

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

---

## WI Dept. of Natural Resources – County Forest Program SCS-FM/COC-00083G

101 S. Webster St. PO Box 7921, Madison, WI 53707-7921  
Joseph.Schwantes@wisconsin.gov  
<http://www.wisconsincountyforests.com>

CERTIFIED	EXPIRATION
31 December 2009	13 December 2014

DATE OF FIELD AUDIT
14-17 August 2013
DATE OF LAST UPDATE
8 October 2013

SCS Contact:

**Brendan Grady** | Director  
Forest Management Certification  
+1.510.452.8000  
[bgrady@scsglobalservices.com](mailto:bgrady@scsglobalservices.com)

**SCS**global  
SERVICES

*Setting the standard for sustainability™*

2000 Powell Street, Ste. 600, Emeryville, CA 94608 USA  
+1.510.452.8000 main | +1.510.452.8001 fax  
[www.SCSGlobalServices.com](http://www.SCSGlobalServices.com)

## Foreword

Cycle in annual surveillance audits			
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <sup>st</sup> annual audit	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <sup>nd</sup> annual audit	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <sup>rd</sup> annual audit	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4 <sup>th</sup> annual audit
Name of Forest Management Enterprise (FME) and abbreviation used in this report:			
WI Dept. of Natural Resources – County Forest Program (County Forests)			

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

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

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

### Organization of the Report

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

## Table of Contents

---

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY .....	4
1. GENERAL INFORMATION .....	4
1.1 Annual Audit Team.....	4
1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation .....	5
1.3 Standards Employed .....	5
2 ANNUAL AUDIT DATES AND ACTIVITIES .....	6
2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities .....	6
2.2 Evaluation of Management Systems .....	14
3. CHANGES IN MANAGEMENT PRACTICES .....	14
4. RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION.....	14
4.1 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations .....	14
4.2 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations .....	17
5. STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS .....	18
6. CERTIFICATION DECISION .....	19
7. CHANGES IN CERTIFICATION SCOPE .....	19
8. ANNUAL DATA UPDATE .....	25
8.1 Social Information.....	25
8.2 Annual Summary of Pesticide and Other Chemical Use .....	26
SECTION B – APPENDICES (CONFIDENTIAL).....	27
Appendix 1 – List of FMUs Selected For Evaluation.....	27
Appendix 2 – List of Stakeholders Consulted.....	28
Appendix 3 – Additional Audit Techniques Employed.....	29
Appendix 4 – Pesticide Derogations .....	29
Appendix 5 – Detailed Observations.....	29
Appendix 6 – Chain of Custody Indicators for FMEs.....	50
Appendix 7 – FMU’s .....	50

## SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY

### 1. General Information

#### 1.1 Annual Audit Team

<b>Auditor Name:</b>	Dave Wager	<b>Auditor role:</b>	Lead Auditor
<b>Qualifications:</b>	<p>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).</p>		
<b>Auditor Name:</b>	Mike Ferrucci	<b>Auditor role:</b>	Team Auditor
<b>Qualifications:</b>	<p>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 RAB-QSA Lead Auditor (ISO 14001 Environmental Management Systems), as an SFI Lead Auditor for Forest Management, Procurement, and Chain of Custody, as an FSC Lead Auditor Forest Management and Chain of Custody, as a Tree Farm Group Certification Lead Auditor, and as a GHG Lead Auditor. Mike has led Sustainable Forest Initiative (SFI) certification and precertification reviews throughout the United States. He has also led or participated in joint SFI and Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) certification projects in nearly one dozen states and a joint scoping or precertification gap-analysis project on tribal lands throughout the United States. He also co-led the pioneering pilot dual evaluation of the Lakeview Stewardship Unit on the Fremont-Winema National Forest.</p> <p>Mike Ferrucci has 30 years of forest management experience. His expertise is in sustainable forest management planning; in certification of forests as sustainably managed; in the application of easements for large-scale working forests, and in the ecology, silviculture, and management of mixed species forests, with an emphasis on regeneration and management of native hardwood species. Mike has conducted or participated in assessments of forest management operations throughout the United States, with field experience in 4 countries and 30 states. Mike has been a member of the Society of American Foresters for over 30 years. Mike is also a Lecturer at the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, where he has taught graduate courses and workshops in forest management, operations, professional forest ethics, private forestry, and financial analysis.</p>		
<b>Auditor Name:</b>	JoAnn Hanowski	<b>Auditor role:</b>	Team Auditor
<b>Qualifications:</b>	<p>JoAnn M. Hanowski was a senior research fellow at the University of Minnesota-Duluth’s Natural Resources Research Institute. She has considerable expertise evaluating the effects of forest management on wildlife habitat, and is currently</p>		

	<p>working on research projects involving the response of birds to various forest management practices in stream and seasonal pond buffers and the development of indicators of forest and water health and sustainability in Minnesota and across the Great Lakes. She was a member of the forest bird technical team for the original GEIS and participated on the wildlife technical team that wrote forest management guidelines for Minnesota. She is a participant in a 14-year project for monitoring avian populations on the Chequamegon National Forest. She was a member of the riparian science technical committee that is investigating the effectiveness of Minnesota’s current guidelines for forest management in riparian systems. She has published 64 peer- reviewed journal articles and over 75 reports in her 21 year tenure with the University of Minnesota. In 2005 JoAnn participated in the largest forest certification project ever conducted in the United States, the joint FSC/SFI certification of Minnesota’s state lands. In 2006 and 2007 JoAnn contributed regional ecological expertise to the annual surveillance audits of the MN DNR’s FSC and SFI certificates.</p>
--	--

## 1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation

A. Number of days spent on-site assessing the applicant:	3
B. Number of auditors participating in on-site evaluation:	3
C. Additional days spent on preparation, stakeholder consultation, and post-site follow-up:	2
<b>D. Total number of person days used in evaluation:</b>	<b>11</b>

## 1.3 Standards Employed

### 1.3.1. Applicable FSC-Accredited Standards

Title	Version	Date of Finalization
FSC-US Forest Management Standard	1.0	July 2010
<p>All standards employed are available on the websites of FSC International (<a href="http://www.fsc.org">www.fsc.org</a>), the FSC-US (<a href="http://www.fscus.org">www.fscus.org</a>) or the SCS Standards page (<a href="http://www.scsglobalservices.com/certification-standards-and-program-documents">www.scsglobalservices.com/certification-standards-and-program-documents</a>). Standards are also available, upon request, from SCS Global Services (<a href="http://www.SCSglobalServices.com">www.SCSglobalServices.com</a>).</p>		

### 1.3.2. SCS Interim FSC Standards

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

## 2 Annual Audit Dates and Activities

### 2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities

<b>Date:</b> 14 August 2013	
<b>FMU / Location / sites visited</b>	<b>Activities / notes</b>
Bayfield County Courthouse	Opening Meeting  Dave Wager, FSC Lead Auditor, SCS Global Services JoAnn Hanowski, FSC, SFI team auditor Mike Ferrucci, SFI Lead Auditor, NSF-ISR
Site #1. Stand 11-13	This 32 acre aspen/jack pine stand was whole tree harvested in 2013. The goal for the site is to regenerate jack pine. Due to future site activities (aerial seeding and trenching) the green tree retention guidelines were not followed. The policy is to get these sites as "clean" as possible for safety and disease concerns. Identified that staff are using the NHI database for SGCN species forest management guidelines.
Site #2. Tripp Gravel Pitt Road chemical release site.	This 33 acre site was treated with an aerial application of rodeo, sulfomet XP and TA-40 Surfactant to control competing vegetation. The site had been harvested, fire plowed and then hand planted with red pine in 2009. Good results on knocking down competing vegetation and the red pine looked good. County is using the lowest dosage rates of chemicals in their applications.
Site #3. Stand 40-10	This was an 86 acre aspen regeneration harvest that was completed in Dec 2011. Approximately 5% retention was prescribed for the site, primarily by retaining long-lived conifer species. An ephemeral pond was buffered with a 15 ft no-harvest strip which is above the BMP requirements for this wetland type.
Site #4. Stand 12-13	This site is a proposed 14 acre aspen harvest that has a small stream bisecting the proposed sale. A 35 ft buffer on each side of the stream was marked for retention. The goal is to regenerate aspen on the site. The site is scheduled for harvest in 2013 but has not been cut. There are steep slopes on the site and a discussion was had regarding how the logger would remove the wood from the site.
Site #5. Stand 25-11	32 acre aspen clearcut of aspen, mixed hardwood, oak, and jack pine. Excellent retention primarily clumped along intermittent streams and in small islands. Excellent job by operator not damaging conifer regeneration. Adjacent landowner complained about clearcut impacting aesthetics of local beach at Jackman Lake. In response County modified the sale to include a roadside buffer of 2 tree lengths. Buffer was implemented and neighbor was satisfied. Interviewed logger and confirmed overall good attention to safety including: operator had FISTA training; hand cutters had chaps, hard hats, gloves, and ear protection; operator carried spill kit, fire extinguisher, and water tank; operator holds monthly safety meetings with workers.

<p>Site #6. County Hwy A chemical release.</p>	<p>This former jack pine stand was clearcut and the site prepped in 2011. Containerized red pine were planted in spring 2012 with seedlings from a Canadian nursery that were grown with a local seed source. County has found that they are getting 90-95% survival with containerized stock. This site is outside the Barnes Barrens area and will be converted to red pine. The overall goal on the forest is to maintain current acres of red and jack pine. Because some red pine in the Barrens will be converted to jack pine, there is a need to convert some jack pine to red pine outside the Barrens management area.</p>
<p>Site # 7. Chemical release of extensive red pine stand.</p>	<p>Good results observed (from vehicle).</p>
<p>Site #8. Road maintenance methods on two-track system road on loose sand.</p>	<p>The County has come up with a way to build and maintain durable road surfaces in the sand soiled areas of the County by incorporating organic material into the surface as a binder and by allowing sod growth to help bind the road surface. Results are quite good. At this stop the adjacent legacy 1320-foot wide fuel break was observed and discussed (moving away from these massive breaks due to challenges maintaining them, in favor of block barrens habitat and more modest breaks associated with roads).</p>
<p>Site # 9. Stand 16-12</p>	<p>This stand is located in the Barnes Barrens management unit (about 11,500 acres) that will be managed on a landscape context for barrens land habitat (an HCVF). This 119 acre mature jack pine stand will be clearcut and then maintained as open habitat within the core area of the floating matrix landscape plan. We had a long discussion on how the plan was developed and how it will be implemented. The area will provide habitat for sharp-tailed grouse and many other barrens habitat dependent species.</p>
<p>Site #10. New road construction.</p>	<p>Road is being constructed for a fire protection break. This is a piece of a comprehensive regional fire protection plan.</p>
<p>Site #11. Stand 59-11</p>	<p>This area will receive three different treatments.  A 21- acre stand marked for an overstory removal. Excellent advanced regeneration of mixed hardwoods. Approximately 5 sq ft of basal area was marked to be retained following overstory removal. Retention designated by painting green leave trees and designating all conifers to be maintained. Verified that adequate quality and numbers of retention are marked to remain after overstory removal.</p> <p>The largest portion of the sale is in a northern hardwood stand managed under selection silviculture. Improvement thinning on 80% of area, with canopy gaps on the remainder. Gaps are located systematically, with care taken to ensure sufficiently large canopy gaps to favor varied species of regeneration. Increased emphasis on monitoring the regeneration was discussed, and monitoring forms reviewed.</p>

	A 27 acre lowland conifer stand will be strip-clear cut (clearcut 2 chains wide with 2 chain wide retention strips). The harvest will occur in the winter and only if there is sufficient freeze up. The goal is to regenerate tamarack and black spruce.
<b>Date:</b> 15 August 2013	
<b>FMU / Location / sites visited</b>	<b>Activities / notes</b>
Barron County	Mike Ferrucci, SFI Lead Auditor, NSF-ISR
Site #1: Sale# 330, Red Head Lake	Completed improvement thinning and selection in several stands with varying mixtures of oak, northern hardwood, birch, and Aspen comprising 114 acres. Drier portions will be managed for oak (even-aged) and moister places for northern hardwood (uneven-aged). Habitat classification was used but is not definitive. Also a six-acre stand of red pine that was thinned.
Site #2: Sale# 341, Burnett County Line	Nearly complete except 3-acre oak shelterwood section (logging not taking place). 180 acres total, most sections will be managed using selection systems to gradually convert oak-dominated stands to hardwoods with an oak component. Habitat classification was used but is not definitive. Many portions could be managed for oak (even-aged) or for northern hardwood (uneven-aged), but in many areas this decision will not be made until the next entry. Boundary lines issues were resolved. Portion of Ice-Age Trail located on logging roads; trail was left in good condition.
Site #3: Trailhead for Ice Age Trail (lunch)	Parking area, kiosk and signs, picnic table, warming shed.
Site #4: Sale# 336, Beauty Lake	Completed improvement thinning in a 39 acre Oak Stand. Good documentation of contacts with adjacent landowners regarding access and boundary issues. Close review of silviculture and retention of wildlife trees confirmed that harvest meets handbook provisions for each.
Site#5: Sale #339	Mirror Lake Pine, block on Goose Lake Road Completed Red Pine row thinning.
Site#6: 2011 Oak TSI Release near Sale #339, block on Goose Lake Road	Good results from brush-saw release by TSI Contractor
Site#7: 2011 Oak Overstory Removal near Sale #339, block on Goose Lake Road	Some oaks may be free-to-grow, but most at risk from overtopping. Prescribed fire not implemented (weather conditions not favorable) so TSI may be done to free oak saplings from heavy competition of Aspen and red maple.
Site#8: Goose Lake Road	Recreation road open all year except during spring thaw. Gravel has been added as needed, most sections are holding up well, despite limited provisions for drainage and some below-grade sections; soil is well-drained. The road is only heavily used during hunting season, and is one of only two county forest roads that are open, so it receives regular attention.
Site#9: Sale #345, 26 <sup>th</sup> Avenue,	Active harvest by logging contractor, reviewed small Aspen clearcut

