

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

---

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

SCS-FM/COC-00083G

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

Douglas.Brown@wisconsin.gov

<http://www.wisconsincountyforests.com>

CERTIFIED	EXPIRATION
22 December 2014	21 December 2019

DATE OF FIELD EVALUATION
7-10 August 2018
DATE OF LAST UPDATE
6 November 2018

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 evaluations				
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <sup>st</sup> annual evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <sup>nd</sup> annual evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <sup>rd</sup> annual evaluation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4 <sup>th</sup> annual evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/> Other ( <i>expansion of scope, Major CAR audit, special audit, etc.</i> ):
Name of Forest Management Enterprise (FME) and abbreviation used in this report:				
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources – County Forest Program (WCFP or FME)				

All certificates issued by SCS under the aegis of the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) require annual evaluations 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 evaluations are not intended to comprehensively examine the full scope of the certified forest operations, as the cost of a full-scope evaluation would be prohibitive and it is not mandated by FSC evaluation protocols. Rather, annual evaluations 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 evaluation);
- Follow-up inquiry into any issues that may have arisen since the award of certification or prior to this evaluation; 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 evaluation.

### 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 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 evaluation. Section B contains more detailed results and information for required FSC record-keeping or the use by the FME.

## Table of Contents

---

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY .....	4
1. GENERAL INFORMATION .....	4
1.1 Evaluation Team.....	4
1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation .....	4
1.3 Standards Used .....	5
2. CERTIFICATION EVALUATION PROCESS .....	5
2.1 Evaluation Itinerary, Activities, and Site Notes.....	5
2.2 Evaluation of Management Systems .....	12
3. CHANGES IN MANAGEMENT PRACTICES .....	13
4. RESULTS OF EVALUATION .....	13
4.1 Definitions of Major CARs, Minor CARs and Observations.....	13
4.2 History of Findings for Certificate Period.....	13
4.3 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations .....	15
4.4 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations .....	20
5. STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS .....	21
5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted .....	22
5.2 Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Evaluation Team Responses .....	22
6. CERTIFICATION DECISION .....	23
7. ANNUAL DATA UPDATE .....	23
SECTION B – APPENDICES (CONFIDENTIAL).....	35
Appendix 1 – List of FMUs Selected for Evaluation .....	35
Appendix 2 – Staff and Stakeholders Consulted.....	35
Appendix 3 – Additional Evaluation Techniques Employed .....	37
Appendix 4 – Pesticide Derogations .....	37
Appendix 5 – Forest Management Standard Conformance Table .....	37
Appendix 6 – Chain of Custody Indicators for FMEs Conformance Table .....	76
Appendix 7 – Trademark Standard Conformance Table.....	81
Appendix 8 – Group Management Program.....	86

## SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY

### 1. General Information

#### 1.1 Evaluation Team

<b>Auditor name:</b>	Stefan A. Bergmann	<b>Auditor role:</b>	Lead Auditor
<b>Qualifications:</b>	Mr. Bergmann has been in the forestry and wood products field for 15 years, working across the US in forest policy, landowner extension, executive leadership, and forest certification. Prior to joining SCS in July 2017, he worked for Rainforest Alliance, overseeing the Forest Stewardship Council® (FSC®) Forest Management auditing program in the US. He has successfully completed FSC Forest Management Lead Auditor training, ISO 9001 Lead Auditor training, and is qualified to be a team SFI Auditor. He has served as lead and team auditors on numerous FSC FM audits. He holds a BS in Wildlife Science and an MS in Forest Resources, both from Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon, USA, and is pursuing an MBA at the University of California Davis.		
<b>Auditor name:</b>	Shannon Wilks	<b>Auditor role:</b>	Team Auditor
<b>Qualifications:</b>	Mr. Wilks has over 23 years of professional experience in the forest products industry. His responsibilities included supply chain management, contract negotiations, and environmental management system compliance. He has also managed industrial properties with land management functions. Mr. Wilks completed Forest Stewardship Council® (FSC®) Forest Management Lead Auditor training, FSC Chain of Custody Lead Auditor training, and ISO 19011 training. He has been a lead auditor for Sustainable Forestry Initiative-Fiber Sourcing, technical expert for Sustainable Biomass Program, and team auditor for FSC Forest Management. Mr. Wilks is a graduate of Louisiana Tech University with a Bachelor of Science-Forest Management degree.		
<b>Auditor name:</b>	Mike Ferrucci	<b>Auditor role:</b>	Team Auditor
<b>Qualifications:</b>	Mike is a founding partner and President of Interforest, LLC where he is responsible for the assembly and management of integrated teams of scientists and professional managers to solve complex forestry problems. He is also responsible for the firm’s forest certification program, which includes SFI and FSC certification and preparation services. Mike is also the SFI Program Manager for NSF – International Strategic Registrations and is responsible for all aspects of the firm’s SFI Certification programs. He has a B.Sc. degree in forestry from the University of Maine and a Master of Forestry degree from the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies. Mike has 27 years of forest management experience. He has conducted or participated in assessments of forest management on more than 14 million acres of forestland in 27 states.		

#### 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. Number of days spent by any technical experts (in addition to amount in line A):	0
D. Additional days spent on preparation, stakeholder consultation, and follow-up:	3

<b>E. Total number of person days used in evaluation:</b>	<b>12</b>
---	-----------

### 1.3 Standards Used

All standards used are available on the websites of FSC International ([www.fsc.org](http://www.fsc.org)) or SCS Global Services ([www.SCSglobalServices.com](http://www.SCSglobalServices.com)). All standards are available on request from SCS Global Services via the comment form on our website. When no national standard exists for the country/region, SCS Interim Standards are developed by modifying SCS’s Generic Interim Standard to reflect forest management in the region and by incorporating relevant components of any Draft Regional/National Standard and comments from stakeholders. More than one month prior to the start of the field evaluation, SCS Draft Interim Standards are provided to stakeholders identified by FSC International, SCS, forest managers under evaluation, and the FSC National or Regional Office for comment. SCS’s COC indicators for FMEs are based on the most current versions of the FSC Chain of Custody Standard, FSC Standard for Group Entities in Forest Management Groups (FSC-STD-30-005), and FSC Accreditation Requirements.

Standards used <i>NOTE: Please include the full standard name and Version number and check all that apply.</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Forest Stewardship Standard(s), including version: C V1.0, approved 8 July 2010
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SCS COC indicators for FMEs, V7-0
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FSC Trademark Standard (FSC-STD-50-001 V2-0)
	<input type="checkbox"/> FSC standard for group entities in forest management groups (FSC-STD-30-005), V1-1
	<input type="checkbox"/> Other:

## 2. Certification Evaluation Process

### 2.1 Evaluation Itinerary, Activities, and Site Notes

<b>Date:</b> August 7, 2018, Taylor County	
<b>FMU / location / sites visited</b>	<b>Activities / notes</b>
Lincoln County Forest Office, Merrill Program-wide Opening Meeting	Opening Meeting: Introductions, client update, review scope of evaluation, audit plan, intro/update to FSC and SCS standards, confidentiality and public summary, conformance evaluation methods and review of open CARs/OBS, emergency and security procedures for evaluation team, final site selection.
Taylor County Forest Office, Medford	Overview of Taylor County’s forest and land management programs; review of training, CoC, and pesticide use records; final site selection.

<p>Site 1: Gersttberger Pines Taylor County Park</p>	<p>Approximately 9 acres of Type 1 old growth forest; although this has not been classified as HCVF, it is designated as special use. Dominant species white pine, red oak, birch, and basswood. Several white pines dead/dying due to lightning strikes. Trail with stations identifying unique characteristics. Mechanical removal of Buckthorn encroaching from adjoining landowner recently performed; the county will follow up with herbicide treatment of the buckthorn. 100% inventory performed at +/- 10 year intervals. Observed rocks cleared from adjacent fields by early settlers. In 1995, an interpretive trail was installed in collaboration with University of Wisconsin Extension. Aside from maintaining the interpretive trail and controlling invasive species, no active management occurs at the site.</p>
<p>Site 2: Taylor County Forest Timber Sale 9-14 #633</p>	<p>143-acre selection harvest. Observed gaps in forest canopy and two age classes of timber; the current harvest is intended to stimulate natural regeneration for a third age class by creating 25-foot gaps in the canopy. Managing for red oak and maple. Observed saplings of red oak and maple in understory with minimal damage to residual stands. No trash or spills observed. No sign of soil movement or erosion. Observed good utilization of timber. Ice Age Trail marked with yellow paint crossed the harvest unit, and care had been taken to minimize impact by using timber mats at equipment crossings of trail and greater basal area retained along the trail. Observed equipment exclusion area marked with red paint to protect low/wet area. No evidence of equipment in the exclusion area, and no tops or tree removal within the area was seen per the prescription. Managed as uneven age stand. Viewed logger training documentation from FISTA, which was up to date.</p>
<p>Site 3: Taylor County Forest Timber Sale 9-14 #633</p>	<p>17-acre aspen regeneration harvest. Area separated from adjoining selection harvest (Site 2) by yellow paint. All trees removed except red oak, white spruce, hemlock, and green marked trees and Ice Age Trail marker trees. Minimal damage to residual trees. Observed bald eagle nest identified by logger and mapped by National Heritage Index database; mitigation included no logging from 2/15 to 8/1 within a 330-foot buffer). Observed reproduction of aspen 6+ feet high with only two growing seasons. Good timber utilization and no signs of soil movement or oil spills from equipment. Managed as even age stand. Observed red painted boundary protecting RMZ areas: 100-foot buffer around Wood Lake, and 15-foot buffer along the lake's backwater.</p>
<p>Site 4: Wilderness Avenue (town road)</p>	<p>Crowned and ditched logging/ATV road. Graveled with no issues or signs of soil movement. Last used for logging approximately 15 years ago.</p>

