days to offer land owner training.</p> <p>See also analysis of conformance to COC indicators for FMEs.</p>
iii. A map or supporting documentation describing or showing the location of the member's forest properties;	C	Verified for all 67 MFL properties visited in 2013 audit.
iv. Evidence of consent of all Group members;	C	Verified for all 67 MFL properties visited in 2013 audit.
v. Documentation and records regarding recommended practices for forest management (i.e. silvicultural systems);	c	Verified for all 67 MFL properties visited in 2013 audit.
vi. Records demonstrating the implementation of any internal control or monitoring systems. Such records shall include records of internal inspections, non-compliances identified in such inspections, actions taken to correct any such non-compliance;	c	MFL 2013 Internal Audit Report Forest Tax Handbook Chapter 21
viii. Records of the estimated annual overall FSC production and annual FSC sales of the Group.	c	Forest Tax Handbook, Cutting Notice and Report See also analysis of conformance to COC indicators for FMEs.
5.2 Group records shall be retained for at least five (5) years.		Forest Tax Handbook Chapter 21
5.3 Group entities shall not issue any kind of certificates or declarations to their group members that could be confused with FSC certificates. Group member certificates may however be requested from the certification	c	No sub-certificates are issued.

body.		
PART 2 GROUP FEATURES		
C6 Group Size		
6.1 There is no restriction on the maximum size that a group certificate can cover in terms of number of group members, their individual forest property size or total forest area. The Group entity shall have sufficient human and technical resources to manage and control the Group in line with the requirements of this standard. <i>NOTE: The number of Group members, their individual size and the total area will however influence the evaluation intensity applied by the certification body in their annual audits.</i>	c	Forest Tax Handbook Chapter 21
6.2 The Group entity shall specify in their procedures the maximum number of members that can be supported by the management system and the human and technical capacities of the Group entity.	c	Forest Tax Handbook Chapter 21
C7 Multinational groups		
7.1 Group schemes shall only be applied to national groups which are covered by the same Forest Stewardship Standard.	NA	
7.2 In cases where homogeneous conditions between countries / regions may allow an effective and credible cross- border or multi-regional monitoring system, the Group entity shall request formal approval by FSC IC through their accredited Certification Body to allow certification of such a group scheme.	NA	
PART 3 INTERNAL MONITORING		
C8 Monitoring requirements		
8.1 The Group entity shall implement a documented monitoring and control system that includes at least the following:	c	Forest Tax Handbook Chapter 21
i. Written description of the monitoring and control system;	c	Forest Tax Handbook Chapter 21
ii. Regular (at least annual) monitoring visits to a sample of Group members to confirm continued compliance with all the requirements of the applicable Forest Stewardship Standard, and with any additional requirements for membership of the Group.	c	Forest Tax Handbook Chapter 21 2013 MFL Internal Audit Report