Town of Cedar Lake	nearly complete and landing. Interviewed two loggers, both of whom are FISTA (SFI) trained, and both who clearly described environmentally-appropriate logging practices as well as provisions to leave trees with wildlife activity.
Site#10: Sale #346, Mikana South	Marked and sold, 74 acre sale. Reviewed marking in small portion of selection area and oak shelterwood area. Confirmed that harvest meets handbook provisions regarding silviculture.
Date: 15 August 2013	
Ashland County	Dave Wager, FSC Lead Auditor, SCS Global JoAnn Hanowski, FSC, SFI team auditor
Site#1. Mudline Road	This is one of a 4.2 mile section of County maintained road. The roadside had recently received an herbicide application to control grass. Culverts have recently been replaced and a section of road that had washed out in early summer was repaired. The area of the road over the new culverts were raised to prevent water from flowing over the road. Access points off of road are either gated or bermed to prevent unauthorized off road trucks.
Site #2. Stand 952	This was an 87 acre sale that included three stands, a northern hardwood selection, an aspen coppice and a balsam fir/red maple coppice. Adequate retention was seen in the clearcut areas and was predominantly long lived conifers. The goal for the northern hardwoods is to grow saw logs. Cavity, den and legacy trees were left in the hardwood stand. The stand was successfully converted to aspen. Coppice areas were cut in winter and there were no BMP issues.
Site#3. Stand 965	This sale and harvest was a multi-stand sale in lowland hardwoods. The treatments were either a strip coppice with residuals of cedar and yellow birch or a clearcut with residuals. The State has recently finished the silvicultural chapter for lowland hardwoods and some of the stands in Ashland County are being used as test sites. The site was harvested this past winter and inspection revealed that care had been taken during harvest to protect soils. Stand was coded in WisFIRS for follow-up regeneration monitoring in 3 years.
Site# 4. Active sale Stand 961	Northern hardwood improvement thinning. Residual stand damage was minimized. Good use of slash mats, no BMP violations. Actively being harvested by logging contractor using processor and forwarder. Interviewed logger about BMPs, training, and safety. A portion of the hardwood sale that was marked, but not harvested was also inspected. This site had a fairly dense sedge layer and we had a discussion on the difficulty of regenerating sugar maple on these sites. The County is experimenting with chemical treatment of sedges to enhance regeneration.
Site #5. Stand 963	This was an active sale-started but not yet complete. There was a fairly steep slope where a skid trail was placed. The trail was rehabbed with water bars and brush to prevent erosion. A berm was placed on the top of the ridge to prevent water from running

	down the trail. Retention looked good on the site and wetlands were buffered. Peeler logs were being sold from this site.
Site#6. Compartment 48-8	This planting was completed after a salvage harvest of a spruce plantation that had been damaged by bud worm. The site was disc trenched and herbicided before a spring 2013 planting. Heavy competition and the red pine may need to be released in the future. Trees had good growth in year 1. The road into the site was rehabilitated with water bars and a water diversion structure.
Site#7. Hunter Walking Trails	The County manages six hunter walking trails. A sign and map of the trail is located at the trailhead. The locations of the trails are marked on the County map. Mowing is done annually and the trails are plowed and reseeded about every five years to replace clover that has been out competed by the grasses. Walking trails are nationally recognized and contribute to the local economy with out of state bird hunters annually visiting Butternut.
Site#8. Stand 964	This multi-stand, 102 acre sale included an aspen regeneration, a hardwood thin and a swamp hardwood shelterwood. The site was marked but has not been harvested.
Site #9. Stand 957	This mature red pine stand (plantation origin) was recently thinned (40 acres). The trees were utilized for utility poles with high value sale of ~\$85 per cord. The County will continue to harvest mature trees over several more entries and eventually will allow the site to convert to northern hardwoods. The planting occurred on an old farm field and there is advanced regeneration of hardwoods on the site.
Stie #10. Stand 911	This 137-acre northern hardwood sale was comprised of two stands. Both stands received a thinning treatment. Discussion of leave trees, the County has a goal of leaving three or more den, mast and snag trees/acre in their hardwood thinnings. Had a discussion of the new American marten habitat management guidelines which are now in process. Viewed one of several vernal pools in the stand that had 15 foot buffer
Site# 11. Hemlock HCVF	The County has a bit over 500 acres of high conservation value forests in two different blocks, the Snow Shoe Lake Block (374 acres) and Camp K Block (127 acres). We visited a stand that had received a harvest treatment. The goal is to create gaps adjacent to hemlock trees to provide adequate seeding opportunities. The goal is to regenerate both yellow birch and hemlock in these gaps. Some of Ashland County's hemlock stands are part of the silvicultural trials program. The site was harvested in the past year and it is too early to determine regeneration success.
<b>Date: 16 August 2013</b>	
Douglas County – Team 1	JoAnn Hanowski – Auditor
Site #1: Sale 4107	The site is a mixed aspen clearcut with pockets of black spruce that were strip-thinned. There was good green tree retention that was obtained by prescription (leave pine, oak and white spruce). A 100ft

	wide buffer was retained along the Little Black River. Good regeneration on site and good species diversity in strips.
Site #2: Kestrel County Road	This dead end road was constructed by a contractor to access timber. The construction of the road was solid and had a surface that was recently graded. The ditches had also recently been brushed.
Site #3: Sale 3949	This 73 acre northern hardwood stand was harvested with a an all-aged single tree selection system. The goal is to promote northern hardwoods on the site. American Marten are known to occur in this area (NHI hit) and management will accommodate their biological requirements. Leave trees were marked and there was good retention of wildlife trees on the site.
Site #4: Japanese Knotweed treatment	A small pocket of knotweed was found by County employees and documented. Staff received permission to chemically treat the site with milestone which did a good at killing the vegetation. The plan is to mechanically treat the site as the knotweed persists.
Site #5: State line flowage	A failed control structure was replaced on the flowage.
Site #6: Sale 4063	This active sale is an 83 acre northern hardwood and red maple stand that is being treated with and even-age clearcut (red maple) and all-aged individual tree selection (northern hardwood) harvest methods. Most of the area had been treated and there was good individual tree retention and a small reserve ash lowland reserve area.
Site #7: Winter recreation Trail	The County has about 300 miles of winter trail and about 100 miles of summer trails. The trails are mowed by private clubs with guidance by the County.
Douglas County – Team 2	Mike Ferrucci – Auditor
Site #1: Sale #4078	Active harvest site, subcontract logger not present (left for machine repair). Seed-tree harvest in an over-mature red maple-dominated stand. 20 trees (14 square feet of basal area) per acre retained, including designated important or difficult to regenerate species: cedar, yellow birch, white pine, black spruce. Pattern includes scattered and clumped, including clumps in pockets of wet soil, providing protection.
Site #2: Jackson Box Flowage	Flowage originally installed based on Wisconsin DNR’s request to enhance habitat and for hunting. More recently WDNR requires inspections, and where needed, modifications for safety and stability. Douglas County upgraded per inspection; also planted wild rice working with an Indian tribe.
Site #3: Several completed Aspen clearcuts along Jackson Box Road	West side of road is a grouse management area, east side managed to complement, but not as fully directed towards aspen management. Clearcut are separated by uncut areas or by timing, with dispersed and clumped retention. White pine legacy trees retained.
Site #4: Grouse Road	County forest system road used as a main haul road. Built to Douglas County road specification. Roads generally built by timber purchaser’s contractor, and specifications are contained in the

	timber sale contract template (reviewed by auditor). Roads observed meet BMPs.
Site #5: Wildlife Openings	Several maintained, grassy wildlife openings were observed. These are maintained by periodic mowing, and provide cover and places for hunting. Many of these openings are located in legacy, large landings (formerly box company land).
Site #6: Bounty Road, aka Empire Wilderness Road	County forest system road used as a main haul road, but also serves as a winter recreation trail. Built to Douglas County road specification, but significantly wider row clearing so that the truck traffic and snowmobile traffic can be kept separate.
Site #7 Tower Oak Burn, Tower Fire Lane	Northern hardwoods on a site that was good for oak also had been thinned, forester decided it was a good oak regeneration opportunity, consistent with plan. Burned it once, then cut other hardwoods, then burned again somewhat hard. Observed that about one-third of overstory oak are dead, and forester will leave the rest uncut, providing habitat, mast, and structure. Oak in understory are vigorous and plentiful, and should dominate the stand over time. Project is a success; this is important because regenerating stands to have a predominant oak component has been difficult.
Site #8: Sale #4032	Selection harvest in northern hardwoods. Inspected Unit 2, Stand 18, 30 acres reduced from 171 to 81 square feet basal area per acre with some limited gaps. Pole-sized, 63-years old. Silvicultural method and its application appropriate.
Site #9: Northern Hardwood Stand	Adjacent to Sale #4032, this sale was completed 4-5 years ago. Selection harvest with gaps per silvicultural guidelines. Ample sugar maple regeneration between and particularly in gaps, but gaps also had free-to-grow oak saplings. A very successful application of selection per the handbook.
Site #10: Sale #4132	Harvest Unit 2, 47 acre clearcut with reserves of an Aspen/Mixed hardwood stand. Reserves comprised 22 trees per acre with about 12% crown cover, primarily red oak, with white pine and white spruce. Protected vernal pool per BMPs. Confirmed effective sale administration.
Site #11: Sale# 4027	Active birch seed tree harvest. Douglas County staff discussed advantages and disadvantages of this method, and a working group will visit Douglas County soon to review several sites. Forester designates wetland species for retention to help protect soils in moist-to-wet pockets. Contractor is a very high-production outfit. Observed an efficient and very fast roundwood and biomass operation including fixed-head processor, 2 grapple skidders, stroke delimeter, slasher-loader. Felled trees are pre-bunched in harvest area, then limbed before yarding pole-length to main landing for slashing and loading trucks. Piles of biomass are cold-decked, to be yarded later for chipping at main landing.
Douglas County – Team 3	Dave Wagner – Auditor

<p>Site #1: Twin Lakes Road, Jack Pine Planting Site</p>	<p>31-acre Jack pine planting site. Site preparation completed with fire plow, no chemicals were used. Planting done with containerized stock from locally collected Jack pine seed. Excellent survival at over 99%. Trees will be bud capped in fall 2013.</p>
<p>Site #2: Flat Lake SNA T44N-R11W, Sections 3, 4</p>	<p>104-acre SNA established in 2007. Shallow soft-water seepage lake with lush emergent and submergent marsh community. A timber harvest was conducted adjacent to SNA, but over 100 ft of buffer was left. Confirmed Douglas County Forester consults Ecological Resources whenever operations occur adjacent to SNA to ensure management will not impact rare habitat.</p>
<p>Site #3. Gordan Dam County Park and Adjacent Timber Sale</p>	<p>Gateway to the Wild and Scenic stretch of the St. Croix River. Timber sale was a 31-acre aspen/red maple clearcut with reserves. Efforts were taken to release white pine regeneration. Good protection of advanced regeneration and implementation of BMP's. Excellent reserves left within the stand and in the RMZ along the St. Croix River. Significant care was taken to ensure site maintained aesthetic qualities so as not to impact the high use recreation area.</p>
<p>Site 4. Gordon Dam County Park Campground</p>	<p>County carefully maintains flowage gates to minimize up-river flooding and ensure adequate downstream flows. County recreation site with campgrounds, boat launches, and swimming areas. \$50,000 recently invested to build new bathroom.</p>
<p>Site #5: Sale #3856; Red Pine Plantation Blowdown</p>	<p>July 2011 blowdown impacts on red pine plantation. Majority of the red pine was salvaged and site will be regenerated naturally with a mix of pine and oak.</p>
<p>Site #6: ATV Trail</p>	<p>Trail is well designed, signed, and maintained. Discussed Douglas County's approaches to trail maintenance, monitoring of illegal uses, user groups, enforcement.</p>
<p>Site #7: Sale #4057.</p>	<p>137-acre emergency salvage harvest resulting from July 2011 straight line wind event. Prior to wind-event, stand was composed of oak (which had had a first stage shelterwood cut) and aspen. Both oak and mature aspen were severely impacted by July 2011 wind event. Very good oak regeneration and Douglas County plans to maintain oak on the site by using prescribed fire within 2-3 years. Vernal pool identified and protected from harvesting equipment. Given the extent of blowdown, adequate green tree retention was left around water features and undisturbed patches.</p>
<p>Site #8: Sale #3904.</p>	<p>Seed tree harvest of mature red oak, aspen/red maple, and northern hardwood. The sale was setup, but not yet harvested, prior to the wind event. Harvested in December 2012. Good oak regeneration and plans are to use prescribed fire to promote oak where possible. Good protection of RMZ and overall effective BMP implementation. Biomass guidelines effectively used on sale. Access trail was bermed to prevent unauthorized vehicle access.</p>