<p>Site 5: Taylor County Forest Timber Sale 1-17 #655</p>	<p>91-acre timber sale with 26-acre selection harvest, 51-acre over-story removal primarily for oak &amp; maple regeneration, and 14-acre regeneration harvest primarily for aspen regeneration. Active harvest site by FISTA-trained logger with certification expiration of 12/18 (training records reviewed). Harvest dates comply with prescription for bald eagle management of nest (i.e., no harvesting 2/15 to 8/1 within 330 feet of the nest). Initial timber inspection on 7/31 with harvest operations beginning 8/2. Blue painted line separating stands and harvest types. Observed some wet areas due to recent rainfall and hail event. No soil movement or excessive damage to residual stand. Observed red painted area denoting no harvesting/machines or logging slash. County contractor has improved sections of interior logging access road by grading and graveling a low, wet section. Culvert and gravel will be installed at wet area before hauling, and no skidding will occur until the soil on the unit dries out. Minor soil compaction noted in spots. FSC auditor conducted on site interview with contractor.</p>
<p>Site 6: Taylor County Forest Timber Sale 7-16 #648</p>	<p>92-acre select harvest. Site harvested on 4/17 by FISTA trained logger with expiration of 2018 (training records observed). Sale not closed due to committee approval process. Observed various age classes and minimal damage to residual stand. Observed green painted area identifying black ash with no harvesting/machines/debris observed within area. Good utilization of harvested timber. No visible signs of oil spills or soil movement. Dead trees left for snags/perches unless safety hazard. Canopy gaps created. Ironwood and balsam 2" diameter and greater removed, with some damage observed to residual samplings. Good regeneration observed. No harvesting from April 15 to July 15 due to oak wilt restrictions.</p> <p>An improperly constructed water bar on a skid trail was observed; the water bar was installed perpendicular to the trail and had no outlet. The same trail crossed an ephemeral stream, showing signs of erosion and compaction at the equipment crossing. See <b>OBS 2018.1</b>.</p>
<p>Site 7: Taylor County Forest Road (Bear Avenue) rehab</p>	<p>This 2-mile section of forest road suffered the effects of a recent rain/hail event with two failures at culverted crossings. The failures have been temporarily repaired. Within the next 30 days, the road will be rehabilitated, including graded with a crown and both culverts replaced.</p>

<p>Site 8: Taylor County Forest Timber Sale 9-17 #660</p>	<p>81-acre select harvest sale. Natural regeneration of red oak and maple. Observed logging road with gravel supplied by county. Taylor County forestry staff indicated low/vernal pool areas must be 0.2 acres or larger to be painted for no harvesting activity. Minimal residual stand damage observed with good utilization of timber. Observed minor residual stems within red painted areas; could be due to wind or broken tops from harvested timber. No visible signs of soil movement or oil spills.</p>
<p>Taylor County Field Briefing</p>	<p>Lead auditor review of sites visited, outstanding issues, and logistics for next day.</p>
<p><b>Date:</b> August 8, 2018, Oneida County</p>	
<p><b>FMU / location / sites visited</b></p>	<p><b>Activities / notes</b></p>
<p>Oneida County Forest Office, Rhinelander County-level Opening Meeting</p>	<p>Overview of Oneida County’s forest and land management programs; review of training, CoC, and pesticide use records; final site selection.</p>
<p>Site 9: Oneida County Forest Campground Hardwood #1675</p>	<p>Active harvest sale of 123 acres. Primarily a marked 119-acre northern hardwood stand, which had been the site for a research project on canopy gaps in the early 2000s. Prescription is to harvest all aspen, balsam fir, ironwood, and orange marked trees. Canopy gaps marked in purple paint: cut all trees 1-inch and greater except oak saplings. Observed regeneration within gaps of basswood, oak, and maple. Approximately 4-acre regeneration harvest with expectation to harvest all aspen, white birch, balsam, maple, ash, and ironwood. Sale was marked by forestry class from University of Wisconsin Stevens Point. Students mentored by Oneida county forestry staff and given direction on marking. Site contained campground established in 2009; campground had buffer in which no harvesting is allowed until after 12/1 to minimize conflict and ensure safety. Sale also contained ATV/UTV trails maintained by ATV club. Observed minimal residual stand damage and evidence of good timber utilization on areas harvested. Observed bundle of merchantable wood, which forester flagged for the logger to retrieve. Observed snags left for nesting species. White and red pines left for diversity and wildlife habitat. Target residual species were red oaks, sugar maple, and basswood. No sign of soil movement, spills, or trash. Riparian management zone around Leech Pond. Historical logging camp site in sale area, which has also been buffered. Soils on harvested area scarified to promote regeneration. Sale harvested by FISTA-trained logging crew; two operators were interviewed by the audit team, and training records were reviewed. Shingle Mill Road showed some track damage from processor, which will be fixed by contractor.</p>
<p>Site 10: Perch Lake Shelter-Washburn Silent Trails Area</p>	<p>Observed Perch Lake Shelter built for silent sports such as cross-country skiing, mountain biking, horse riding, and hiking. Trails maintained by Rhinelander Area Silent Trails Association (RASTA).</p>



	Annual revenue of approximately \$10K to county due from single use and annual fees. Built in 2005 and bathrooms established 2009. Interviewed RASTA member who is active in the organization's leadership.
Site 11: Gobbler Lake State Natural Area	1,085-acre HCV area featuring esker, open bog, and 20-acre lake. Surrounding lake is open bog (muskeg) dominated by sphagnum and sedges with scattered and stunted black spruce, pitcher plants, shrubs, and grasses. Road is on an esker and maintained by the town. Designated as state natural area in 1974. No management. Protected by annual surveys for invasives.
Site 12: Indian Village-McCord Village Special Site	Special site protected by Oneida County. McCord Village was inhabited by Native Americans from 1890s to early 1950s. Several artifacts and significant structures have been mapped and surveyed by DNR archaeology staff. Maps are protected and not for public use in order to secure locations from artifact hunters and looters. Forest management activities coordinated with State Archaeologist and Native American tribes. Observed green painted buffer lines prohibiting activity within area. Oneida County forestry staff showed great care in protecting historical artifacts such as at this site.
Site 13: East Strips Sale-White Birch Scarification #1677	Approximately 70-acre completed birch shelterwood sale. Utilized approximately 27-foot spacing to encourage birch regeneration. Also maintained aspen to prevent coppice regeneration. Utilized DNR dozer/operator to scarify the ground in order to advance birch regeneration. Observed white birch seedling regeneration. Good utilization and no sign of damage to residual stand. Observed red painted RMZ area for black ash swamp with no sign of equipment entry. Cedar stand also buffered. Woody debris scattered and utilized to minimize soil movement. Sale harvested by FISTA-trained logger (training records reviewed, all training up to date).
Oneida County Field Briefing	Lead auditor review of sites visited, outstanding issues, and logistics for next day.
<b>Date:</b> August 9, 2018, Lincoln County	
<b>FMU / location / sites visited</b>	<b>Activities / notes</b>
Lincoln County Forest Office, Merrill County-level Opening Meeting	Introductions, client update, review scope of evaluation, audit plan, intro/update to FSC and SCS standards, confidentiality and public summary, conformance evaluation methods and review of open CARs/OBS, emergency and security procedures for evaluation team, final site selection.
Site 14: T005-18-1 #18005 Compartment 129 Stand 29	2 <sup>nd</sup> thinning of 6-acre red pine stand. Objective is to improve residual stand by removing poor quality stems and release crop tree. Target is approximately 120 BA/acre. Trees marked double sided in orange paint to be harvested every 5 <sup>th</sup> row. Site includes invasive European honeysuckle, but no control measures as it is ubiquitous in the county. Prescription matched field inspection. Sale not harvested but contract awarded. Lincoln County forestry

	staff notify adjacent landowners as communication prior to harvesting operations.
Site 15: T005-18-1 Bike Trail-Underdown or Disconnect Trail	Newly-constructed mountain bike trail to connect with Merrill Memorial Forest bike trails. Observed recently installed water bars to control water movement and prevent erosion. Trails constructed to follow contour of land. Trail will be maintained by bike club. Bike trails on county lands contribute economic activity to local communities.
Site 16: T005-18-1 Squawberry Compartment 130 Stands 7 & 18	4 <sup>th</sup> thinning of red pine stand approximately 38 acres. Stand was planted around 1938. Large understory component of northern hardwoods. Portion of sale included salvage harvest 10 years ago from a tornado. Site contains locally significant old/unused Girl Scout camp, and equipment is excluded from remnants of camp for protection. Site mapped within GIS and protected on ground from disturbance by painted delineation. Site will be allowed to return to northern hardwood stand gradually with canopy gaps painted to encourage regeneration of red oak, basswood, and maple. Red painted area observed protecting wetland/kettle or pot. Discussion was centered on the information from research being distributed to forestry staff regarding the management of uplands around wetland areas. No logging activity has occurred yet on this site. Invasive species recently updated honeysuckle to GIS for management in future. RTE species review through National Heritage Index identified state-listed species as threatened; no action required. Snags will not be cut unless they pose danger to logging crew. Prescription matched ground conditions.
Site 17: Horn Lake Road	This county forest road is generally in good condition, with some surface erosion noted on sloping portions, some small potholes, and a minor roadside grading berm noted. The berm generally prevents road surface water from directly entering adjacent wetlands located in pothole depressions.
Site 18: Garlic Mustard Treatment Area within T022-18	Site of garlic mustard invasive species treatment for past 10 years. Signs visible warning of invasives management, and horse trail had been sealed off with detour signs rerouting trail to an alternate route. Site treated annually in spring. Site has been identified in GIS system.
Site 19: Horse Trail within area of sale T022-18	Horse/ski trail in good condition (did not go beyond gate to minimize contact with garlic mustard). Discussed timber harvest restrictions as to timing and access routes to protect trail and user experience.
Site 20: T003-17-1 ATV Trail southeast of Turtle Lake Road	Recreational ATV trail observed with water bars installed to prevent erosion. Observed signs for safety and warnings to stay on trail. Trail was well groomed and no visible signs of soil movement, trash, or oil spills. The county has a full-time recreation officer who patrols the forest.