<p>8.2 The Group entity shall define criteria to be monitored at each internal audit and according to the group characteristics, risk factors and local circumstances.</p>	<p>c</p>	<p>Forest Tax Handbook Chapter 21 2013 MFL Internal Audit Report</p>																				
<p>8.3. The minimum sample to be visited annually for internal monitoring shall be determined as follows:</p> <p><i>NOTE: for the purpose of sampling, FMUs < 1,000 ha and managed by the same managerial body may be combined into a 'resource management unit' (RMU) according to the proposal made in FSC-STD-20-007 Annex 1.</i></p>	<p>c</p>	<p>Forest Tax Handbook Chapter 21 2013 MFL Internal Audit Report</p>																				
<p>a) Type I Groups with mixed responsibilities (see section D Terms and definitions) Groups or sub-groups with mixed responsibilities shall apply a minimum sampling of $X = \sqrt{y}$ for 'normal' FMUs and $X = 0.6 * \sqrt{y}$ for FMUs < 1,000 ha. Sampling shall be increased if HCVs are threatened or land tenure or use right disputes are pending within the group.</p>	<p>NA</p>																					
<p>b) Type II Resource Manager Groups (see section D Terms and definitions) Group entities who also operate as resource managers may define the required internal sampling intensity at their own discretion for the forest properties they are managing, independent of their size and ownership (the minimum numbers as defined above do not apply here).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Forest Tax Handbook Chapter 21 2013 MFL Internal Audit Report</p>																				
<p>8.4 For monitoring purposes the Group entity should use the same stratification into sets of 'like' FMUs as defined by the certification body in their evaluation.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>2013 Internal Audit covered</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="837 1339 1443 1619"> <thead> <tr> <th>County</th> <th>DNR Forester</th> <th>Supervisor</th> <th>MFL Orders</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>St Croix</td> <td>Dahn Borh</td> <td>Sue Crowley</td> <td>397</td> </tr> <tr> <td>La Crosse</td> <td>Adam Zirbel</td> <td>Sue Crowley</td> <td>474</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Adams</td> <td>Austin Felts</td> <td>John Schwingel</td> <td>1,366</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Adams</td> <td>Terri Wilson</td> <td>John Schwingel</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	County	DNR Forester	Supervisor	MFL Orders	St Croix	Dahn Borh	Sue Crowley	397	La Crosse	Adam Zirbel	Sue Crowley	474	Adams	Austin Felts	John Schwingel	1,366	Adams	Terri Wilson	John Schwingel	
County	DNR Forester	Supervisor	MFL Orders																			
St Croix	Dahn Borh	Sue Crowley	397																			
La Crosse	Adam Zirbel	Sue Crowley	474																			
Adams	Austin Felts	John Schwingel	1,366																			
Adams	Terri Wilson	John Schwingel																				
<p>8.5 The Group entity should visit different members in their annual monitoring than the ones selected for evaluation by the certification body, unless pending corrective actions, complaints or risk factors are requiring a revisit of the same units.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>2013 Internal Audit covered</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="837 1764 1443 1902"> <thead> <tr> <th>County</th> <th>DNR Forester</th> <th>Supervisor</th> <th>MFL Orders</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>St Croix</td> <td>Dahn Borh</td> <td>Sue Crowley</td> <td>397</td> </tr> <tr> <td>La Crosse</td> <td>Adam Zirbel</td> <td>Sue Crowley</td> <td>474</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	County	DNR Forester	Supervisor	MFL Orders	St Croix	Dahn Borh	Sue Crowley	397	La Crosse	Adam Zirbel	Sue Crowley	474								
County	DNR Forester	Supervisor	MFL Orders																			
St Croix	Dahn Borh	Sue Crowley	397																			
La Crosse	Adam Zirbel	Sue Crowley	474																			

		Adams	Austin Felts	John Schwingel	1,366	67,171
		Adams	Terri Wilson	John Schwingel		16-M
8.6 In the selection process of members to be visited, the Group entity should include random selection techniques.	C	2013 Internal Audit used some random selection techniques.				
8.7 The Group entity shall issue corrective action requests to address non-compliances identified during their visits and monitor their implementation.	C	2013 Internal Audit Report				
8.8 Additional monitoring visits shall be scheduled when potential problems arise or the Group entity receives information from stakeholders about alleged violations of the FSC requirements by Group members.	C	Internal audit results communicated to November Field Operations Team. Items that require policy decisions will be sent to the Forestry Leadership Team				
C9 Sales of forest products and use of the FSC trademark						
9.1 The Group entity shall document and implement a system for tracking and tracing of forest products produced by the Group members which are supposed to be sold as FSC certified.	C	Documentation and implementation required to demonstrate conformance to COC indicators for FMEs fulfills the requirements of this indicator.				
9.2 For the purpose of ensuring that non certified material is not being mixed with FSC certified material, FSC products shall only be sold according to a sales protocol agreed by the Group members and the Group entity.	C	Documentation and implementation required to demonstrate conformance to COC indicators for FMEs fulfills the requirements of this indicator.				
9.3 The Group entity shall ensure that all invoices for sales of FSC certified material are issued with the required information (see FSC-STD-40-004 V2-0 Clause 6.1.1) and are filed by the group members.	C	Documentation and implementation required to demonstrate conformance to COC indicators for FMEs fulfills the requirements of this indicator.				
9.4 The Group entity shall ensure that all uses of the FSC Trademark are approved by the responsible certification body in advance.	C	Documentation and implementation required to demonstrate conformance to COC indicators for FMEs fulfills the requirements of this indicator.				

Group Management Program Members

Total forest area in scope of certificate which is:	2,491,669	Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac
privately managed	2,491,669	
state managed		
community managed		
Number of FMUs in scope that are:		
less than 100 ha in area	45,770	100 - 1000 ha in area 258

1000 - 10 000 ha in area		more than 10 000 ha in area	
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is included in FMUs that:			Units: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac
are less than 100 ha in area	964,840		
are between 100 ha and 1000 ha in area	45,221		
meet the eligibility criteria as <i>low intensity</i> SLIMF FMUs	1,010,061		
Division of FMUs into manageable units:			
Managed Forest Law order numbers			