## 2.2 Evaluation of Management Systems

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

## 3. Changes in Management Practices

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

## 4. Results of the Evaluation

### 4.1 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations

<b>Finding Number: 2012.1</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Major CAR</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Minor CAR</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Observation</b>	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):</b>	
<b>Deadline</b>	<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):
<b>FSC Indicator(s):</b>	FSC US 4.2.b
<b>Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):</b> Although contracts with logging contractors contain language requiring contractors to abide by OSHA regulations concerning job-site safety, county foresters and DNR foresters do not enforce compliance with these regulations upon observing unsafe practices, e.g., working without personal protective equipment. Two such instances were observed during the audit. Thus, there is a double standard—county and DNR employees do comply with requirements to wear protective equipment, but they do not always enforce the requirement for contractors or their employees to comply with these regulations.	
<b>Corrective Action Request (or Observation):</b> All County Forest employees and contractors must demonstrate a safe work environment.	
The language of the CAR is directly from the standard (4.2.b): The forest owner or manager and their	

<p>employees and contractors demonstrate a safe work environment. The role of the auditor is to identify non-conformances to the standard, but not to dictate specific solutions. If County and DNR Foresters accomplish this through contacting the contractor rather than the contractor's employee directly, that is acceptable. However, from the evidence in the non-conformity section, it is not clear that this step was taken.</p>	
<p><b>FME response</b> <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i></p>	<p>The Wisconsin county forests and Wisconsin DNR have a strong track record of supporting contractor training and professionalism, including the requirement for logging contractors to maintain FISTA SFI-trained certification and support of the Wisconsin Master Logger (WML) program. FISTA and WML both incorporate elements of work site safety into their programs.</p>
<p><b>SCS review</b></p>	<p>The SCS audit team confirmed that Wisconsin DNR continues to take significant actions (e.g., requirement for FISTA certification and support of WML) to encourage a safe working environment for employees as well as contractors. During the 2013 audit we observed a safe working environment including use of required PPE on the active logging jobs that were visited in Bayfield, Ashland, Barron, and Douglas Counties.</p>
<p><b>Status of CAR:</b></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed  <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major  <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)</p>

<p><b>Finding Number:</b> 2012.2</p>	
<p><b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation</p>	
<p><b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):</p>	
<p><b>Deadline</b></p>	<p><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):</p>
<p><b>FSC Indicator(s):</b></p>	<p>FSC US 7.1.c</p>
<p><b>Non-Conformity</b> (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): Variation pertaining to the presentation and discussion of desired future conditions was found among county forests management plans reviewed during the audit. In one plan, the auditor could find no presentation of desired future conditions, only conditions predicted by current management direction. If found in more plans, this could present a future non-conformance.</p>	
<p><b>Corrective Action Request</b> (or Observation): County Forests should be more explicit and/or more consistent in presenting desired future conditions in county forest plans and associated management activities to move the FMU toward the desired conditions.</p>	
<p><b>FME response</b> <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i></p>	<p>Wisconsin county forests consider desired future conditions at both a stand and landscape level. Desired future conditions at a stand level are incorporated into the stand recon data – with a field designated as “management objective” that codes the forester’s expected future cover type for each individual stand. This stand level code is typically based on a combination of the current cover type, site potential, and desired future conditions with landscape level considerations. Landscape level future considerations are considered during the development of County Forest</p>

	<p>Comprehensive Land Use Plans and are often included as a consideration in Annual Work Plan development and Annual Partnership Meeting reviews.</p> <p>In order to more explicitly document desired future conditions, the Wisconsin County Forest Association (WCFA) legislative and forest certification committee passed a motion recommending that county forests include a copy of information from WisFIRS report #207 (Past, Present &amp; Future Conditions) and a sentence or two regarding any broad goals for desired future conditions in counties' annual work plans.</p>
<b>SCS review</b>	<p>SCS audit team verified that the actions described above are occurring at Bayfield, Ashland, Barron, and Douglas Counties. Examples of adequate consideration of desired future condition at both the stand and landscape level included Bayfield County Stand 16-12 (Barrens management) and Douglas County #4057 (landscape goals for oak maintenance).</p>
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

<b>Finding Number: 2012.3</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Major CAR</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Minor CAR</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Observation</b>	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):</b>	
<b>Deadline</b>	<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):
<b>FSC Indicator(s):</b>	FSC US 7.2.a
<p><b>Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):</b> County forest managers are directed to develop new comprehensive land use plans every 15 years by Wisconsin State Statute 28.11(5)(a), although the plans are living documents and updated frequently. Annual work plans follow the entry of new data from forest reconnaissance, and annual WisFIRS updates produce new 15-year harvest projections. However, an environmental assessment is only completed as part of the complete comprehensive land use plan revision.</p> <p>The standard requires a full revision of the management plan at least every 10 years. Thus, there is a potential conflict between Wisconsin State Statutes directing DNR and County Forests to schedule plan revisions and the FSC Principles, Criteria, and Indicators.</p>	
<p><b>Corrective Action Request (or Observation):</b> Wisconsin's County Forests should examine the current process of plan revision and determine if the FSC requirement for a full revision of management plans every 10 years will be adequately addressed by 2016. Any proposed solution must ensure that management plans are reviewed on an ongoing basis and are updated whenever necessary to incorporate results of monitoring or new scientific and technical information, as well as to respond to changing environmental, social and economic circumstances.</p>	
<b>FME response (including any</b>	<p>What constitutes the "management plan" includes a variety of documents, handbooks, directives, etc. WI County Forests through annual work planning</p>

<i>evidence submitted</i>	updates, partnership meetings, accomplishment reports, as-needed updates to the 15 year plan, DNR handbooks, and other guidelines the “management plan” is revised annually. Additionally, the formal County Forest Comprehensive Land Use Plans are prepared for a 15- year period based on Wisconsin Statute 28.11 (5).
<b>SCS review</b>	The SCS audit team confirmed that the collection of planning documents that guide management are updated on an as needed basis, in many cases at least every 10 years. Such documents include the Silvicultural Handbook, Public Lands Handbook, 2460 Cutting Notices, Ecological Landscapes, and Annual Work Plans for each county. Assuming that these planning documents continue to play important roles in guiding management of WI’s County Forests, then the 15 year update schedule for the County Forest Comprehensive Land Use Plans is acceptable.
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

## 4.2 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations

<b>Finding Number:2013.1</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):	
<b>Deadline</b>	<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):
<b>FSC Indicator:</b>	6.1.a
<b>Background:</b> Habitat classification is not being consistently recorded on the Timber Sale Notice and Cutting Report (Form 2460-1) in some counties (not the case for Douglas). We saw great understanding of habitat types and making appropriate forest type decisions for the site. However, audit team concludes that a more consistent documenting of habitat classification may be beneficial in making some cover type change decisions in borderline or difficult cases and would certainly add a key piece of information to the monitoring and historical records of a stand.	
<b>Observation:</b> WI County Forests should consider taking measures to ensure that the habitat type for each stand is documented.	
<b>FME response</b> <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	
<b>SCS review</b>	
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

<b>Finding Number: 2013.2</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):	
<b>Deadline</b>	<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):
<b>FSC Indicator:</b>	6.3.a, 6.3.b
<b>Background:</b> The audit team is concerned that recent changes to the State of Wisconsin deer hunting regulations may result in over abundant deer populations. As observed in past audit years (particularly during years when deer numbers were higher than they are in 2013), herbivory from over abundant deer populations poses challenges to conformance with forest regeneration requirements of Indicator 6.3.a. Even at the current reduced population levels, county forests are required to use expensive measures (bud capping) to ensure regeneration of some planted stands.	
<b>Observation:</b> County Forests should consider developing forest regeneration strategies to use if increases in deer populations (projected from 2013 changes to State regulations) impact forest regeneration.	
<b>FME response</b> <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	
<b>SCS review</b>	
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

## 5. Stakeholder Comments

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

- To solicit input from affected parties as to the strengths and weaknesses of the FME's management, relative to the standard, and the nature of the interaction between the company and the surrounding communities.

To solicit input on whether the forest management operation has consulted with stakeholders regarding identifying any high conservation value forests (HCVFs).

Principal stakeholder groups are identified based upon results from past evaluations, lists of stakeholders from the FME under evaluation, and additional stakeholder contacts from other sources

(e.g., chair of the regional FSC working group). The following types of groups and individuals were determined to be principal stakeholders in this evaluation:

**5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted**

DNR employees	Logging contractors
County employees	Forestry Committee Members

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

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

FME has not received any stakeholder comments from interested parties as a result of stakeholder outreach activities during this annual audit.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	-------------------------------------

**6. Certification Decision**

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

**7. Changes in Certification Scope**

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

**Name and Contact Information**

Organization name	Wisconsin DNR		
Contact person	Joe Schwantes		
Address	101 S. Webster St. Madison, WI 53707	Telephone	608-264-9217
		Fax	608-266-8756
		e-mail	joseph.schwantes@wisconsin.gov
		Website	http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/CountyForests/

**FSC Sales Information**

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

		e-mail	
		Website	

**Scope of Certificate**

Certificate Type	<input type="checkbox"/> Single FMU		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple FMU <sup>†</sup>	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Group			
SLIMF (if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/> Small SLIMF certificate		<input type="checkbox"/> Low intensity SLIMF certificate	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Group SLIMF certificate			
Group Members (if applicable)				
Number of FMU's in scope of certificate				
Geographic location of non-SLIMF FMU(s)‡	Latitude & Longitude:			
Forest zone <sup>1,2</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/> Boreal		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Temperate	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Subtropical		<input type="checkbox"/> Tropical	
<b>Total forest area in scope of certificate which is:</b>				
<b>privately managed<sup>3</sup></b>		ha or ac		
<b>state managed</b>		ha or ac		
<b>community managed<sup>4</sup></b>		1,640,043 acres (Rpt.50A - FSC only)		
<b>Number of FMUs in scope that are:</b>				
less than 100 ha in area	0	100 - 1000 ha in area	0	
1000 - 10 000 ha in area	4	more than 10 000 ha in area	15	
<b>Total forest area in scope of certificate which is included in FMUs that:</b>				
are less than 100 ha in area		#		
are between 100 ha and 1000 ha in area		#		
meet the eligibility criteria as <i>low intensity</i> SLIMF FMUs		#		
<b>Division of FMUs into manageable units:</b>				
FMU are individual County Forests which are further subdivided into compartments and stands.				

<sup>1</sup> According to the Holdridge life zone classification scheme.

<sup>2</sup> If more than one zone is applicable, please include the total area for each forest zone.

<sup>3</sup> The category of 'private management' includes state owned forests that are leased to private companies for management, e.g. through a concession system.

<sup>4</sup> A community managed forest management unit is one in which the management and use of the forest and tree resources is controlled by local communities.

**Non-SLIMF Group Members (if applicable)**

Name	Contact information	Latitude/ longitude of Non-SLIMF FMUs	

**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)	1,326,314 forested area scheduled for management (Rpt.101)
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 <sup>5</sup>	127,740 (PR, SW and 2/3 PJ) (Rpt.102)
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by natural regeneration, or by a combination of natural regeneration and coppicing of the naturally regenerated stems	1,198,574
Silvicultural system(s)	Area under type of management
Even-aged management	
Clearcut (clearcut size range 1-264 (16.45 avg) ac (WisFIRS export)	609,889 - A, 1/3 PJ, OX (Rpt.102)
Shelterwood	163,803 PW and O
Other (e.g., coppice, seed-tree)	130,299
Uneven-aged management	
Individual tree selection	226,295 NH
Group selection	68,288 BH, SH, CH
Other (e.g., variable retention, variable density thinning)	
<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)	Acres: (Rpt. 201) 12,074 ASPEN 159 BOTTOMLAND HDWDS 381 WHITE BIRCH 470 WHITE CEDAR 13 CENTRAL HARDWOODS 197 BALSAM FIR 356 FIR SPRUCE 87 HEMLOCK 14 MISC. CONIFEROUS

<sup>5</sup> The area is the *total* area being regenerated primarily by planting, *not* the area which is replanted annually. NB this area may be different to the area defined as a 'plantation' for the purpose of calculating the Annual Accreditation Fee (AAF) or for other purposes.