<p>Site 21: T003-17-1 Camp Kettle II</p>	<p>84-acre marked hardwood sale. Marked canopy gaps about every 4 chains with purple paint. Stems to be harvested marked in orange paint. Ecologist stated that single tree selection is being implemented in order to convert the stand and improve diameter distribution, increase multiple age classes, and enhance quality. Gaps utilized increase diversity of age classes, diameters, and species composition. Gaps utilized to assist with conversion from even age to uneven age characteristics. Understory component of maple, oak, basswood, and elm. Observed orange marked trees of lower quality basswood and maple. Canopy were impacted higher quality oak and basswood. Marking objective for crop tree release of saw log potential stems.</p>
<p>Site 22: T003-17-1 Aspen Regen</p>	<p>Approximately 30-acre aspen regeneration harvested in summer of 2017. Green tree retention and buffer observed protecting small lake with approximately 100-foot red painted boundary. No harvesting of white pine, oak, butternut, black ash, cherry, cedar, spruce, or hemlock. Two small retention “islands” with no harvest to ensure some aspen retained. Observed aspen regeneration of approximately 4-foot heights and some oak regeneration. No visible signs of soil movement, trash, or oil spills. Evidence of good utilization of timber resources.</p>
<p>Site 23: Otter Lake Campground and Day Use Area</p>	<p>Well-maintained campground and picnic area with beach on lake.</p>
<p>Site 24: T019-18-1 Twin Peaks</p>	<p>Active 56-acre logging job. Harvesting operations began within past 10 days. Mature aspen stand with objective to create diversity of age class and species. Oak, black ash, spruce, tamarack, pine, cedar, cherry, hemlock, and balsam fir not to be harvested. Interviewed logger, who is both FISTA trained and certified as a Wisconsin Master Logger. Processor and forwarder set up with “Eco-tracks” and “Eco-treaded” tires to minimize soil compaction. No equipment or logging slash in vernal ponds, per prescription. Observed good stem utilization, woody debris left on site, no visible signs of oil leaks, trash or damage to residual stand.</p>
<p>Site 25: T024-17-1 Gimpy Trash Panda</p>	<p>39-acre regeneration harvest adjacent to Hwy 8. Aesthetic buffer painted blue along Hwy 8. Sandy soils. Observed red painted boundary protecting RMZ with no sign of equipment entry observed. Good utilization of fiber resources. No sign of oil spills or trash. Prescription matched ground conditions. Harvested by FISTA trained logger (same logger as Site 11).</p>
<p>Site 26: T023-16-1 Late Bait</p>	<p>Approximately 88-acre aspen stand. Objective to create aspen age class diversity and regenerate other species present: oak, spruce, tamarack, pine, cedar, cherry, balsam fir, and hemlock were not to be harvested. Observed intermittent stream crossing on access road seeded with clover and herbaceous vegetation. Road blocked to ATV use by berm. Observed stands of spruce/aspen for green tree retention. Sale harvested in December/January during frozen ground conditions. Based on sale notes, appeared ground was not</p>

	<p>frozen solid during part of harvest. Observed signs that wood mats utilized by machinery for travel, though there were small areas with soil compaction. Snag retention observed for wildlife. Forestry staff during monitoring observed cutting green tree retention area. Contractor alerted and retention was marked in alternate location. No visible signs of oil spills or trash on site. Good utilization of fiber resources. Prescription matched ground conditions.</p>
Site 27: Poplar Road	<p>Poplar Road, a Lincoln County Forest Road, has extensive sections with many parallel, shallow (1- to 2-inch deep) ruts which are not causing erosion or movement of sediment off of the road. There were no water quality impacts observed. The road surface is fine-textured native material, with no crown, so the ruts hold rainwater which impairs the ability of the road surface to sustain use without further rutting. See <b>OBS 2018.1</b>.</p>
Site 28: T020-17	<p>35-acre northern hardwood stand marked per selection system with canopy gaps. Confirmed that marking retained trees with the best form and potential for growth and increase in value. Trees with habitat features were retained, and sale layout included an unmarked buffer along a wetland.</p>
Lincoln County FME Office	<p>Lead auditor review of sites visited, outstanding issues.</p>
<p><b>Date:</b> August 10, 2018</p>	
<b>FMU / location / sites visited</b>	<b>Activities / notes</b>
Lincoln County FME Office	<p>Closing Meeting: Reviewed preliminary findings (potential non-conformities and observations) and discussed next steps in report preparation.</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 reviewing documents and records, interviewing FME personnel and contractors, implementing sampling strategies to visit a broad number of forest cover and harvest prescription types, observing implementation of management plans and policies in the field, and collecting and analyzing stakeholder input. When there is more than one team member, each member 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, interviews, stakeholder comments, and reviewed documents and records. Where consensus among 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 management and/or harvesting methods that affect the FME’s conformance to the FSC standards and policies.

Significant changes occurred since the last evaluation that may affect the FME’s conformance to FSC standards and policies (*describe*):

### 4. Results of Evaluation

#### 4.1 Definitions of Major CARs, Minor CARs and Observations

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

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



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

#### 4.2 History of Findings for Certificate Period

FM Principle	Cert/Re-cert Evaluation 2014	1 <sup>st</sup> Annual Evaluation 2015	2 <sup>nd</sup> Annual Evaluation 2016	3 <sup>rd</sup> Annual Evaluation 2017	4 <sup>th</sup> Annual Evaluation 2018
P1		OBS, 1.1.a.			
P2					
P3					
P4	Minor CAR, 4.2.b.		OBS, 4.2.b.		
P5					
P6	OBS, 6.3.f and 6.3.g.1.		OBS, 6.3.f. (see also 7.1.q.)	Minor CAR, 6.5.d.; OBS, 6.5.d	OBS, 6.5.b; OBS 6.6.d
P7			OBS, 7.1.o.	OBS, 7.3.a.	
P8					
P9	OBS, 9.1.a.				

P10	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
COC for FM					
Trademark			Major CAR, 1.5, 1.15, 1.16, & 5.1		
Group	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other					

### **4.3 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations**

<b>Finding Number: 2017.1</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU): Iron County	
<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"/> Observation – response is optional <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify): None
<b>FSC Indicator:</b>	FSC-US Forest Management Standard 6.5.d
<p><b>Non-Conformity</b> (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): A portion of the North County ATV Trail was visited in association with a site visit to the Penokee Range Biological Reserve Area in Iron County. A portion of this ATV trail was actively eroding and sediment was flowing down the ditches on the sides of the trail. This sediment was being discharged directly into an ash swale and partially plugging a culvert. Additionally cross drain culverts were partially plugged with sediment from similar ditch sources. Other portions of the trail are embedded into the hillside, with no drainage provisions.</p> <p>The transportation system including the design and placement of permanent and temporary haul roads, skid trails, recreational trails, water crossings and landings is designed and constructed, maintained, and/or reconstructed to reduce short and long-term environmental impacts. This includes the bullet item that erosion is minimized. Recreational trails require the same degree of management to protect the resources as roads. There seemed to be some confusion as to who had maintenance responsibility, as the maintenance is often at least shared with user groups, and whether or not the BMP's included in the Wisconsin's Forestry Best Management Practices for Water Quality applied to recreational trails. Under the FSC standard recreational trails are included as a part of the overall transportation system.</p>	
<p><b>Corrective Action Request</b> (or Observation): The FME must demonstrate the application of the BMP's included in Wisconsin's Forestry Best Management Practices for Water Quality to the entire transportation system; recreational trails as well as forest roads.</p>	
<p><b>FME response</b> (including any evidence submitted)</p>	<p>1. <b>Culvert Replaced.</b> A Containment Plan (also accepted by SFI) was implemented in June 2018 with the culvert that was the focus of the CAR being replaced on June 13, 2018 by the Iron County Rec crew as they perform annual maintenance along Trail 6 through the Penokee Range.</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;">   </div> <p style="text-align: center;">Completed culvert replacement –photos taken on July 16, 2018</p>



	<p>2. <b>Field Inspections Conducted.</b> DNR Forest Hydrologist and DNR BMP Forester met on site with Iron County Forest staff (foresters &amp; recreation maintenance crew) on June 13, 2018 to review Water Quality BMP's and inspect a portion of Iron County motorized trails, culverts, and bridges. It was clearly noted the specific site that had sediment discharge, these are not eroded trail conditions, they are heaved up culverts. The foresters also spent additional time with Forest Hydrologist DNR and BMP Forester as they reviewed selected Iron County timber sales as part of the BMP monitoring program.</p> <p>DNR staff discussed options with Iron County Forest staff for water control structures along the trail system and agreed that most of the structures in place were adequate but could use more regular maintenance. The Iron County recreation crew does most of the construction and maintenance with heavy equipment on the county trail system. They have a good understanding of water quality BMPs and their implementation. Iron County will work with the local ATV clubs on grading techniques and educating those operators on how to maintain the water control structures along the trail system.</p> <p>3. <b>BMP Training Offered.</b> Forty-five county forest staff attended one of three one-day training sessions offered in July 2018 on Forestry BMPs for Water Quality.</p> <p>4. <b>BMP Monitoring Scheduled.</b> In the fall of 2018, the Department will be coordinating monitoring of Forestry BMPs for Water Quality on state and county lands. Previous years' monitoring reports can be found at: <a href="https://dnr.wi.gov/topic/forestmanagement/bmp.html">https://dnr.wi.gov/topic/forestmanagement/bmp.html</a></p>
<b>SCS review</b>	<p>Per written evidence provided by FME above and interviews with DNR and county staff, the FME has replaced the culvert in question, completed field inspections, delivered BMP training, and has developed a long-term plan for BMP monitoring. Sign-in forms for the three training sessions were reviewed. Taylor, Oneida, Langlade, and Lincoln Counties (the four counties sampled in 2018 audit) all have programs for regular monitoring and maintenance of ATV trail systems.</p>
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)</p>