	10 MISC. DECIDUOUS 899 RED MAPLE 11,778 NORTHERN HDWOODS 4,903 OAK 596 SCRUB OAK 1,194 JACK PINE 4,127 RED PINE 1,541 WHITE PINE 780 BLACK SPRUCE 303 SWAMP CONIFER 2,417 SWAMP HARDWOODS 208 WHITE SPRUCE 532 TAMARACK  43,039 TOTAL ACRES
<b>Non-timber Forest Products (NTFPs)</b>	
Area of forest protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for the production of NTFPs or services	0
Other areas managed for NTFPs or services	0
Approximate annual commercial production of non-timber forest products included in the scope of the certificate, by product type	<i>Spagnum moss- 20,000 bales annually (0391B sub-product)</i>
<b>Explanation of the assumptions and reference to the data source upon which AAH and NTFP harvest rates estimates are based:</b>	
Data is derived from "WisFIRS" which is database that contains all recon, treatment, and timber sale data for State and County Lands. Sustainable rate of harvest is based on long term harvest goals (15yr avg.)	
<b>Species in scope of joint FM/COC certificate</b>	
<b><i>Scientific/ Latin Name (Common/ Trade Name)</i></b>	
<i>White pine, red pine, jack pine, spruce-fir, northern hardwoods, central hardwoods, oak, aspen and other merchantable species.</i>	

**FSC Product Classification** (select all that apply)

Wood Products	Product Level 1	Product Level 2	MBF and cords
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	W1 Rough Wood	W1.1 Roundwood (logs)	11,129 MBF and 590,701 cds (Rpt.37A)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	W1 Rough Wood	W1.2 Fuel Wood	3,712 cds
<input type="checkbox"/>	W1 Rough Wood	W1.3 Twigs	
<input type="checkbox"/>	W2 Wood charcoal		E.g. Barbecue charcoal
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	W3 Wood in chips or particles	W3.1 Wood chips ( <i>Please select the appropriate product from the list</i> ) and	<4" diameter (prod code 26) and mixed diameter (prod code 24) - Rpt.37A (total cords - sum of cords by species) 84,800 cd eq.
Non-Timber Forest Products	Product Level 1	Product Level 2	Product Level 3
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N6 Plants and parts of plants	N6.3 Whole trees or plants ( <i>Please select the appropriate product from the list</i> ) and X-Mas Trees - 33 trees (Rpt. 37A) Boughs - 33 tons (WisFIRS export product 42)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N6.3.1 Christmas trees
<i>For a full list of FSC product classes, product types, and product sub-types, see FSC-STD-40-004a (Version 2-0) EN – FSC Product Classification.</i>			

**Conservation Areas**

Area of forest and non-forest land protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for conservation objectives			<input type="checkbox"/> ha <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac	
<b>High Conservation Value Forest/ Areas</b>				
<b>High Conservation Values present and respective areas</b>				
	Code	HCV Type <sup>6</sup>	Description & Location	Area
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV1	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g. endemism, endangered species, refugia).	Barrens-Eau Claire, Clark, Jackson Old Growth pine relics-Juneau, Talyor, Forest Oak Savanna- Clark, Washburn	2233
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV2	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant large landscape level forests, contained within, or containing the management unit, where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance.	St. Croix River scenic easements (Natural Scenic River) Penokee Range-Iron Silent Wood Benchmark For.- Washburn	2713
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV3	Forests or areas that are in or contain	Assorted bogs, Wetland	36,020

<sup>6</sup> High conservation values should be classified following the numbering system given in the ProForest High Conservation Value Forest Toolkit (2003) available at [www.ProForest.net](http://www.ProForest.net) or at [www.wwf.org](http://www.wwf.org)

		rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems.	communities, hemlock areas, fens, kettle lakes- Several counties	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV4	Forests or areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g. watershed protection, erosion control).	Migratory Bird Area-Clark Nemadji Floodplain forest-Douglas Potato River Falls-Iron	619
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV5	Forests or areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g. subsistence, health).	Ruffed Grouse Mgmt. Areas- Wood, Washburn, Clark	2060
<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).		
<b>Total Area of forest classified as 'High Conservation Value Forest/ Area'</b>				43,645

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

<input type="checkbox"/> N/A – All forestland owned or managed by the applicant is included in the scope.		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Applicant owns and/or manages other FMUs not under evaluation.		
<input type="checkbox"/> Applicant wishes to excise portions of the FMU(s) under evaluation from the scope of certification.		
<b>Explanation for exclusion of FMUs and/or excision:</b>		
<b>Control measures to prevent mixing of certified and non-certified product (C8.3):</b>		
<b>Description of FMUs excluded from or forested area excised from the scope of certification:</b>		
<b>Name of FMU or Stand</b>	<b>Location (city, state, country)</b>	<b>Size (<input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac)</b>
29 County Forests exist in WI. 19 of them have chosen to commit to FSC certification. The other 10 are either SFI certified or not certified.	Scattered across WI.	~710,000 acres.

**Group Management Program Members**

If you have your own file for tracking group members, as an alternative you may provide it to the SCS audit team.

Yellow fields indicate a county is FSC certified under this certificate. White fields indicate a county is certified under an SFI certificate and is not included in the FSC certificate being audited. The grey fields indicate a county is not certified under FSC or SFI certifications.

County Name	Forest Administrator	Email Address	Co. Forest Lands	Special Use Lands	Total Acres
Ashland	Chris Hoffman	choffman05@centurytel.net	40,083.33	0.00	40,083.33
Barron	'John Cisek'	john.cisek@co.barron.wi.us	16,264.69	0.00	16,264.69

Bayfield	Jason Bodine'	jbodine@bayfieldcounty.org	169,284.01	110.70	169,394.71
Burnett	Jason Nichols	jnichols@burnettcounty.org	105,224.63	0.00	105,224.63
Chippewa	Dahlby, Mike	mdahlby@co.chippewa.wi.us	32,818.88	1,614.56	34,433.44
Clark	Rick Dailey	rick.dailey@co.clark.wi.us	132,676.14	63.50	132,739.64
Douglas	'Jon Harris'	jharris@douglascountywi.org	262,057.91	15,297.28	277,355.19
Eau Claire	Joshua Pedersen	Josh.Pedersen@co.eau-claire.wi.us	51,579.82	793.10	52,372.92
Florence	'Patrick Smith'	psmith@co.florence.wi.us	36,331.65	63.15	36,394.80
Forest	'David Ziolkowski'	dzforestco@ez-net.com	12,100.46	0.00	12,100.46
Iron	'Joe Vairus'	icfadmin@ironcountyforest.org	173,111.30	1,048.02	174,159.32
Jackson	'Jim Zahasky'	jim.zahasky@centurytel.net	118,774.91	2,685.40	121,460.31
Juneau	Brian Loyd	pfadm@co.juneau.wi.us	15,936.87	991.68	16,928.55
Langlade	Erik Rantala	erantala@co.langlade.wi.us	126,013.07	1,925.24	127,938.31
Lincoln	'Kevin Kleinschmidt'	kkleinschmidt@co.lincoln.wi.us	100,423.30	421.75	100,845.05
Marathon	Tom Lovlien	tglovlien@mail.co.marathon.wi.us	29,381.06	552.10	29,933.16
Marinette	Pete Villas	pvillas@marinettecounty.com	227,038.18	3,530.12	230,568.30
Monroe	Chad Ziegler	chiegler@co.monroe.wi.us	6,841.17	432.30	7,273.47
Oconto	Robert Skalitzky	robert.skalitzky@co.oconto.wi.us	43,514.37	159.43	43,673.80
Oneida	John Bilogan	jbilogan@co.oneida.wi.us	82,099.81	179.20	82,279.01
Polk	Jeremy Koslowski	jeremy.koslowski@co.polk.wi.us	16,445.71	698.04	17,143.75
Price	'Eric Holm'	eric.holm@co.price.wi.us	91,472.81	795.01	92,267.82
Rusk	Paul Teska	pteska@ruskcountywi.us	88,765.62	240.00	89,005.62
Sawyer	'Greg Peterson'	greg.peterson@sawyercountygov.org	115,197.28	0.00	115,197.28
Taylor	Aszmann Russ	russ.aszmann@co.taylor.wi.us	17,564.58	18.86	17,583.44
Vernon	Matt Hansen	matt.hansen@vernoncounty.org	997.46	0.00	997.46
Vilas	Larry Stevens	vcfor@co.vilas.wi.us	40,906.64	101.27	41,007.91
Washburn	'Mike Peterson'	mlpeters@co.washburn.wi.us	148,342.18	721.67	149,063.85
Wood	'Fritz Schubert'	fschubert@co.wood.wi.us	37,031.84	692.58	37,724.42
<b>Totals :</b>			<b>2,338,279.68</b>	<b>33,134.96</b>	<b>2,371,414.64</b>

## 8. Annual Data Update

### 8.1 Social Information

Number of forest workers (including contractors) working in forest within scope of certificate (differentiated by gender):		
# of male workers 854	# of female workers 55	
Number of accidents in forest work since last audit:	Serious: # 0	Fatal: # 1 Iron County. Last winter there was one fatality on Iron County property. A logger was killed by a falling limb while felling a large tree. The limb hit the

		logger on the back of the neck/head.
--	--	--------------------------------------

## 8.2 Annual Summary of Pesticide and Other Chemical Use

Commercial name of pesticide/ herbicide	Active ingredient	Quantity applied annually (kg or lbs)	Size of area treated during previous year (ha or ac)	Reason for use
Round Up	Glyphosate isopropylamine salt (18%)	12 oz	.16 acres	Garlic mustard control
Round Up	Glyphosate isopropylamine salt (18%)	12oz		Spot weed treatment at County park
Glystar	Glyphosate	12.5 gallons	20	Site prep, invasive control
Oust	Sulfometuron Methyl	25 ozs.	12	Site Prep
Garlon	Triclopyr	1.5 gallons	12	Site Prep
Milestone	aminopyralid	1.5 liquid ounces	.02 acres	Japanese Knotweed Control
Arsenal AC	Imazapyr	126 ounces	+/- 25 ac	Site prep and release
Accord	Glyphosate	116.20 quarts	+/-77 ac	Site prep and release
Garlon 4	Triclopyr	50 quarts	+/- 50 ac	Site prep and release
Oust	Sulfometuron-Methyl	384 ounces	+/- 300	Site prep
Transline	Clopyralid	18 ounces	+/- 10 ac	Invasive plant control
Milestone	Triisopropanolamm onium salt of 2-pyridine	14 ounces	+/-8 ac	Invasive plant control
Tordon K	Picloram	65 ounces	+/-20 ac	Invasive plant control
stalker	Imazapyr	120 ounces	Cut stump ?	Oak Wilt Control
Ranger Pro	Glyphosate	495 quarts	+/- 330 ac	Site Prep
Chopper	imazapyr	91.5 quarts	+/-330ac	Site prep
Cellu-Treat	Disodium Octaborate Tetrahydrate	75 lbs	100 acres	Annosum Root Disease
Cornerstone Plus	Glyphosate	3% Solution-Spray	20-25 acres	Garlic Mustard

		to Wet		
Oust XP	Sulforeturon methyl	1 oz./acre	9 acres	Garlic Mustard
Garlon 4	Triclopyr	2% Solution-Spray to Wet	1 acre	Garlic Mustard
Garlon 4 Ultra	Triclopyr	6.5 gallons	5 acres	Buckthorn
Cellu-treat	Disodium Octaborate Tetrahydrate	210 lbs	405 acres	Annosum root rot
Cornerstone Plus	Glyphosate	6 qt.	1.5 acres	Garlic mustard
Cellutreat	Borax	10 gallons	114 acres	Annosum prevention
Garlon	Triclopyr	8 gallons	8 acres	Oak wilt sites
Spike 20P	tebuthiuron	5-15 lb/ac spot treatment at base of woody vegetation	54.5 ac	Maintain wildlife openings. Applied by WIDNR wildlife management staff
Aquaneat	Glyphosate	1.5 qt/acre	82 acres	Preplanting site prep and post planting release
Oust	Sulfomethuran methyl	1 oz/acre	82 acres	Preplanting site prep and post planting release

## SECTION B – APPENDICES (CONFIDENTIAL)

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

FME consists of a single FMU

FME consists of multiple FMUs or is a Group

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

FMU Name	FMU Size Category:	Forest Type:	Rationale for Selection:
	- SLIMF - non-SLIMF - Large > 10,000 ha	- Plantation - Natural Forest	- Random Sample - Stakeholder issue - Ease of access

			- Other – please describe
Bayfield County	Large>10,000 ha	Natural Forest	Logistics: same region of state and time since last audit visit
Ashland County	Large>10,000ha	Natural Forest	Logistics: same region of state and time since last audit visit
Barron County	SLIMF	Natural Forest	Logistics: same region of state and time since last audit visit
Douglas County	Large>10,000ha	Natural Forest	Logistics: same region of state and time since last audit visit

## Appendix 2 – List of Stakeholders Consulted

### List of FME Staff Consulted

Joe Schwantes, County & Public Forest Specialist  
 Mark Heyde, Division of Forestry, Forest Certification Coordinator, Wisconsin DNR  
 Carmen Hardin, Forest Science Section Chief, Wisconsin DNR  
 Todd Naas, Wildlife Biologist, Wisconsin DNR  
 Matt Blaylock, Team Leader, Wisconsin DNR  
 Jay Gallagher, Area Forestry Supervisor, Wisconsin DNR  
 Joseph LeBouton, Bayfield County Liaison, Wisconsin DNR  
 Jeff Barkley, Wisconsin County Forests Association  
 Jason Bodine, Forestry & Parks Administrator, Bayfield County  
 Steve Probst, Forestry & Parks Assistant Administrator, Bayfield County  
 Leigh Downing, Recreation Forester, Bayfield County  
 Mike Amman, Forester, Bayfield County  
 Jeremiah Neitzel, Forester, Bayfield County  
 Andrew O’Krueg, Forester, Bayfield County  
 Jason Holmes, Forester, Bayfield County  
 John Mesko, Technician, Bayfield County  
 John Cisek, Barron County Forest Administrator  
 Tom Duke, District Forester, Wisconsin DNR  
 Chris Rucinski, Liasson Forester, Wisconsin DNR  
 Dave Kafura, Forest Hydrologist, Wisconsin DNR  
 Steve Runstrom, Forestry Specialist, Wisconsin DNR  
 Kevin Morgan, Wisconsin DNR  
 Chris Hoffman, Ashland County Forest Administrator/Trail Coordinator  
 Matt Schultz, Ashland County Assistant Forest Administrator  
 Jerome Wotachek, Ashland County Forester  
 Tom Piikkila – Ashland County Liaison Forester, WI DNR  
 Bruce Bacon, Wildlife Biologist, WI DNR  
 Heather Berklund, Area Team Leader, WI DNR  
 Colleen Matula, Forest Ecologist/Silviculturist, WI DNR

Eric Peterson, Forester, WI DNR  
 Jim Latvala – Douglas County Forester (*team leader*)  
 Jason Langenecker – Douglas County Inventory Forester/GIS Specialist  
 Rod Fouks – WDNR Team Leader  
 Greg Kessler – WDNR Wildlife Biologist  
 Craig Golembiewski – Douglas County Forester (*team leader*)  
 Dave Cizmas – Douglas County Forester (*team leader*)  
 Jon Harris – Douglas County Forest Administrator  
 Dale Rochon – WDNR Forester/Ranger  
 Rick Matlack – WDNR Forester  
 Mark Hager – Douglas County Forester (*team leader*)  
 Lance Wegner – Douglas County Forestry Technician  
 Mark Schroeder – Douglas County Parks & Recreation Manager  
 Don Luebbe – WDNR Forester (Douglas County Liaison)  
 Ryan Magana – WDNR Endangered Resources Ecologist  
 Mike Luedeke – WCFA Director-at-Large  
 John Robinson – Douglas County Forest, Parks, & Recreation Committee Member (Vice Chair)  
 Dave Conley – Douglas County Forest, Parks, & Recreation Committee Member

**List of other Stakeholders Consulted**

No outside stakeholders were conducted as part of the 2013 audit.

**Appendix 3 – Additional Audit Techniques Employed**

No additional audit techniques were employed.

**Appendix 4 – Pesticide Derogations**

There are no active pesticide derogations for this FME.

**Appendix 5 – Detailed Observations**

Evaluation Year	FSC P&C Reviewed
2009	All – (Re)certification Evaluation
2010	P.1 and P.2
2011	Criteria 1.2, 1.5, 1.6, 2.3, 3.2, 4.2, 4.4, 5.5, 5.6, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, 6.6, 6.9, 7.1, 8.1, 8.2, and 9.4
2012	P.5. and P.7; Criteria 1.5, 2.1, 2.3, 3.2, 3.4, 4.2, 4.4, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.6, 6.9, 8.2, 8.3, 8.4, 8.5, 9.3, 9.4,
2013	Criteria 1.5, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 5.6, 6.2, 6.3, 6.7, 6.8, 6.10, 8.2, 9.1, 9.2, 9.4

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

Approved by FSC-IC, July 8, 2010

REQUIREMENT	C/N/C	COMMENT/CAR
<b>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.</b>		
<b>C1.5. Forest management areas should be protected from illegal harvesting, settlement and other unauthorized activities.</b>	C	
1.5.a. The forest owner or manager supports or implements measures intended to prevent illegal and unauthorized activities on the <i>Forest Management Unit</i> (FMU).	C	All County Forests take considerable actions to limit illegal and unauthorized activities in the forest. Observances of gates, berms, road closures and other techniques including posted signs indicating allowed uses. County Forests also mark boundaries in timber sale. Observed effective use of law enforcement specialists to control unauthorized vehicle access.
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	Timber theft and trespass issues on County Forest properties are dealt with locally, and are typically investigated by county law enforcement, DNR forester-rangers, or county forest patrol officers (see attached information).
<b>P2 Long-term tenure and use rights to the land and forest resources shall be clearly defined, documented and legally established.</b>		
<b>C2.3. Appropriate mechanisms shall be employed to resolve disputes over tenure claims and use rights. The circumstances and status of any outstanding disputes will be explicitly considered in the certification evaluation. Disputes of substantial magnitude involving a significant number of interests will normally disqualify an operation from being certified.</b>	C	
2.3.a. If <i>disputes</i> arise regarding tenure claims or use rights then the forest owner or manager initially attempts to resolve them through open communication, negotiation, and/or mediation. If these good-faith efforts fail, then federal, state, and/or local laws are employed to resolve such disputes.	C	Iron County and the Lac Courte Oreilles band of Lake Superior Chippewa are working to resolve a dispute over the legality of a harvest camp established on County Forest. The concern is that the harvesting camp has exceeded the two week maximum stay allowed for such a permit. Attempts are being made to resolve the dispute through open communication.
2.3.b. The forest owner or manager documents any significant disputes over tenure and use rights.	C	The Iron County dispute is being documented. There are no other disputes.
<b>P3 The legal and customary rights of indigenous peoples to own, use and manage their lands, territories, and resources shall be recognized and respected.</b>		
<b>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.</b>	NA	County Forests program does not include any tribal lands.
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.		
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.		
<b>C3.2. Forest management shall not threaten or diminish, either directly or indirectly, the resources or tenure rights of indigenous peoples.</b>	C	
3.2.a. During management planning, the forest owner or manager consults with American Indian groups that have legal rights or other binding agreements to the	C	WCFP sent letters to 11 Tribes (as well as Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission GLFWC) deemed to be potentially interested in management of the County Forests. The letters

<p>FMU to avoid harming their resources or rights.</p>		<p>provided contact information for the County Administrators, described the County Forests, the County Forest planning process, and invited participation on identifying archaeological and cultural resources. Thus, All County Forests have met the minimum requirement for this Indicator. Additionally, All County Forests have participated in cultural resources training that included at least one tribal representative. In 2013 auditors confirmed that Bayfield County maintains ongoing communication, through quarterly meetings, with neighboring Red Cliff Tribe and Forest County has annual meetings with Sokoagon Chippewa Community and Potawatomi Community. Other Counties annual solicit input from Tribes through the annual partnership meetings, for example Price County has been inviting input from the Lake Superior Chippewa Indians annual since 2006.</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>Forest management occurs on an ongoing basis. County Board meetings and forestry committee meetings in which policies for resource management and work plans are set allow for public input, including Native American organizations. The DNR also maintains relationships with local Tribes. 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 County Forests, 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"> <li>A) The Wild Plant Management and Policy Committee (WPMPC)</li> <li>B) Wildlife Management Committees for:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Bear</li> <li>(2) Deer</li> <li>(3) Elk</li> <li>(4) Furbearer</li> <li>(5) Invasives</li> <li>(6) Marten Advisory</li> <li>(7) Migratory Game Bird</li> <li>(7) Pheasant</li> <li>(8) Prairie Grouse</li> <li>(9) Ruffed Grouse / Woodcock</li> <li>(10) Turkey</li> <li>(11) Upland Small Game (Sub-committee of Pheasant Committee)</li> <li>(12) Wildlife Health</li> <li>(13) Wolf</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Timber Sale handbook (page 32-5) requiring a check of the cultural database be included for all County Forest timber sales and that such information be included on the Timber Sale narrative (Form</p>

		2460-1A).
<b>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.</b>	C	
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.	C	Timber Sale handbook (page 32-5) requiring a check of the cultural database be included for all County Forest timber sales and that such information be included on the Timber Sale narrative (Form 2460-1A). All Counties audited in 2013 were found to follow these procedures. Bayfield County holds quarterly meetings with the Red Cliff Tribe. Forestry issues are a standing agenda item at each meeting.
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	Field observations in 2013 indicate that County Staff are aware of and sensitive to cultural resources that may be located on their properties. Measures are taken during field operations to protect known cultural resources and to document locations of newly found sites.
<b>P4 Forest management operations shall maintain or enhance the long-term social and economic well-being of forest workers and local communities.</b>		
<b>C4.1. The communities within, or adjacent to, the forest management area should be given opportunities for employment, training, and other services.</b>	C	
4.1.a. Employee compensation and hiring practices meet or exceed the prevailing <i>local</i> norms within the forestry industry.	C	Employment opportunities at DNR and County Forests are non-discriminatory, including with respect to place of residence. Contractors are obligated to provide equal protection for all employees regardless of whether they are local or non-local. Service providers indicated satisfaction with work conditions and local and non-local conditions are similar. Additional conformance evidence: County Forests distribute bid prospectus to a comprehensive list of potential bidders County Forests intentionally vary sizes of timber sales to allow access to local companies of varying sizes
4.1.b. Forest work is offered in ways that create high quality job opportunities for employees.	C	County and DNR jobs are quality positions with competitive compensation and benefits. The workforce demonstrates a high degree of commitment to their work and to the natural resources that they are charged with managing in the peoples' interest. All County Forests have stable relationships with contractors (e.g., low turnover ratios) indicating satisfaction with the work. Though County employee salaries are typically less than industry, there are other benefits that help offset the differences. There is a long average tenure of DNR and County forestry staff, indicating that the quality of work life (compensation, work hours, job security, intangibles, etc.) is favorable compared to other employment opportunities. County employees interviewed during the 2013 audit expressed a high degree of job satisfaction.
4.1.c. Forest workers are provided with fair wages.	C	Though employee salaries for most County Forests are less than industry, there are other benefits that help offset the differences.
4.1.d. Hiring practices and conditions of employment are non-discriminatory and follow applicable federal, state and local regulations.	C	Employment opportunities at DNR and County Forests are non-discriminatory, including with respect to place of residence. Contractors are obligated to provide equal protection for all employees regardless of whether they are local or non-local.