<b>Finding Number: 2017.2</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): Iron County	
<b>Deadline</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation – response is optional <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify): None
<b>FSC Indicator:</b>	FSC-US Forest Management Standard 7.3.a
<b>Non-Conformity</b> (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): The FME’s employees and contractors have had some cases of poor communications regarding practices during wet weather. This was reported in a stakeholder’s comments received in Iron County and through a contractor interview in Price County. This communication problem could lead to a situation where not all forest workers are provided with sufficient guidance and supervision to adequately implement their respective components of the plan.	
<b>Corrective Action Request</b> (or Observation): The FME’s employees and contractors should strive to improve communications to enhance their ability to implement the management plan. Examples of better communications were observed during the review of communications between FME and contractors including letters and checklists in Vilas County, and through contractor interviews in Vilas County.	
<b>FME response</b> (including any evidence submitted)	<b>“Pre-Work” Meetings Held.</b> Timber sales have “pre-work” meetings in which sale specifics with contractors working onsite occur on all county forests. Sale maps, prospectus and such are reviewed and discussed with administering forester. Timber Sale Handbook, Chapter 70 (72-1) directly addresses Presale Inspections with administering forester and contractor.
<b>SCS review</b>	As confirmed in interviews with county and DNR staff and operators, pre-work meetings are conducted immediately prior to initiating harvesting activity on a sale; a sample of pre-work checklists was reviewed. Additionally, interviews with operators and a review of written inspection forms confirmed regular visits by county foresters during operations. Operators stated that county foresters are accessible if questions arise and that there is regular communication.
<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: 2017.3</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU): Price County Forestry	
<b>Deadline</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation – response is optional <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify): None
<b>FSC Indicator:</b>	FSC-US Forest Management Standard 6.5.d
<b>Non-Conformity</b> (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): BMPs for water bar installation were not applied at the forest harvest site Tract 17-16 in Price County in accordance with Wisconsin’s Forestry Best Management Practices for Water Quality, Chapter 4. This tract appeared to have somewhat unique topography related to other sites visited. All other sites visited were in conformance as this is isolated and appears unique; the grading is as an Observation.	
<b>Corrective Action Request</b> (or Observation): FME’s should ensure the implementation of the BMP’s to the transportation system, including design and placement of permanent and temporary haul roads, skid trails, recreational trails, water crossings and landings, is designed, constructed, maintained, and/or reconstructed to reduce short and long-term environmental impacts, habitat fragmentation, soil and water disturbance and cumulative adverse effects, while allowing for customary uses and use rights.	
<b>FME response</b> (including any evidence submitted)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Erosion Potential of Site Reviewed.</b> The site on Price County’s forest for this observation, in fact had no soil displacement identified during the time of the audit. Sale administrator and county forest administrator, knowing the site (cut previously with no issues), felt water bars were not necessary and would cause extra work and create soil displacement by CAT work. Price County followed existing BMP guidelines.</li> <li><b>BMPs for Water Quality Field Manual Consulted.</b> BMP handbook - Chapter 6, page 75 states: “Where possible, keep skid trail grades less than 15%. Where steep grades are unavoidable, break the grade, install drainage structures, and use soil stabilization practices (as described in Chapter 4: Forest Roads) <b>where needed</b> to minimize runoff and erosion.”</li> <li><b>Follow-up Inspections Conducted.</b> Price County forestry staff went back to revisit the site on 21 August 2017 while seeding trails and in May 2018 and noted there was still no soil displacement on the short skid route.</li> </ol>
<b>SCS review</b>	Per FME’s response and as confirmed through interviews with county and DNR staff, no soil displacement had been identified at the site during the 2017 audit, and Wisconsin BMPs for water quality were followed. Additionally, the county and DNR conducted follow-up inspections at the site in question confirming no soil displacement.
<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)

### 4.4 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations

<b>Finding Number: 2018.1</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 (when more than one FMU):</b>	
<b>Deadline</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification/recertification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> 12 months or next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation – response is optional <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
<b>FSC Indicator:</b>	FSC-US Forest Management Standard 6.5.b
<p><b>Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):</b>          At Site 6 (Taylor County—Forest Timber Sale 7-16 #648), an improperly constructed water bar on a skid trail was observed on the closed-out unit. The water bar was installed perpendicular to the trail and had no outlet. The same trail crossed an ephemeral stream, showing signs of erosion and compaction at the equipment crossing.</p> <p>At Site 13 (Lincoln County), Poplar County Road was observed as having extensive sections with many parallel, shallow (1- to 2-inch deep) ruts which are not causing erosion or movement of sediment off of the road. There were no water quality impacts observed. The road surface is fine-textured native material, with no crown, so the ruts hold rainwater which impairs the ability of the road surface to sustain use without further rutting.</p> <p>For active roads, the <i>Wisconsin Forestry Best Management Practices for Water Quality</i> field manual (PUB FR-093 2010) states that roads must be well maintained. BMPs include (page 61):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inspect the road system at regular intervals, especially after heavy rainfall, to detect problems and schedule repairs...</li> <li>• Keep traffic to a minimum during wet periods and spring breakup to reduce maintenance needs...[and]</li> <li>• Shape road surfaces periodically to maintain proper surface drainage. Fill in ruts and holes with gravel or compacted fill as soon as possible to reduce erosion potential.</li> </ul> <p>The conditions observed at the two sites suggests that there is an opportunity to improve road maintenance to comply with Wisconsin BMPs.</p>	
<p><b>Corrective Action Request (or Observation):</b>          Forest operations shall meet or exceed Best Management Practices (BMPs) that address components of the Criterion where the operation takes place.</p>	
<b>FME response (including any evidence submitted)</b>	
<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: 2018.2</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/recertification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> 12 months or next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation – response is optional <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
<b>FSC Indicator:</b>	FSC-US Forest Management Standard 6.6.d
<b>Non-Conformity</b> (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): On two occasions, an Oneida County forester applied chemical herbicide after the expiration of his/her Wisconsin Pesticide Applicator’s certification. The forester’s certification expired on 3/31/18. Chemical herbicide applications occurred on 6/18/18 (0.5 Gal of Garlon Ultra) and 7/3/18 (0.1 Gal of Garlon Ultra). The forester has signed up for the required training to reinstate certification. Documentation confirming that the training will occur on 9/19/18 was reviewed.	
<b>Corrective Action Request</b> (or Observation): Chemicals must be applied only by workers who have received proper training in application methods and safety. They are made aware of the risks, wear proper safety equipment, and are trained to minimize environmental impacts on non-target species and sites.	
<b>FME response</b> (including any evidence submitted)	
<b>SCS review</b>	
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

## 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 FME 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).

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.

### 5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted

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. Stakeholder groups who are consulted as part of the evaluation include FME management and staff, consulting foresters, contractors, lease holders, adjacent property owners, local and regionally-based social interest and civic organizations, purchasers of logs harvested on FME forestlands, recreational user groups, tribal members and/or representatives, members of the FSC National Initiative, members of the regional FSC working group, FSC International, local and regionally-based environmental organizations and conservationists, and forest industry groups and organizations, as well as local, state, and federal regulatory agency personnel and other relevant groups.

### 5.2 Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Evaluation Team Responses

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.

<input type="checkbox"/> <i>FME has not received any stakeholder comments from interested parties as a result of stakeholder outreach activities during this annual evaluation.</i>	
<b>Stakeholder Comment</b>	<b>SCS Response</b>
County and DNR foresters are easy to work with as an operator; they are available if any questions and regularly stop by to check in	This demonstrates conformance to 7.3.a. Interviews with operators and a review of written inspection forms confirmed regular visits by county foresters during operations. Operators stated that county foresters are accessible if questions arise and that there is regular communication.
Minimum bid rates on county forest sales are competitive and consistent with local market conditions.	This demonstrates conformance to 4.1.c. Interviewed operators indicated that bid rates accepted by the counties for purchased wood is comparable to current rates in the wood market.
County forests are important to the local loggers and economy.	This demonstrates conformance with 5.2.a. Interviews with operators, as well as review of records, verify that all loggers and mills are considered local.
The counties themselves contribute 50% of land acquisition costs for the purchase of new forestland utilizing Knowles-Nelson Stewardship Grant, which has resulted in over \$18 million to	This demonstrates conformance with 5.1.a. It shows that counties are able to financially implement core management activities, including expanding the amount of the forest resource on the landscape, which supports landscape-level ecological values.

grow Wisconsin's County Forests.	
Like it or not, 'If you are not at the table you are on the menu.' Politics is important in our role as natural resource managers of a significant public resource. The involvement of county forests at the state level is critical to supporting responsible resource management in Wisconsin.	This demonstrates conformance with 4.1.f. The FME makes a concerted effort to support learning opportunities to improve public understanding of forests and forest management.

## 6. Certification Decision

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

## 7. Annual Data Update

<input type="checkbox"/> No changes since previous evaluation.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information in the following sections has changed since previous evaluation.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Name and Contact Information <input type="checkbox"/> FSC Sales Information <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scope of Certificate <input type="checkbox"/> Non-SLIMF FMUs <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Social Information	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pesticide and Other Chemical Use <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Production Forests <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FSC Product Classification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conservation & High Conservation Value Areas <input type="checkbox"/> Areas Outside of the Scope of Certification

### Name and Contact Information

<b>Organization name</b>	Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources – County Forest Program		
<b>Contact person</b>	Douglas Brown		
<b>Address</b>	101 S. Webster St. Madison, WI 53707	<b>Telephone</b>	715-453-2188, Ext. 6
		<b>Fax</b>	
		<b>e-mail</b>	Douglas.brown@wisconsin.gov
		<b>Website</b>	<a href="http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/CountyForests/">http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/CountyForests/</a>

### FSC Sales Information

<input type="checkbox"/> FSC Sales contact information same as above.			
<b>FSC salesperson</b>	Sabina Dhungana, Forest Products Services Specialist		
<b>Address</b>		<b>Telephone</b>	(608) 261-0754

	<b>Fax</b>	(608) 266-8756
	<b>e-mail</b>	Sabina.Dhungana@wisconsin.gov
	<b>Website</b>	<a href="http://www.dnr.wi.gov">http://www.dnr.wi.gov</a>

**Scope of Certificate**

Certificate Type	<input type="checkbox"/> Single FMU		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple FMU	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Group			
SLIMF (if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/> Small SLIMF certificate		<input type="checkbox"/> Low intensity SLIMF certificate	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Group SLIMF certificate			
# Group Members (if applicable)				
Number of FMUs in scope of certificate	21			
Geographic location of non-SLIMF FMU(s)	Latitude & Longitude: See table later in this section for location of each county forest in general			
Forest zone	<input type="checkbox"/> Boreal		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Temperate	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Subtropical		<input type="checkbox"/> Tropical	
<b>Total forest area in scope of certificate which is:</b>				<b>Units:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac
privately managed	0			
state managed	0			
community managed WICFP Note: (Rpt.50A 7/1/2018 - FSC only)	1,778,491.22			
<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	17	
<b>Total forest area in scope of certificate which is included in FMUs that:</b>				<b>Units:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac
are less than 100 ha in area			0	
are between 100 ha and 1000 ha in area			0	
meet the eligibility criteria as <i>low intensity</i> SLIMF FMUs			0	
<b>Division of FMUs into manageable units:</b>				
FMU are individual County Forests which are further subdivided into compartments and stands.				

**Non-SLIMF FMUs (Group or Multiple FMU Certificates)**

Name	Contact information	Latitude/ longitude of Non-SLIMF FMUs	
NA*	NA	NA	NA

\* All FSC-certified FMUs are non-SLIMF. Vernon County is less than the 1,000-hectare size threshold for SLIMF, but it is not certified.



**Social Information**

<b>Number of forest workers (including contractors) working in forest within scope of certificate (differentiated by gender):</b>		
Male workers: 1,452	Female workers: 72	
<b>Number of accidents in forest work since previous evaluation:</b>	Serious: 0	Fatal: 0

**Pesticide and Other Chemical Use**

<input type="checkbox"/> FME does not use pesticides.					
County	Commercial name of pesticide / herbicide	Active ingredient	Quantity applied since previous evaluation (kg or lbs.)	Total area treated since previous evaluation (ha or ac)	Reason for use
Ashland	Garlon 4 Ultra, Accord XRT, DuPont Oust	Triclopyr, Glyphosate, Sulfometurom methyl	79.5 qts, 148 qts, 67 oz.	67 Acres	Invasive control, opening maintenance
Barron	None				
Bayfield	Transline	Clopyralid	27 oz	9 acres	Black Locust
	Garlon 4 Ultra	Triclopyr	135 oz	15 acres	Buckthorn
	Milestone	Aminopyralid	51 oz	97 acres	Spotted Knapweed
	Accord XRT	Glyphosate	219 gallons	585 acres	Site Prep
	Chopper	Imazypyr	92 gallons	585 acres	Site Prep
	Oust Extra	Sulforeturon methyl	37 pounds	585 acres	Site Prep
Chippewa	Garlon 4 Ultra	Triclopyr	2% solution (1.5 total gallons of solution)	60 acres	Garlic Mustard
	Oust XP	Sulfometuron Methyl	0.05% solution (1.5 total gallons total gallons of solution)	60 acres	Garlic Mustard
	MSO	surfactant	2% solution (1.5 total gallon total gallons of solutions)	60 acres	Garlic Mustard
	Garlon 4 Ultra	Triclopyr	10 % solution (21.5 total gallons total gallons of solution)	21 acres	Release of Hemlock & White Pine

Clark	Garlon 4 Ultra	Triclopyr	34.54 gal	58 acres + Spot Treatments	Oak Release & Invasive Control
	Rodeo	Glyphosate	51 oz	7.2	Pine Release/Flowage Dike Maintenance
	Escort XP	Metsulfuron methyl	0.42 oz	Spot Treatments	Invasive Control
	Polaris	Imazapyr	8 oz	0.5 acres	Flowage Dike Maintenance
	Arsenal AC	Imazapyr	6 oz	Spot Treatments	Oak Wilt Control
	Sulfomet Xtra	Sulfometuron methyl	11.56 lbs	185.5 acres	Site Prep
	Element 4	Triclopyr	16.31 gal.	19.6 acres + Spot Treatments	Oak Release/Invasive Control/Oak Wilt Control
	Accord XRT II	Glyphosate	121.78 gal.	222.5 acres	Site Prep
	Transline	Clopyralid	65.28 oz	Spot Treatments	Invasive Control
	Milestone	Aminopyralid	47.1 oz	Spot Treatments	Invasive Control
	Tordon K	Picloram	102 oz	Spot Treatments	Invasive Control
	Oust XP	Sufometuron Methyl	9 lbs	140	Site Prep
	Chopper Gen2	Imazapyr	27.25 gal	222.5 acres	Site Prep
	Red River NIS	Surfactant	11.25 gal	185.5	Site Prep
	Destiny HC	Surfactant	16 oz	0.5	Flowage Dike Maintenance
	Activator 90 Surfactant	Surfactant	1.5 gal.	37	Site Prep
	Preference Surfactant	Surfactant	51.01 oz	Spot Treatments	Invasives/oak wilt
Douglas	Aquaneat	Glyphosate	87 gallons (2% solution)	About 1 acre	Invasive vegetation management on utility ROW
	Garlon	Triclopyr	3.25 pints (2% solution) 0.6 pints (30% solution)	0.34 acres	Experimental invasive vegetation management trial within County Park
Eau Claire	Accord	Glyphosate	2 quarts/ac	35 ac	Site Prep

	Oust	Sulforeturon methyl	1 oz/acre	35 ac	Site Prep
	Chopper	Imazapyr	20 oz/acre	35 ac	Site Prep
Florence	Oust	Sulforeturon methyl	362.5oz	376	Pine release
	Rodeo	Glyphosate	99.6 gal	376	Pine release
	Element 4	Triclopyr	32 oz	approx 1 acre	buckthorn management
Forest	NA				
Iron	N/A				
Jackson	Garlon 4 Ultra	triclopyr	215 lbs	166 acres	Buckthorn
	Vastlan	triclopyr	8 lbs	4 acres	Buckthorn
	Milestone	aminopyralid	0.78 lbs	14 acres	Spotted Knapweed
	Arsenal	imazapyr	3 lbs	8 acres	Phragmites
Juneau	Roundup	Glyphosate	.17 kg	2 acres	Buckthorn
Lincoln	Cornerstone Plus	Glyphosate	3% Solution	5 acres	Buckthorn
	Element 4	Triclopyr	2% Solution	25 acres	Garlic Mustard
	Oust	Sulforeturon methyl	1 oz.acre	25 acres	Garlic Mustard
	2, 4-D	Dimethylamine salt of 2,4-D	2% Solution	1 acre	Crown Vetch
Oconto	Cellutreat	Disodium Octaborate Tetrahydrate	50 pounds	97 acre	HRD stump treatment
	Round up	Glyphosate	1% solution	8 acres	park and rec.ground maintenance
Oneida	Makaze	Glyphosate	.094 lb (3 fl oz)	0.34 Ac	Garlic Mustard Control.
Price	Gly-star	glyphosate	2.5% solution	6.25 ac	Wildlife opening maintenance, buckthorn and park maintenance
Sawyer	NA				
Taylor	Cornerstone	2% glyphosate	87 liquid oz.	4.6 acres	Wildlife opening maintenance
Vilas	Chopper Gen II	Isopropylamine salt of Imazapyr	12.55 gallons	99-acres	Site Preparation
	Accord XRT II	Glyphosate	37.75 gallons	99-acres	Site Preparation
	Oust XP	Sulforeturon methyl	99-oz	99-acres	Site Preparation
Washburn	None				
Wood	None				

**Production Forests**

<b>Timber Forest Products</b>		<b>Units:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac
Total area of production forest (i.e. forest from which timber may be harvested)		1,475,848 forested area scheduled for management (96.3% of total forested area is eligible for harvest) (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		139,943 (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		1,335,905
<b>Silvicultural system(s)</b>		<b>Area under type of management</b>
Even-aged management		
Clearcut (clearcut size range (clearcut size range <u>1-183 (20.36 avg)</u> )-(WisFIRS export))		159,621 - 1/3 PJ, OX, 1/2 MR, Fb, SB, 1/2 T, 1/2 C
Shelterwood		193,960 PW, O & 1/2 MR
Other: (e.g., coppice, seed-tree)		670,272 (A, BW, MC, SC, 1/2 T, 1/2 C)
Uneven-aged management		
Individual tree selection		231,807 NH
Group selection		74,834 BH, SH, CH, H, MD
Other:		
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (e.g. nursery, recreation area, windbreak, bamboo, silvo-pastoral system, agro-forestry system, etc.)		
<b>Non-timber Forest Products (NTFPs)</b>		
Area of forest protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for the production of NTFPs or services		0
Other areas managed for NTFPs or services		0
Approximate annual commercial production of non-timber forest products included in the scope of the certificate, by product type		Sphagnum moss - 29,585 bales in 2017, typically <20,000 bales (0391B sub-product); N6.3.1 Christmas trees 20 trees and 11 tons of boughs (WisFIRS export product 40 & 42T)
<b>Species in scope of joint FM/COC certificate: (Scientific / Latin Name and Common / Trade Name)</b>		
Species	Scientific Name	Miscellaneous conifers:
Aspen/Poplar:	Populus tremuloides	Scotch pine Pinus sylvestris
	Populus grandidentata	European larch Larix decidua
Balsam poplar	Populus balsamifera	Norway spruce Picea abies
		Eastern red cedar Juniperus virginiana
Bottomland hardwoods:		Blue spruce Picea pungens