		Service providers indicated satisfaction with work conditions and local and non-local conditions are similar.
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.	C	County Forests distribute bid prospectus to a comprehensive list of potential bidders. County Forests intentionally vary sizes of timber sales to allow access to local companies of varying sizes
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	County employees reside in small, mid-sized and large communities throughout Wisconsin and the workforce is engaged in civic activities throughout the state both as private citizens in off hours and as DNR and County representatives during work hours. DNR Liaisons and County Forest staff support a large number and wide range of environmental education activities.
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.	C	Annual expenditures on county forest access roads (which are open to all licensed, registered, and inspected motor vehicles) exceed \$293,000. Each year the County Forests offer over \$20 million in timber sales.
<b>C4.2. Forest management should meet or exceed all applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of employees and their families.</b>	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).	C	At All County Forests, compliance with OSHA regulations and other safety considerations are an express element of contracts
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.	C	<p>The loggers working on visited sites in 2013 were knowledgeable and had suitable safety equipment in the immediate vicinity. All logging contractors interviewed had received logger training, such as through FISTA; insurance companies require so it is universal. At All County Forests, compliance with OSHA regulations and other safety considerations are an express element of contracts. OSHA does not apply in the rare instance that a timber sale is purchased and harvested by a sole proprietor. However, the safety measure of FISTA training is required for all operators.</p> <p>DNR and County employees observed on the audit demonstrated a safe working environment. Evidence included hard hats on active logging jobs, seatbelts in vehicles, and appropriate safety training credentials (e.g., FISTA, licensed pesticide applicator, etc).</p> <p>Although there is adequate evidence of measures taken to encourage a safe working environment, logging is inherently dangerous and accidents will happen. Last winter there was a fatal accident on Iron County Forest. A logger was killed by a falling limb while felling a large tree. The limb hit the individual in the back of the neck, and it appears that he died immediately.</p> <p>One fatality reported during last year's audit on Chippewa County Forest. Chippewa County and FISTA put on a safety refresher training session that was attended by approximately 30 loggers in response to this accident.</p>
4.2.c. The forest owner or manager hires well-qualified service providers to safely implement the management plan.		All County Forests have some training safety program for county staff- including safety meetings held at least annually. Safety records, training reports, and certificates are maintained. All

		logger contractors are required to have FISTA training.
<b>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).</b>	C	
4.3.a. Forest workers are free to associate with other workers for the purpose of advocating for their own employment interests.	C	Freedom of association is unambiguously guaranteed for all DNR and County employees. Right to organize is guaranteed by U.S. and State of Wisconsin Law For all employees of contractors, the standard contract requires the contractor to comply with all applicable labor laws; as such, freedom of association is assured.
4.3.b. The forest owner or manager has effective and culturally sensitive mechanisms to resolve disputes between workers and management.	C	For both County and DNR employees, there is a dispute resolution mechanism for its employees, both union and non-union employees.
<b>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.</b>	C	
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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Archeological sites and sites of cultural, historical and community significance (on and off the FMU);</li> <li>• Public resources, including air, water and food (hunting, fishing, collecting);</li> <li>• Aesthetics;</li> <li>• Community goals for forest and natural resource use and protection such as employment, subsistence, recreation and health;</li> <li>• Community economic opportunities;</li> <li>• Other people who may be affected by management operations.</li> </ul> A summary is available to the CB.	C	County forests are managed in close cooperation with the public (e.g., Forestry Committees in each county). Discussions with county and state officials (DNR liaison foresters) during the audit frequently revealed the incorporation of social impacts into management planning and operations. No concise written summary of social impacts is available from county to county, but various summary documents were presented to auditors upon request. At All County Forests, County and DNR field staff members adhere to protocols that entail consultation with the state archeologist. At All County Forests, staff had participated in training sessions for identifying and protecting cultural resources. Special sites such as archeological, cultural and historic sites are effectively and consistently protected with special management designations. Site disturbing land management actions are modified or foregone, as necessary, to avoid adverse impacts to archeological, cultural and historic sites.
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.	C	A process for requesting public input and responding is an integral part of developing the management plans. There is ample opportunity for public consultation during the 15 year planning process, annual work planning processes, and during the monthly Forestry Committee meetings. Additionally, as key issues arise, e.g., access planning, public input is sought through different mechanisms.
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	It is standard procedure to notify adjacent landowners, especially private owners, before any harvest-related operations commence. Form 2460, for pre-harvest assessment, has a check-off for such notification. All County Forests engage in a full and robust array of both formal and informal stakeholder interactions, dialogue and consultation. Policies and practices are highly responsive to the desires and

		<p>expectations of the citizens of each County and the State of Wisconsin.</p> <p>Planned harvest sites are an agenda item at some Monthly Forestry Committee Meetings.</p>
<p>4.4.d. For <b>public forests</b>, consultation shall include the following components:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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;</li> <li>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;</li> <li>3. An accessible and affordable appeals process to planning decisions is available.</li> </ol> <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>	C	<p>All County Forests provide ample opportunity for input in management planning through Monthly Forestry Committee Meetings. Many counties had public meetings specific to the 15-year plan revision. 15-year Plans were distributed widely throughout the State to a broad range of stakeholders. County board meetings and forestry committee meetings in which policies for resource management and work plans are set allow for public input. County Forest administrators are readily accessible to the public, facilitating the evaluation of social impacts.</p>
<p><b>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.</b></p>	C	
<p>4.5.a. The forest owner or manager does not engage in negligent activities that cause damage to other people.</p>	C	<p>No evidence of negligent activity by the Counties visited in 2013 was found by the audit team.</p>
<p>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.</p>	C	<p>DNR and County personnel have a long tradition of maintaining an open and transparent public input and planning process. This process, which occurs at all county forests, helps head off disputes before they become problematic. Counties maintain open dialogue with a wide array of interest groups as well as individuals. Field observation in Bayfield, Ashland, Barron, and Douglas counties indicates this occurs frequently especially in property line boundary disputes.</p>
<p>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.</p>	C	<p>Instances of damage or loss of income caused by the County Forests program are very rare. When such disputes occur, a mitigation and compensation process is used. Towns containing lands enrolled in the WCFP receive payments from the State to offset loss of development and property tax potential from the landbase.</p>
<p><b>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.</b></p>		
<p><b>C5.6. The rate of harvest of forest products shall not exceed levels which can be permanently sustained.</b></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 rationale for determining the size and layout of the planning unit. The sustained yield harvest level calculation is documented in the Management Plan.</p>	C	<p>Although CF management plans do not present details of the method of allowable harvest calculation, they do refer to the Public Forest Lands Handbook, where most of this information is available. Harvest levels are produced for each county, in cooperation with DNR, from WisFIRS. Sustained yields are determined by area, not by volume, and are presented in the management plan, with annual updates. Growth and regeneration data, site index models, soil</p>

<p>The sustained yield harvest level calculation for each planning unit is based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• documented growth rates for particular sites, and/or acreage of forest types, age-classes and species distributions;</li> <li>• mortality and decay and other factors that affect net growth;</li> <li>• areas reserved from harvest or subject to harvest restrictions to meet other management goals;</li> <li>• silvicultural practices that will be employed on the FMU;</li> <li>• management objectives and desired future conditions.</li> </ul> <p>The calculation is made by considering the effects of repeated prescribed harvests on the product/species and its ecosystem, as well as planned management treatments and projections of subsequent regrowth beyond single rotation and multiple re-entries.</p>		<p>classification, and desired future condition all factor into determining when a given stand will be harvested. Counties visited in 2013 were appropriately implementing the area control method for ensuring a sustained yield.</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>	C	<p>Counties visited in 2013 are all at or below their 10 year moving allowable harvest level. 35,605 ac (established sale acres CY12 – rpt.301) vs. 43,235 ac (long term goal - 15 year average –PY12 – rpt.303).Species distribution and balanced age classes have yet to be achieved in many Counties. County Forests are working to adjust age-class distribution., e.g. some County Forests are still treating back-logs. FIA data shows that across the whole County Forest system harvests are approximately 75% of net growth.</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>	C	<p>WisFIRS was designed to do exactly what is described by this indicator. Forest recon and other sources of annual updates inform the adaptive harvest scheduling, modifying desired conditions on the FMU as appropriate for changing conditions. The 2013 audit team visited sites that were salvage harvested after a 2011 wind event in Douglas County. Salvage operations were consistent with the requirement to return stands to desired stocking levels. Examples included maintaining undamaged trees, protecting advanced regeneration, and adhering to BMP’s to protect soil resources.</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>	C	<p>County forest administrators did not report any examples of NTFPs being harvested in commercial quantities. Small-quantities of NTFPs for personal consumption, e.g., firewood, boughs, birch bark, may be taken by the public, but permits are required and recorded.</p>
<p><b>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.</b></p>		
<p><b>C 6.2. Safeguards shall exist which protect rare, threatened and endangered species and their habitats (e.g., nesting and feeding areas). Conservation zones and protection areas shall be established, appropriate to the scale and intensity of forest management and the uniqueness of the affected resources.</b></p>	C	

<p><b>Inappropriate hunting, fishing, trapping, and collecting shall be controlled.</b></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>C</p>	<p>County foresters, in cooperation with numerous experts in DNR, identify the likely presence of RTE species in three steps: (1) a listing of known species at the time of the comprehensive management plan, (2) at annual interdisciplinary meetings where harvest plans are reviewed, and (3) at the pre-harvest (Form 2460) assessment and prescription, where endangered resources ecologists would contribute if there were evidence of a listed species. At all steps, the Natural Heritage Inventory (NHI) database is consulted. The 2013 audit team found that all County personnel were correctly filling out the Form 2460 and contacting appropriate personnel when an RTE species "hit" was located in or adjacent to a planned sale.</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. <b>Conservation zones</b> and/or <b>protected areas</b> are established for RTE species, including those S3 species that are considered rare, where they are necessary to maintain or improve the short and long-term viability of the species. Conservation measures are based on relevant science, guidelines and/or consultation with relevant, independent experts as necessary to achieve the conservation goal of the Indicator.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The interdisciplinary approach to protected RTE species and their habitat described above, 6.2.a, assures that appropriate conservation measures are taken. A number of such examples were seen on field audits: American marten, red-shouldered hawks, two threatened plant species. Conservation zones also are established for certain species, such as Kirtland's warbler.</p>
<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>	<p>C</p>	<p>County forests engage in management to meet the recovery goals of threatened species, just as would be expected in state forest lands. Examples mentioned during audit: Karner blue butterfly, golden-winged warbler (young forest) and Kirtland's warbler (jack pine forest). DNR wildlife biologists work with liaison foresters and county forest administrators to plan and carry out projects for wildlife habitat improvement. Funding of \$.05/ acre is provided to county forests by the DNR to perform habitat improvement work. Additionally, individual biologists, foresters, and county forest administrators pursue additional projects for the benefit of wildlife at a local level. Some recent examples of efforts to benefit wildlife include: Young Forest Initiative, barrens restoration and management, grouse/woodcock habitat, turkey habitat, etc. Projects are often conducted in partnership with other groups including ruffed grouse society, wild turkey federation, USFWS, etc.</p>
<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>	<p>C</p>	<p>Again, close cooperation with DNR assures the control of hunting, fishing, and trapping in the context of this indicator. However, some county foresters have expressed concern about DNR's management of the white-tailed deer population at densities that threaten the natural reproduction of some forest communities. See observation 2013 #2.</p>
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>6.3.a.1. The forest owner or manager maintains, enhances, and/or restores under-represented <b>successional</b> stages in the FMU that would naturally</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Counties visited in 2013 have active management plans to maintain and restore hemlock and pine barren habitats. Bayfield County has a long-term Barnes Barrens Management plan to</p>

<p>occur on the types of sites found on the FMU. Where old growth of different community types that would naturally occur on the forest are under-represented in the landscape relative to natural conditions, a portion of the forest is managed to enhance and/or restore old growth characteristics.</p>		<p>convert a large area to a moving mosaic of barrens habitat. The Counties are participating with the USFWS to shear decadent alder habitat to provide early successional habitat for wildlife species (e.g., American woodcock and golden-winged warbler). See also C6.10.</p>
<p>6.3.a.2. When a <i>rare ecological community</i> 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, <i>conservation zones</i> and/or <i>protected areas</i> are established where warranted.</p>	C	<p>If a rare ecological community is present on a county forest, it would be identified in the NHI database. This database is searched for rare elements in the planning of management activities on county forests. If an NHI hit is found, an appropriate biologist/ecologist is consulted and the site is protected as appropriate, usually by buffers or by limiting harvest to the winter season. New in 2013 is the soon to be released habitat plan for the American Marten. WI DNR continues to add habitat management plans for special concern species in the State.</p>
<p>6.3.a.3. When they are present, management maintains the area, structure, composition, and processes of all <i>Type 1</i> and <i>Type 2 old growth</i>. 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 appropriate).</p> <p>On American Indian lands, timber harvest may be permitted in Type 1 and Type 2 old growth in recognition of their sovereignty and unique ownership. Timber harvest is permitted in situations where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Old growth forests comprise a significant portion of the tribal ownership.</li> <li>2. A history of forest stewardship by the tribe exists.</li> <li>3. High Conservation Value Forest attributes are maintained.</li> <li>4. Old-growth structures are maintained.</li> </ol>	C	<p>Counties visited in 2013 did not have any Type 1 or Type 2 old growth on county forests.</p>

<p>5. Conservation zones representative of old growth stands are established.</p> <p>6. Landscape level considerations are addressed.</p> <p>7. Rare species are protected.</p>		
<p>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>	C	<p>County forests management plan goals are ecologically oriented and management is conducted to maintain ecological habitat conditions that are suited to each site. These decisions are aided by the habitat classification that is done in the reconnaissance inventory for each site (however see Observation 2013 #1). County forests visited in 2013 are likely to allow natural regeneration and succession to occur on the site. For example, old pine plantations will be allowed to succeed to hardwoods where natural regeneration allows.</p>
<p>6.3.c. Management maintains, enhances and/or restores the plant and wildlife habitat of <b>Riparian Management Zones (RMZs)</b> to provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) habitat for aquatic species that breed in surrounding uplands;</li> <li>b) habitat for predominantly terrestrial species that breed in adjacent <b>aquatic habitats</b>;</li> <li>c) habitat for species that use riparian areas for feeding, cover, and travel;</li> <li>d) habitat for plant species associated with riparian areas; and,</li> <li>e) stream shading and inputs of wood and leaf litter into the adjacent aquatic ecosystem.</li> </ul>	C	<p>The four Counties visited in 2013 did an excellent job at protecting water resources during forest harvest.</p> <p>Revisions to the Wisconsin Best Management Practices For Water Quality took effect in January 2011; these specify additional protection for all wetlands, particularly seasonal wetlands, many of which are small but some of which are ecologically significant; foresters and loggers are aware of these provisions and work to implement them.</p> <p>Water quality considerations including lakes or rivers potentially affected by the harvest are documented for each proposed harvest on a Form 2460, "Timber Sale Notice and Cutting Report" and this information is reflected in the harvesting requirements within the timber sale contracts.</p> <p>Sale and/or harvest unit boundaries are designed to avoid or buffer wetlands, stream, lakes, and other water bodies. Riparian buffers associated with harvests are shown on maps and marked on the ground. Confirmed by field observations that non-forested wetlands are protected by excluding them from sales where possible, and by buffering them using special colors of paint to indicate "no harvest" or "no equipment," or by not marking any trees for harvest. Very small non-forested wetlands are generally protected; loggers try to avoid these, and foresters work to communicate their locations, but some are entered on occasion. Many sites with significant areas of included wetlands (forested and/or non-forested) are designated for winter harvest only. Confirmed from field audits from all four counties visited that foresters are knowledgeable of the BMP requirements to protect these wetland elements and are doing an excellent job of implementing them on harvest sites.</p>
<p><b>Stand-scale Indicators</b></p> <p>6.3.d Management practices maintain or enhance plant species composition, distribution and frequency of occurrence similar to those that would naturally occur on the site.</p>	C	<p>County forest management plans and pre-harvest assessments clearly reflect an emphasis on importance of site conditions and naturally occurring species. Foresters are well aware of growing the right species for the right sites. See also C6.10.</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. <b>Native species</b> suited to the site are normally selected</p>	C	<p>Counties regularly buy trees from the state nurseries. Some Counties have begun purchasing container stock from a private nursery in Canada, however, local seed of known provenance is used in all cases. As far as the auditors could determine, no counties are planting non-native species. (see attached addendum for specific information).</p>

for regeneration.		
<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:</p> <p>a) large live trees, live trees with decay or declining health, <b>snags</b>, and well-distributed coarse down and dead woody material. <b>Legacy trees</b> where present are not harvested; and</p> <p>b) vertical and horizontal complexity.</p> <p>Trees selected for <b>retention</b> are generally representative of the dominant species found on the site.</p>	C	<p>County personnel employ statewide silvicultural guidelines for retaining structural diversity in even-aged management systems. County personnel attended training to gain understanding and application of the new green tree retention standards. Based on recent revisions to the marking and retention chapter in the Silviculture Handbook, foresters are marking more leave trees (individual) and painting off more pockets or clumps of leave trees, especially around wetlands. Staff were aware of the new legacy tree requirement and are incorporating that feature in their green tree retention. Northern hardwood selection harvest sites visited in 2013 showed compliance with leaving cavity and legacy trees and snags during harvest. (see attached addendum).</p>
<p>6.3.g.1 In the Southeast, Appalachia, Ozark-Ouachita, Mississippi Alluvial Valley, and Pacific Coast Regions, when <b>even-aged systems</b> are employed, and during salvage harvests, live trees and other native vegetation are retained within the harvest unit as described in Appendix C for the applicable region.</p> <p>In the Lake States Northeast, Rocky Mountain and Southwest Regions, when even-aged silvicultural systems are employed, and during salvage harvests, live trees and other native vegetation are retained within the harvest unit in a proportion and configuration that is consistent with the characteristic natural disturbance regime unless retention at a lower level is necessary for the purposes of restoration or rehabilitation. See Appendix C for additional regional requirements and guidance.</p>	C	<p>County foresters routinely retain green trees in a harvest by prescription and by marking wildlife trees. In addition, native vegetation is retained in riparian buffers and in retention islands. In Bayfield County, leave trees are not retained in pine sites that will be aerially herbicided due to safety concerns of helicopter operations and planting ease.</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"> <li>1. Is developed by qualified experts in ecological and/or related fields (wildlife biology, hydrology, landscape ecology, forestry/silviculture).</li> <li>2. Is based on the totality of the <b>best available information</b> including peer-reviewed science regarding natural disturbance regimes for the FMU.</li> <li>3. Is spatially and temporally explicit and includes maps of proposed openings or areas.</li> <li>4. Demonstrates that the variations will result in equal or greater benefit to wildlife, water quality, and other values compared to the normal opening size limits, including for sensitive and rare species.</li> <li>5. Is reviewed by independent experts in wildlife biology, hydrology, and landscape ecology, to confirm the preceding findings.</li> </ol>	NA	<p>There are no opening size limits for the Lake States-Central Hardwood region.</p>
<p>6.3.h. The forest owner or manager assesses the risk of, prioritizes, and, as warranted, develops and</p>	C	<p>All counties visited in 2013 have strong programs to limit the introduction and spread of exotic plants. Logging equipment is</p>

<p>implements a strategy to prevent or control <b>invasive species</b>, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. a method to determine the extent of invasive species and the degree of threat to native species and ecosystems;</li> <li>2. implementation of management practices that minimize the risk of invasive establishment, growth, and spread;</li> <li>3. eradication or control of established invasive populations when feasible: and,</li> <li>4. monitoring of control measures and management practices to assess their effectiveness in preventing or controlling invasive species.</li> </ol>		<p>cleaned before harvest is initiated, staff are trained on invasive species, and surveys were completed to document invasive species locations. Counties monitor the effectiveness of their control measures and routinely make changes to methodology to control invasive species.</p> <p>Audit team visited one site in Douglas County where Japanese knotweed had been found and subsequently treated. Additionally, Ashland County identified garlic mustard in one area on the County Forest and effectively controlled it through herbicide treatments.</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>	<p>C</p>	<p>Counties use prescribed fire in wildlife management work to maintain open habitat characteristics of lowland and upland habitat. Prescribed fires are planned and controlled to meet safety and risk requirements. Beyond controlled fires, county foresters are often trained fire fighters and cooperate with DNR in preventing and controlling wildfires.</p> <p>Records for County Forests are not readily available centrally but these numbers are statewide:                  Prescribed burns-361 for around 13,800 ac                  Wildfires - 498 for 8304 acres.</p>
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>6.7.a. The forest owner or manager, and employees and contractors, have the equipment and training necessary to respond to hazardous spills</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Logging contractors have awareness of spill clean-up procedures. Timber sale contracts include provisions for proper off-site disposal of fluids such as motor oil and hydraulic fluid. Contract loggers interviewed in 2013 had training (FISTA) and proper equipment for hazardous spills.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Timber sale contracts include provisions for proper off-site disposal of fluids such as motor oil and hydraulic fluid. Interviews of loggers confirmed off-site disposal and spill containment procedures are adhered to.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>No instances of leaks or mis-management of hazardous materials were observed by the 2013 audit team.</p>
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>6.8.a. Use of <b>biological control agents</b> are used only as part of a pest management strategy for the control of invasive plants, <b>pathogens</b>, insects, or other animals when other pest control methods are ineffective, or are expected to be ineffective. Such use is contingent upon</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>County Forests are successfully employing biological control of purple loosestrife, gypsy moth, and spotted knapweed. All releases of biological control agents follow U.S. Dept. of Agriculture regulations and protocols.</p>

peer-reviewed scientific evidence that the agents in question are non-invasive and are safe for native species.		
6.8.b. If biological control agents are used, they are applied by trained workers using proper equipment.	C	Biological control agents are applied by County and or DNR staff that have been trained to release them (primarily insects).
6.8.c. If biological control agents are used, their use shall be documented, monitored and strictly 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.	C	Staff follow and adhere to known and documented protocols for releasing and growing biological control agents.
6.8.d. Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) are not used for any purpose	C	No use of GMOs was found by the 2013 audit team.
<b>C6.10. Forest conversion to plantations or non-forest land uses shall not occur, except in circumstances where conversion:</b> <b>a) Entails a very limited portion of the forest management unit; and b) Does not occur on High Conservation Value Forest areas; and c) Will enable clear, substantial, additional, secure, long-term conservation benefits across the forest management unit.</b>	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 to non-forested areas primarily restricted to prairie restoration and large grassland management areas for specific desired habitat conditions (ie. Sharptailed- grouse).
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 c are related and all need to be conformed with for conversion to be allowed).	C	No conversions were found in the four Counties audited in 2013.
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	Conversion of forested (pine) to non-forested (open lands) will occur in pine barrens management (Bayfield County and others). This conversion is not permanent-the open lands habitat type is a successional stage of barrens land management. This likely does not meet the FSC definition of conversion to non-forest land-use.
6.10.d Natural or semi-natural stands are not converted to plantations. Degraded, semi-natural stands may be converted to restoration plantations.	NA	As part of the large Barnes Barrens management plan in Bayfield County, some jack pine stands outside the management area will be converted to red pine and some red pine plantations within the management area will be managed for jack pine. This will allow for a large continuous block of barrens in a floating mosaic of successional stages in one area. This management plan will benefit several species of conservation need in Wisconsin including the sharp-tailed grouse. This does not meet the definition of conversion of natural/ semi-natural stands to plantations, but qualifies as a justified type-conversion under C6.3.
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	NA	See 6.10.d above

Criterion 7.1.l)		
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	No such conversion has occurred.
<p><b>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.</b></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>		
<b>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.</b>	C	
8.2.a.1. For all commercially harvested products, an inventory system is maintained. The inventory system includes at a minimum: a) species, b) volumes, c) stocking, d) regeneration, and e) stand and forest composition and structure; and f) timber quality.	C	WisFIRS is a comprehensive system for guiding the reconnaissance and inventory of forest compartments as well as for scheduling harvest and other management options of stands. All of the elements listed in this indicator are included in compartment reconnaissance (Public Forest Lands Handbook).
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.	C	Data on any such losses would be gathered by a special recon inventory and entered into WisFIRS before annual updates of harvest scheduling. Observed use of WisFIRS at Douglas County to quantify removal and loss after large blowdown event.
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.	C	Careful records are kept of harvested timber and entered into WisFIRS before annual updates on harvest scheduling. Records for harvest of NTFPs are maintained for firewood and for any products harvested by members of tribes.
8.2.c. The forest owner or manager periodically obtains data needed to monitor presence on the FMU of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Rare, threatened and endangered species and/or their <i>habitats</i>;</li> <li>2) Common and rare plant communities and/or habitat;</li> <li>3) Location, presence and abundance of invasive species;</li> <li>4) Condition of protected areas, set-asides and buffer zones;</li> <li>5) High Conservation Value Forests (see Criterion 9.4).</li> </ol>	C	Most of these data are collected and maintained by personnel with Bureaus of Wildlife and Endangered Resources. Results of such monitoring are made available to county forest managers during periodic meetings of interdisciplinary teams and/or during review of proposed management operations. Observed closer cooperation between County Forest and Endangered Resources related to establishment of Flat Lake SNA as well as follow-up data sharing related to forest management of adjacent area.

<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>County and DNR foresters indicated that they visit active harvest operations 2-3 times a week; assessment forms are in writing and were inspected during the field audit.</p>
<p>8.2.d.2. A monitoring program is in place to assess the condition and environmental impacts of the forest-road system.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>County Forest plans require annual reports and annual work plans. Work plans routinely report on the system of forest roads and make annual requests for road improvements and maintenance.</p>
<p>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).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Administrators of county forests and their colleagues are active members of communities in the counties where they work, have offices interspersed with other county officials, and purchase most of their equipment and supplies locally. Thus, indirect monitoring of local and socioeconomic activity is ongoing.</p>
<p>8.2.d.4. Stakeholder responses to management activities are monitored and recorded as necessary.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>County forest administrators appear to be in very close communication with their publics. Regular meetings with Forestry and Recreation Committees, with formal minutes, are held in each county. Members of the public are encouraged to attend.</p>
<p>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).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Communication with tribal representatives is on-going, assuring that any opportunities for joint monitoring of cultural sites are made available to tribes.</p>
<p>8.2.e. The forest owner or manager monitors the costs and revenues of management in order to assess productivity and efficiency.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>As public lands, financial management of county forests is closely monitored both by county officials and state officials, the result of substantial cost-sharing by DNR.</p>
<p><b>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.</b></p> <p><b>High Conservation Value Forests are those that possess one or more of the following attributes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>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</b></li> <li><b>b) Forest areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems</b></li> <li><b>c) Forest areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g., watershed protection, erosion control)</b></li> <li><b>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).</b></li> </ul>		
<p><b>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.</b></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>Many County Forests have identified and are conserving forest types/areas that qualify as HCVF, e.g., Karner Blue, barrens communities, State Natural Areas, scenic river ways, ice age trail, bluffs, hemlock, white pine communities, etc.</p> <p>County Forest system as a whole, was built from a highly denuded landscape, and as a result contains low amounts of pristine/unique forests</p> <p><i>De facto</i> HCVF have been identified and protected in many County Forests- through forester's knowledge of unique types and stands and a management approach that maintains those unique qualities.</p> <p>NHI database is checked during planning for all timber sales and significant projects.</p>

		<p>Examples of HCVF observed on this audit include: Hemlock stands in Ashland County &amp; barrens in Bayfield County.</p> <p>The identification of HCVF is completed by both the State of Wisconsin Natural Areas program in collaboration with local County foresters-HCVF identification does comply with the FSC HCVF classification system. They completed quite a bit of this work before they were certified, and each protected site does fit into one or more of the FSC HCVF categories.</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.	C	The Natural Areas Program conducted a coarse level survey of the County Forest system for HCVF. County Forests have also identified their own special sites that they have become familiar with through the long history of surveying (RECON).
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.	C	County management plans have results of the HCVF assessment, a list of HCVF stands and management goals for each HCVF.
<b>C9.2. The consultative portion of the certification process must place emphasis on the identified conservation attributes, and options for the maintenance thereof.</b>	C	
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 their HCV attributes have been adopted.	C	Experts outside of the County Forest program, primarily BER, are used extensively Forestry committee meetings and the 15-year planning process are used to gain public input on all of County Forest management
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.	C	The Natural Areas Program provides guidance on the identification and proposed management of HCVF stands. Stakeholders have several ways to provide input in this process at the State level and also when County plans and annual updates are available for review and comment.
<b>C9.4. Annual monitoring shall be conducted to assess the effectiveness of the measures employed to maintain or enhance the applicable conservation attributes.</b>	C	
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.	C	Monitoring of HCVF on SNAs is a major goal of the SNA program, and is required by the state legislature. 25-30% of SNA are formally monitored each year (detailed monitoring form examined during audit), but other sites are monitored informally by a combination of DNR (including SNA) personnel and county foresters.