Eastern Cottonwood	Populus deltoides		Miscellaneous deciduous:	
Swamp white oak	Quercus bicolor		Norway maple	Acer platanoides
Silver maple	Acer saccharinum		Boxelder	Acer negundo
American elm	Ulmus americana		Black locust	Robinia pseudoacacia
River birch	Betula nigra		Honey locust	Gleditsia triacanthos
Green ash	Fraxinus pennsylvanica		Eastern Hophornbeam, Ironwood	Ostrya virginiana
			Musclewood, Blue beech	Carpinus caroliniana
			Northern hardwoods:	
Central hardwoods:			Sugar maple	Acer saccharum
White oak	Quercus alba		Yellow birch	Betula alleghaniensis
Bur oak	Quercus macrocarpa	White ash	Fraxinus americana	
Black oak	Quercus velutina	American beech	Fagus grandifolia	
Northern pin oak	Quercus ellipsoidalis	American basswood	Tilia americana	
Black walnut	Juglans nigra	White birch	Betula papyrifera	
Butternut	Juglans cinerea	Northern red oak	Quercus rubra	
Shagbark hickory	Carya ovata	Red Pine	Pinus resinosa	
Bitternut hickory	Carya cordiformis	Jack Pine	Pinus banksiana	
Black cherry	Prunus serotina	Eastern white pine	Pinus strobus	
Red maple	Acer rubrum	Black spruce	Picea mariana	
Hackberry	Celtis occidentalis	Tamarack	Larix laricina	
		Black ash	Fraxinus nigra	
Balsam fir	Abies balsamea	White spruce	Picea glauca	
Eastern hemlock	Tsuga canadensis	Northern white cedar	Thuja occidentalis	

### FSC Product Classification

Timber products		
Product Level 1	Product Level 2	Species
<b>W1 Rough Wood</b>	W1.1 Roundwood (logs)	18,521 MBF and 687,430 cds. (Rpt. 37A FY18-total cordwood minus small diameter reported below) – All species listed above.
	W1.2 Fuel Wood	1,574 cds – All species listed above. (Rpt. 37A – Firewood)
<b>W3 Wood in chips or particles</b>	W3.1 Wood chips	<4" diameter (prod code 24/24T- (30% of total volume since combined cordwood and topwood), and 26/26T-topwood only). 15,854 cd eq. –All species listed above. WisFIRS export, FY18 closed sales
Non-Timber Forest Products		
Product Level 1	Product Level 2	Product Level 3 and Species

<b>N6 Plants and parts of plants</b>	N6.2 Grasses, ferns, mosses and lichens	Sphagnum moss (Sphagnum spp.)
	N6.3 Whole trees or plants	N6.3.1 Christmas trees 20 trees and 11 tons of boughs – <i>Abies balsamea</i> (WisFIRS export product 42T)

**Conservation and High Conservation Value Areas**

<b>Conservation Area</b>	<b>Units:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac
<b>Total amount</b> of land in certified area protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for conservation objectives (includes both forested and non-forested lands).*	54,785
WIDNR-CFP Note: (WisFIRS report 101; prefix R, Y and Z)	

*\*Note: Total conservation and HCV areas may differ since these may serve different functions in the FME’s management system. Designation as HCV may allow for active management, including commercial harvest. Conservation areas are typically under passive management, but may undergo invasive species control, prescribed burns, non-commercial harvest, and other management activities intended to maintain or enhance their integrity. In all cases, figures are reported by the FME as it pertains local laws & regulations, management objectives, and FSC requirements.*

<b>High Conservation Value Forest / Areas</b>			<b>Units:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac
<b>Code</b>	<b>HCV Type</b>	<b>Description &amp; Location</b>	<b>Area</b>
HCV1	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g. endemism, endangered species, refugia).	Assorted bogs, wetland communities, fens, kettle lakes, and other areas containing significant biodiversity values (including endangered & threatened species) – 13 numerous counties	31,586
HCV2	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant large landscape level forests, contained within, or containing the management unit, where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance.	Upper Nemadji Floodplain Forest – Douglas County Brazeau Cedar Swamp – Oconto County Penokee Range Hardwood-Iron County Silent Wood Benchmark Forest - Washburn County	5,112
HCV3	Forests or areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems.	Barrens - Eau Claire, Clark, Douglas, Jackson Old Growth/ pine relics-Forest, Juneau, Sawyer, Taylor Oak Savanna - Washburn Oneida - Enterprise Hemlocks, Noisy Creek Cedars, Gobbler Lake SNA	4,163

HCV4	Forests or areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g. watershed protection, erosion control).	Winx Flowage – Clark	320
HCV5	Forests or areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g. subsistence, health).		
HCV6	Forests or areas critical to local communities’ traditional cultural identity (areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in cooperation with such local communities).	Burial Mounds - Oconto	5
<b>Total area of forest classified as ‘High Conservation Value Forest / Area’</b>			<b>41,186</b>

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

<input type="checkbox"/> <i>N/A – All forestland owned or managed by the applicant is included in the scope.</i>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Applicant owns and/or manages other FMUs not under evaluation.</i>		
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Applicant wishes to excise portions of the FMU(s) under evaluation from the scope of certification.</i>		
<b>Explanation for exclusion of FMUs and/or excision:</b>	29 county forests exist in Wisconsin. 21 of them have chosen to commit to FSC certification (Vilas and Oneida joined spring 2017). There are an additional 6 counties that are SFI certified, and 2 are not certified under any forest certification program. Within each county, there may be forestlands that are outside of the scope for other reasons, such as being inaccessible to forest management for timber production.	
<b>Control measures to prevent mixing of certified and non-certified product (C8.3):</b>	Each FMU has its own log or haul tickets that include the appropriate certificate codes as applicable. Non-certified FMUs are not permitted to use any certificate codes. Forest areas outside of the scope within certified counties typically are not managed through timber harvests.	
<b>Description of FMUs excluded from, or forested area excised from, the scope of certification:</b>		
<b>Name of FMU or Stand</b>	<b>Location (city, state, country)</b>	<b>Size (<input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac)</b>
See Wisconsin County Forest FMU Summary table below; prepared by DNR on 15 July 2018.	Scattered across Wisconsin.	~750,000 acres. (Includes SFI-only counties, non-certified counties, and straight county land in FSC counties)  Total acreages: FSC                    1,778,491.22 SFI                     2,216,890.02 Non-certified       9,167.89

## Wisconsin County Forest FMU Summary

Co. Name	Cert Status	Gen Loc Lat	Gen Loc Long	Forest Admin	Email Address	Co. Forest Lands (ac)	Spec Use Lands (ac)	Total Acres
Ashland	FSC/SFI	46° 12' 45" N	-90° 28' 56" W	Chris Hoffman	choffman05@centurytel.net	40,305.19	0	40,305.19
Barron	FSC/SFI	45° 37' 16" N	-91° 52' 6" W	John Cisek	john.cisek@co.barron.wi.us	16,264.69	0	16,264.69
Bayfield	FSC/SFI	46° 47' 12" N	-90° 58' 52" W	Jason Bodine	jbodine@bayfieldcounty.org	172,020.87	0	172,020.87
Burnett	SFI	45° 52' 29" N	-92° 10' 38" W	Jason Nichols	jnichols@burnettcounty.org	111,100.92	0	111,100.92
Chippewa	FSC	45° 11' 50" N	-91° 14' 53" W	Mike Dahlby	mdahlby@co.chippewa.wi.us	32,999.28	1,654.56	34,653.84
Clark	FSC	44° 35' 54" N	-90° 47' 46" W	Rick Dailey	rick.dailey@co.clark.wi.us	134,623.56	48.7	134,672.26
Douglas	FSC/SFI	46° 17' 39" N	-92° 0' 7" W	Jon Harris	jharris@douglascountywi.org	264,426.63	15,639.64	280,066.27
Eau Claire	FSC/SFI	44° 45' 9" N	-91° 2' 7" W	Joshua Pedersen	Josh.Pedersen@co.eau-claire.wi.us	51,515.98	1,154.73	52,670.71
Florence	FSC/SFI	45° 46' 53" N	-88° 15' 4" W	Patrick Smith	psmith@co.florence.wi.us	36,331.65	63.15	36,394.80
Forest	FSC/SFI	45° 31' 52" N	-88° 52' 26" W	Adam Bontje	adam.bontje@co.forest.wi.us	14,826.67	0	14,826.67
Iron	FSC/SFI	46° 17' 45" N	-90° 13' 48" W	Eric Peterson	icfadmin@ironcountyforest.org	174,144.80	1,163.62	175,308.42



Jackson	FSC/SFI	44° 20' 57" N	-90° 32' 6" W	Jim Zahasky	jim.zahasky@centurytel.net	119,764.76	2,685.40	122,450.16
Juneau	FSC/SFI	44° 1' 2" N	-90° 8' 14" W	Brian Loyd	pfadm@co.juneau.wi.us	15,931.07	1,867.72	17,798.79
Langlade	SFI	45° 20' 1" N	-89° 4' 14" W	Erik Rantala	erantala@co.langlade.wi.us	128,115.77	1,885.24	130,001.01
Lincoln	FSC/SFI	45° 22' 57" N	-89° 50' 45" W	Kevin Kleinschmidt	kkleinschmidt@co.lincoln.wi.us	100,421.30	421.75	100,843.05
Marathon	SFI	44° 52' 11" N	-89° 41' 33" W	Tom Lovlien	tglovlien@mail.co.marathon.wi.us	29,622.47	572.32	30,194.79
Marinette	SFI	45° 27' 39" N	-88° 10' 59" W	Pete Villas	pwillas@marinettecounty.com	226,409.60	3,528.91	229,938.51
Monroe	Not Certified	44° 6' 50" N	-90° 44' 54" W	Chad Ziegler	chiegler@co.monroe.wi.us	6,848.69	432.3	7,280.99
Oconto	FSC/SFI	45° 2' 24" N	-88° 16' 40" W	Monty Brink	Monty.brink@co.oconto.wi.us	43,546.40	159.43	43,705.83
Oneida	FSC/SFI	45° 35' 24" N	-89° 37' 1" W	John Bilogan	jbilogan@co.oneida.wi.us	82,219.95	179.2	82,399.15
Polk	SFI	45° 36' 21" N	-92° 43' 11" W	Mark Gossman	mark.gossman@co.polk.wi.us	16,445.71	720.39	17,166.10
Price	FSC/SFI	45° 34' 9" N	-90° 23' 54" W	Eric Holm	eric.holm@co.price.wi.us	91,507.44	795.01	92,302.45
Rusk	SFI	45° 35' 15" N	-91° 4' 19" W	Jeremy Koslowski	pteska@ruskcounty.wi.us jkoslowski@ruskcountywi.us	89,083.57	240	89,323.57

Sawyer	FSC/SFI	45° 42' 43" N	-91° 3' 9" W	Greg Peterson	greg.peter son@saw yercounty gov.org	115,196.50	0	115,196.50
Taylor	FSC/SFI	45° 19' 15" N	-90° 3' 47" W	<u>Jake Walcisak</u>	Jake.Walci sak@co.ta ylor.wi.us	17,669.06	18.86	17,687.92
Vernon	Not Certified	43° 35' 16" N	-91° 0' 29" W	Nick Gilman	nick.gilma n@vernon county.or g	1,886.90	0	1,886.90
Vilas	FSC/SFI	46° 2' 8" N	-89° 17' 19" W	John Gagnon	<u>jogagn@vi lascounty wi.gov</u>	41,078.62	62.79	41,141.41
Washburn	FSC/SFI	45° 57' 3" N	-91° 44' 54" W	Mike Peterson	mlpeters @co.wash burn.wi.us	149,234.36	721.67	149,956.03
Wood	FSC/SFI	44° 22' 45" N	-90° 6' 2" W	Fritz Schubert	fschubert @co.woo d.wi.us	37,133.63	692.58	37,826.21
<b>Total:</b>						2,359,125.95	34,619.80	2,393,745.75

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

FMU Name	FMU Size Category: - SLIMF - non-SLIMF - Large > 10,000 ha	Forest Type: - Plantation - Natural Forest	Rationale for Selection: - Random Sample - Stakeholder issue - Ease of access - Other (please describe)
Taylor County	non-SLIMF	Natural Forest	Ensure all FMUs covered in certification period, geography
Oneida County	non-SLIMF, Large > 10,000 ha	Natural Forest	Ensure all FMUs covered in certification period, geography
Lincoln County	non-SLIMF, Large > 10,000 ha	Natural Forest	Ensure all FMUs covered in certification period, geography

### Appendix 2 – Staff and Stakeholders Consulted

#### List of FME Staff Consulted

Name	Title	Contact Information	Consultation method
Allyssa Hoekstra	NHC Biologist		In person
Bill Groth	Lincoln County Forest Liaison		In person
Brad Hutnik	DNR Silviculturalist		In person
Carly Lapin	NHC Ecologist		In person
Carmin Hardin	Applied Forestry Bureau Director		In person
Cody Brauner	County Forester		In person
Colleen Matula	DNR Silviculturalist		In person
Craig Williams	DNR Team Leader		In person
Dave Kafura	DNR Forest Hydrologist		In person
Dean Bowe	Assistant Administrator		In person
Derek Johnson	DNR Wildlife Biologist		In person

Doug Brown	County Forest and Public Lands Specialist		In person
Eric Rady	Oneida County Forester		In person
Erik Rantala	Langlade County Forest Administrator		In person
Heather Berklund	Deputy Division Administrator		In person
Jake Walcisak	Taylor County Administrator		In person
Janet Brehm	DNR- Wildlife Biologist		In person
Joe Rennick	Oneida County Forester		In person
John Bilogan	County Forest Administrator		In person
John Gillen	DNR Oneida-Vilas Team Leader		In person
Jordan Lutz	Assistant Administrator		In person
Josh Spiegel	DNR Wildlife Biologist		In person
Katherine Lenz	DNR Area Staff Spec.		In person
Kelsey Egelhoff	DNR County Forest Liaison		In person
Kevin Kleinschmidt	Forest Administrator		In person
Kristine Buchholtz	Forestry Specialist		In person
Lee Rahlf	County Forester		In person
Luke Williams	County Forester		In person
Manny Oradei	DNR County Forest Liaison		In person
Mark Heyde	Forest Certification Coordinator		In person
Michele Woodford	DNR Wildlife Biologist		In person
Mike Luedeke	Wisconsin County Forest Association		In person
Nick Beherens	County Forester		In person
Nolan Kriegel	DNR BMP Forester		In person
Paul Fiene	Assist. Co Forest Administrator		In person
Rick Dedeyne	County Forester		In person
Scott Lindow	DNR County Forest Liaison		In person
Shelley Wrzochalski	DNR Team Leader		In person
Skylar Vold	NHC Biologist		In person
Trent Marty	Forestry Field Operations Bureau Director		In person

**List of other Stakeholders Consulted\***

Name	Organization	Contact Information	Consultation method	Requests Cert. Notf.
Guy Hansen	Rhineland Area Silent Trails Association	715-282-5810	In person	Yes
Robert Connor	Connor Forest Management	715-887-3600	In person	Yes
Landin Brockman	Connor Forest Management	715-887-3600	In person	No
Mike Luedeke	Board member, WCFA	715-635-9312	In person	Yes
Paul Roberts	Roberts Logging	715-499-6704	In person	No
Jane Severt	Executive Director, WCFA	715-282-5951	In person	Yes
Gary Zimmer	Assistant Executive Director, WCFA	715-612-2013	In person	Yes
Anonymous	-	-	In person	No

\* Note: SCS may maintain additional records of stakeholder consultation activities (e.g., email notifications) in its recordkeeping system. Stakeholders included in Appendix 2 have given their permission to include their name, contact details, and comments in the report. Anonymous stakeholders may have provided comments as a part of stakeholder outreach activities.

**Appendix 3 – Additional Evaluation Techniques Employed**

- None.
- Additional techniques employed (*describe*):

**Appendix 4 – Pesticide Derogations**

- There are no active pesticide derogations for this FME.

Name of pesticide / herbicide (active ingredient)		Date derogation approved
FME has derogation for hexazinone, which has not been used since before 2014; no use was reported in 2014 – 2018. The derogation is no longer required since hexazinone is not on the 2015 list of FSC HHP.		9 December 2014
Condition	Conformance (C / NC)	Evidence of progress
NA	NA	NA

**Appendix 5 – Forest Management Standard Conformance Table**

Criteria required by FSC at every surveillance	<input type="checkbox"/> NA – all FMUs are exempt from these requirements.
--	--

evaluation ( <i>check all situations that apply</i> )	<input type="checkbox"/> Plantations > 10,000 ha (24,710 ac): 2.3, 4.2, 4.4, 6.7, 6.9, 10.6, 10.7, and 10.8 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Natural forests > 50,000 ha (123,553 ac) ('low intensity' SLIMFs exempt): 1.5, 2.3, 3.2, 4.2, 4.4, 5.6, 6.2, 6.3, 8.2, and 9.4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FMUs containing High Conservation Values ('small forest' SLIMFs exempt): 6.2, 6.3, 6.9 and 9.4
Documents and records reviewed for FMUs/sites sampled	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> All applicable documents and records as required in section 7 of audit plan were reviewed; or <input type="checkbox"/> The following documents and records as required in section 7 of the audit plan were NOT reviewed ( <i>provide explanation</i> ):

**Requirements Reviewed in Annual Evaluation**

Evaluation Year	Requirements Reviewed (FSC P&C Reviewed, FM/COC Indicators, Trademark Indicators, Group Standard Indicators, etc.)
2014	All – (Re)certification Evaluation
2015	Natural forests > 50,000 ha (123,553 ac) and FMUs containing HCVs: 1.5, 2.3, 3.2, 4.2, 4.4, 5.6, 6.2, 6.3, 6.9, 8.2 and 9.4 Other Criteria selected: 1.4, 3.1, 3.3, 3.4, 4.3, 6.10, 8.1, 9.1, 9.2, 9.3
2016	Natural forests > 50,000 ha (123,553 ac) and FMUs containing HCVs: 1.5, 2.3, 3.2, 4.2, 4.4, 5.6, 6.2, 6.3, 6.9, 8.2 and 9.4 Other Criteria selected: 2.1, 2.2, 4.1, 4.5, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 8.4 and 8.5
2017	Natural forests > 50,000 ha (123,553 ac) and FMUs containing HCVs: 1.5, 2.3, 3.2, 4.2, 4.4, 5.6, 6.2, 6.3, 6.9, 8.2 and 9.4 Other Criteria selected: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.6, 6.1, 6.6, 6.7, and 6.8
2018	FSC FM Criteria 1.5, 2.3, 3.2, 4.1, 4.2, 4.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 5.6, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.5, 6.9, 7.3, 8.2, 8.3, and 9.4; COC indicators for FMEs; and FSC Trademark Standard

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

REQUIREMENT	C/ NC	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>C1.1 Forest management shall respect all national and local laws and administrative requirements.</b>	NE	