(C.1.5) Have there been any illegal harvesting, settlement, or unauthorized activities on the FMU? If so, please provide details and what progress has been made in addressing any illegal and unauthorized activities.

Ashland	None
Barron	None
Bayfield	None
Chippewa	None
Clark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unauthorized firewood cutting, gathering- The occurrence of unauthorized firewood cutting and gathering has been around for many</li> </ul>

	<p>years. Its occurrence usually increases during the winter months and during periods of high home fuel prices. Clark County does offer firewood cutting permits to the general public. Department foresters are trained to identify unauthorized cutting and enlist local law enforcement if needed. The problem is very “hit or miss”. It is hard to catch offenders as the location and time of occurrence are very random.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unauthorized garbage dumping- The prevalence of garbage dumping is similar to the unauthorized firewood gathering. The patterns of occurrence are again very random.</li> </ul>
Douglas	<p>Yes. We have dealt with a few minor timber trespass type cases where adjoining landowners have inadvertently harvested trees off CFL or firewood gathers had no permit (none in 2012). We have also dealt with numerous encroachment type situations over the past few years.</p>
Eau Claire	<p><u>Illegal off road use by ATV's and other motorized vehicles:</u> New berms and gates have been constructed along with posting of new warning signs.</p> <p><u>Illegal dumping of garbage and waste:</u> New berms and gates have been constructed along with posting of new warning signs.</p>
Florence	<p>Yes, one timber trespass was discovered. The area was surveyed and an estimate of volume and value was conducted. As part of discussions with the landowner a deal was made. The landowner granted an easement to the County across his land to access a 200+ acre area of county forest that was previously land locked. This is for management purposes.</p>
Forest	<p>1) One illegal road use. Resolved with written warning and restoration of road.</p>
Iron	<p>Yes. A group of people organized by the Lac Courte Oreille Band of Chippewa have been living on the county forest all summer. In May, the forestry committee authorized me to work with corporation counsel to develop a permit to allow them to camp for up to one year. In the process of doing this, it became clear to us that this would not only violate county ordinance, but also violate our own 15 year plan and county forest law. A letter was sent to the tribe explaining the situation, and an alternative of applying for a large group gathering permit was offered. No response was received despite continued verbal communication between forestry staff and the camp. In July, the forestry committee recommended that the full county board seek criminal and civil charges against the illegal village. The recommendation was tabled at the county board meeting to allow for further negotiations with the tribe.</p>
Jackson	<p>Jackson County monitors for and enforces violations for unauthorized use such as illegal deer stands, baiting and garbage dumping, etc as they are discovered during the course of routine work.</p>
Juneau	<p>No illegal harvesting. One case of firewood gathering was observed over the permit level and was addressed by direct contact and prohibiting further permits for firewood gathering from the individual for the year. No settlements or unauthorized activities observed on the FMU.</p>
Lincoln	No
Oconto	None
Price	Minor cases involving gathering of miscellaneous forest products without

	permits. Tickets were issued by local law enforcement. Illegal tree stand use. The tree stand ordinance will be changed in 2013 to address the problems.
Sawyer	No
Taylor	No
Washburn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Snowmobile Trail illegal vehicle use: committee approved to pursue restitution for damages (5 hours dozer time to repair damages). Still pursuing with aid of county sheriff's office.</li> <li>• Adverse possession case brought to court. Court ruled in favor of county.</li> <li>• Fence discovered on County property was relocated onto correct property line location.</li> </ul>
Wood	None

(C.2.3) Have there been any new disputes over tenure claims or use rights since the last FSC evaluation? Please describe the nature of any new disputes, including pertinent contacts. What progress has been made to resolve?

Ashland	No
Barron	None
Bayfield	None
Chippewa	No
Clark	None
Douglas	None
Eau Claire	Proposed land trade by Mike Lea with Eau Claire County: Complaint was made by a member of the public that Mike Lea was using CFL as a docking area for his watercraft. Mike Lea assumed he owned the property from his survey. Property was examined by Eau Claire County and found out it was not Mike's property but indeed CFL. Mike then proposed to trade double his own land to obtain the rights to the CFL. Proposal was then evaluated by Eau Claire County staff and DNR and taken to committee. After public input session and further evaluation by DNR staff the proposal never happened and Mike Lea removed his property off of CFL.
Florence	No
Forest	One cabin was determined to be on County Forest Land during a routine survey. The land owner was contacted, a land sale and withdrawal was authorized by the County Forestry Committee. Final action has not been taken at this time. Will be resolved in next 6 to 12 months
Iron	No disputes
Jackson	When encroachments onto the Jackson County Forest are noted, steps are taken to resolve the situation. In 2012 one land trade was completed to resolve encroachment (Ellis).
Juneau	No such disputes or claims.
Lincoln	No
Oconto	None
Price	No
Sawyer	No
Taylor	No
Washburn	None

Wood	None
------	------

(C.6.3) What seed sources have been used in artificial regeneration during the past year? Please include information on local and non-local seed sources. For any non-local sources, please provide justification for their use.

Ashland	None
Barron	None
Bayfield	All seed used in the artificial regeneration program have come from local sources----- either NW Wisconsin or NE Minnesota
Chippewa	None
Clark	Clark county plants containerized planting stock grown by a private nursery. Most of the seed used to grow our seedlings is sourced within the Great Lakes region, often from sources used and maintained by private forest industry. Clark County has experienced some difficulty in sourcing local seed from WIDNR nurseries to be used in growing our containerized seedlings. We did manage to obtain, after considerable effort, Tamarack seed from WIDNR in 2013 to sow our Tamarack containerized stock.
Douglas	2012 Spring Planting – Jack Pine seed collected from northern WI, MN, MI zone (local WI collection) 2013 Spring Planting – Jack Pine seed collected from northern MN, USDA climate zone 3b
Eau Claire	a.) Jack Pine Seed from WDNR Nursery b.) 3-0 Non Containerized Red Pine from Paint Creek Nursery located in Eau Claire County for spot planting along cross country ski tr
Florence	WDNR nursery and PRT stock
Forest	None
Iron	None
Jackson	Jackson County purchase seedlings from Wisconsin DNR and PRT of Canada. Canada seed source are from Climate Zone 3b and Wisconsin.
Juneau	Only local seedlings and jack pine seed from the Wisconsin DNR Griffith Nursery, in Wisconsin Rapids, has been used in artificial regeneration projects on the Juneau County Forest
Lincoln	Planting stock comes from the Griffith State Nursery.
Oconto	None
Price	None
Sawyer	None
Taylor	None
Washburn	No direct seeding in 2012. Planted 64 acres PR and 170 acres PJ, all from (Griffith?) WI state nursery system.
Wood	WDNR Jack Pine seed

(C.6.9) Describe any monitoring or control activities of invasive, exotic species since the last evaluation.

Ashland	We continue to monitor for invasives while we are setting up timber sales and while doing trail work. We address any that are found immediately. We have one ongoing project with Garlic Mustard that has been going for 6 years now.
Barron	Areas are observed during timber sale set-up, trail maintenance and regular visits

	on the county forest. No invasives observed to date. If and when invasives are observed, BMP's for Invasives will be implemented.
Bayfield	invasives are noted during routine road inspections, where mowing is timed to reduce the potential for spread (primarily for spotted knapweed). We also look for invasives during timber sale establishment, recon, and regen monitoring. Last year we found and recorded 3 small patches of black locust, as well as an area of common buckthorn. Two of the black locust patches were cut and stump treated with Transline
Chippewa	UW Superior, working under DNR oversight, initiated an invasive species survey/inventory that has continued in 2013. Chippewa County has been monitoring an area that contains garlic mustard. Staff conducts a thorough visual examination of areas that previously contained garlic mustard and closely examines adjacent areas to identify any areas where garlic mustard has spread. These areas are identified with ribbon and are then all treated with glyphosate. The garlic mustard has been contained within the area and appears to be decreasing in the number of plants. The County Forest Administrator and Forest & Trails Maintenance Technician obtained Commercial Pesticide Applicator licensure from DATCP this spring.
Clark	Clark County continues to monitor and control invasive and exotic species as noted in the last evaluation. In addition we have expanded our efforts to include the ATV trail system as well as various recreational sites. Monitoring is done while conducting other management activities, as well as intensive yearly surveys of known problem areas. Control is conducted at appropriate times of the year and includes both chemical and cultural control methods i.e. physical removal.
Douglas	Invasive monitoring/observances have been incorporated into the recon program. Invasives are now also further covered in the timber sale narrative document and timber sale contract. We have mechanically removed invasive plants species from our County Park System, released beetles for the purpose of controlling invasive plants, and chemically treated one outbreak.
Eau Claire	Large-scale invasive inventory of majority of county forestland and road system done by Beaver Creek Reserve and the University of Eau Claire Biology Department. Guidance was provided by the Eau Claire County Forester and DNR.
Florence	We continue to educate our staff for invasive and are constantly on the lookout for exotics. No control has occurred
Forest	Two garlic mustard patch (currently .6 acres) was found in the fall of 2012. It was sprayed late season (mid to late October 2012). Site was inspected June of 2013. Mature plants were pulled and immature plants were treated with roundup again. Will check and spray August 2013 and May or June 2014.
Iron	Staff, local residents, and Iron County Land and Water Department continue to monitor for invasives on ICF property.
Jackson	Forestry inventory includes exotic species monitoring. In 2012 5 acres of Buckthorn was sprayed
Juneau	Small patches of garlic mustard in Kennedy Park (part of Juneau County Forest) were hand pulled and disposed of. Monitoring of patches continues.
Lincoln	GIS layer is maintained for known invasive plant occurrences. Areas are sprayed

	and monitored for control.
Oconto	Continue to monitor for invasives when out in the field for any activity, especially in timber sale setup and administration
Price	Buckthorn control consisting of cutting and stump treatment with Element 4 in County Parks and along County Forest roads. Project Forester noted locations of invasive species on GPS while conducting a survey corner monument project. Project Forester treated invasives where feasible. Signs have been posted at boat landings regarding aquatic invasives
Sawyer	Every stand evaluated for timber sale or recon updated is evaluated for presence and level of invasive species if present
Taylor	We monitor for invasive species during forest recon and timber sale establishment.
Washburn	Investigated one infestation of buckthorn (~35 acres). Control activities planned for 2013.
	Monitoring – routine recon and timber sale establishment
Wood	Control – No specific activities

## Appendix 6 – Chain of Custody Indicators for FMEs

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

### PURCHASING AND PROCESSING PRACTICES

Since your last audit, has your company begun to purchase any FSC certified material (e.g. logs or lumber) and pass that material on to the customer with an FSC claim?  Yes  No

Explain:

Have you added any primary or secondary wood processing facilities located within the FMU or otherwise associated with the Forest Management Organization since your last audit?  Yes  No  
*E.g., facilities may include a chipping operation, portable or permanent sawmill, veneer mill, pulp mill, etc.*

If yes, please describe the facility associated with the forest management unit under assessment:  
*Please include location, size, type of operation and owners.*

## Appendix 7 – FMUs

See section 7, where County Forests reported all current members.