<p><b>C1.2. All applicable and legally prescribed fees, royalties, taxes and other charges shall be paid.</b></p>	<p>NE</p>	
<p><b>C1.3. In signatory countries, the provisions of all binding international agreements such as CITES, ILO Conventions, ITTA, and Convention on Biological Diversity, shall be respected.</b></p>	<p>NE</p>	
<p><b>C1.4. Conflicts between laws, regulations and the FSC Principles and Criteria shall be evaluated for the purposes of certification, on a case by case basis, by the certifiers and the involved or affected parties.</b></p>	<p>NE</p>	
<p><b>C1.5. Forest management areas should be protected from illegal harvesting, settlement and other unauthorized activities.</b></p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>1.5.a. The forest owner or manager supports or implements measures intended to prevent illegal and unauthorized activities on the <b>Forest Management Unit</b> (FMU).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Timber theft, trespass, and other illegal or unauthorized activities on county forests are dealt with locally and are typically investigated by county law enforcement, DNR wardens, or county forest patrol or recreation staff, as confirmed in interviews with county staff. The FMUs are regularly patrolled by county or DNR employees to detect illegal or unauthorized activities. Recreational user groups (e.g., ATV/HUV clubs, snowmobile clubs, and mountain biking clubs) are important mechanisms for monitoring the behavior of recreationists. Additionally, active timber sales are monitored by county foresters several times per week, which includes ensuring that illegal or unauthorized activities in harvested sites do not occur. County sheriffs, wardens, and other law enforcement issue citations for ordinance violations (e.g., off-trail ATV use, unpermitted firewood cutting, illegal deer stands, etc.).</p> <p>WCFP takes considerable action to limit illegal and unauthorized activities. Audit team observed gates, berms, and the implementation of other access control techniques including posted signs indicating allowed uses. Surveillance techniques may also be employed in cases of vandalism, trespass, dumping, or other illegal activities.</p> <p>Property boundaries are marked on the ground in advance of timber sales, as well as on harvest maps.</p>

		<p>In 2017, Clark County rectified several encroachments in the towns of Mead and Seif.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Maintaining a regular presence and good relations with user groups, as described in 1.5.a., are considered actions designed to curtail illegal or unauthorized activities. Lincoln County recently hired a new recreation officer, which has substantially reduced the amount of illegal dumping on the county forest, as well as other illegal or unauthorized activities.</p> <p>Wisconsin law allows flexibility in how timber theft and trespass cases are treated. Fines or payment of yield taxes or severance shares can be assigned. Such fines or payments are set between \$100 and \$10,000, but violators may be subject to criminal prosecution or required to cover additional expenses for the assessment and recovery of stolen timber. No significant instances of timber trespass were reported for the four counties sampled in this year's audit.</p> <p>In Oneida County, there was one case of a private timber sale encroaching on the county forest in 2016. FME is awaiting corporate counsel's actions for citations. Additionally, the issue of a private garage inadvertently built across a property line and on county forest property was resolved in 2018 through a purchase of the encroached property by the private party. Firewood gathering on areas that are not designated for this purpose continues to be an issue. Warnings have been given to individuals found to be gathering firewood on non-designated areas; no repeat offenses have occurred. During the summer, an LTE patrols the county's parks/campgrounds after hours and on weekends. In the event that significant violations are encountered, either the administrator or law enforcement is notified. The county also has a designated recreation deputy through the sheriff's office. This person patrols ATV/snowmobile trails and does boating enforcement.</p> <p>Illegal harvesting of birch has been occurring in Ashland, Iron, and Sawyer Counties. Monitoring with cameras and on-the-ground enforcement patrols are used to detect violators. In some areas, the county</p>



		<p>has painted roadside birch to more easily track any trees removed illegally.</p> <p>Washburn and Wood Counties report no illegal harvesting but do face ongoing unauthorized activities relating to motorized travel violations, illegal deer stands, and other civil forfeitures. Wood County also deals with illegal firewood cutting and dumping. The counties utilize recreation officers and law enforcement to deter these activities.</p> <p>Some counties, such as Douglas County, offer an anonymous violation reporting form on its website that can be used by citizens to make violation reports. Many counties have brochures that cover a variety of topics, including rules and regulations governing use of the forest, that are available to the general public as mechanisms for public education.</p>
<p><b>C1.6. Forest managers shall demonstrate a long-term commitment to adhere to the FSC Principles and Criteria.</b></p>	<p>NE</p>	
<p><b>P2 Long-term tenure and use rights to the land and forest resources shall be clearly defined, documented and legally established.</b></p>		
<p><b>C2.1. Clear evidence of long-term forest use rights to the land (e.g., land title, customary rights, or lease agreements) shall be demonstrated.</b></p>	<p>NE</p>	
<p><b>C2.2. Local communities with legal or customary tenure or use rights shall maintain control, to the extent necessary to protect their rights or resources, over forest operations unless they delegate control with free and informed consent to other agencies.</b></p> <p><i>Applicability Note: For the planning and management of publicly owned forests, the local community is defined as all residents and property owners of the relevant jurisdiction.</i></p>	<p>NE</p>	
<p><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</b></p>	<p>C</p>	

<p><b>considered in the certification evaluation. Disputes of substantial magnitude involving a significant number of interests will normally disqualify an operation from being certified.</b></p>		
<p>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.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Barron County was recently served with a summons and complaint claiming adverse interest in approximately 1.31 acres of Barron County forest land. The plaintiffs claim ownership of the area where an old fence deviates from the surveyed property line. The county completed a harvest in the area within the last 10 years, and the DNR county forest &amp; public lands specialist is working with state and county legal counsel to resolve the issue.</p> <p>A significant mineral deposit has been found on the Oneida County forest. The site has been explored by mining companies in the past, and there has been a recent resurgence in interest in the deposit by these companies. The tribes have gone on record opposing any metallic mining on county forest lands within the ceded territory. This opposition was not brought directly to the county forest office, but was expressed during public meetings regarding the re-writing of the county’s metallic mining ordinance.</p>
<p>2.3.b. The forest owner or manager documents any significant disputes over tenure and use rights.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The DNR and counties maintain written documentation of disputes over tenure and use rights. Barron and Oneida Counties are both in the process of addressing disputes per 2.3.a, and documentation that the county staff has maintained is critical to resolution of such conflicts.</p>
<p><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></p>		
<p><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></p>	<p>NE</p>	
<p><b>C3.2. Forest management shall not threaten or diminish, either directly or indirectly, the resources or tenure rights of indigenous peoples.</b></p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>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</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Indian treaty rights, and specifically Lake Superior Bands of Chippewa, were granted reserved rights to hunt, fish, and gather on all ceded lands in eastern Minnesota and northern Wisconsin as part of the</p>

<p>the FMU to avoid harming their resources or rights.</p>		<p>treaties of 1837 and 1842. County board meetings and forestry committee meetings in which policies for resource management are set provide opportunities for public input, including representatives of American Indian groups. In fact, the counties have established formal policies requiring consultation with tribal nations. For example, the Oneida County Forest Comprehensive Land Use Plan states in Section 210.4 that “The County will collaborate with Tribal representatives on projects that could potentially impact Native American archeological or cultural resources. Native American tribes are encouraged to contribute to the comprehensive Forest planning process. Gathering rights for Tribal members on County Forest land is provided and detailed in Chapter 500 (525) of this Plan.” To that end, the DNR and counties maintain relationships with local tribes and solicit input as needed.</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>County and DNR staff are cognizant of the need to ensure that forest management activities do not adversely affect tribal resources. For example, on public lands within the ceded territory, which include county forests, a free permit process is used to provide for tribal gathering of firewood, boughs, tree bark, lodge poles, marsh hay, and maple syrup. A tribal member must provide his/her tribal ID card for this access, which is recorded by the county in which the collection occurs.</p> <p>Additionally, staff are aware of procedures for identifying known archaeological sites and implementing measures to protect them. At Site 12 (McCord Indian Village), artifacts and significant structures have been mapped and surveyed by state archeology staff. Maps are protected and not for public use in order to secure locations from artifact hunters and looters. Forest management activities are coordinated with the state archaeologist and Native American tribes. Buffer lines on the ground and on management maps identify the boundary for activity prohibited within the area.</p>
<p><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></p>	<p>NE</p>	

<p><b>C3.4. Indigenous peoples shall be compensated for the application of their traditional knowledge regarding the use of forest species or management systems in forest operations. This compensation shall be formally agreed upon with their free and informed consent before forest operations commence.</b></p>	<p>NE</p>	
<p><b>P4 Forest management operations shall maintain or enhance the long-term social and economic well-being of forest workers and local communities.</b></p>		
<p><b>C4.1. The communities within, or adjacent to, the forest management area should be given opportunities for employment, training, and other services.</b></p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>4.1.a. Employee compensation and hiring practices meet or exceed the prevailing <i>local</i> norms within the forestry industry.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Employment opportunities at DNR and county forests are non-discriminatory. At counties visited in 2018, state and federal postings were visible in public places. State hiring processes adhere to strict policies for compliance to equal opportunity, including selecting interview candidates and other measures to ensure fair hiring practices. During interviews, county and DNR staff noted that benefit packages are especially good and include health insurance and pensions.</p>
<p>4.1.b. Forest work is offered in ways that create high quality job opportunities for employees.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>There is a long average tenure of DNR and county forest staff, indicating that the quality of work life (compensation, work hours, job security, intangibles, etc.) is desirable. County employees interviewed during the 2016 audit expressed high job satisfaction and ample opportunities for training, including DNR-sponsored programs. A sample of training records in personnel files was reviewed, including certificates of completion. Training topics in records reviewed included invasive species, Karner Blue Butterfly, Natural Heritage Inventory, chainsaw safety, WisFIRS, pesticide application, archeological site identification, among other subjects.</p>
<p>4.1.c. Forest workers are provided with fair wages.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>County and DNR jobs are quality positions with competitive compensation packages. County employees interviewed stated that wages are comparable to somewhat less than to what could be earned in similar positions in private industry. Benefit packages were viewed as being good.</p>

		<p>Interviewed operators indicated that bid rates accepted by the counties for purchased wood is comparable to current rates in the wood market.</p>
<p>4.1.d. Hiring practices and conditions of employment are non-discriminatory and follow applicable federal, state and local regulations.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>County and DNR employment practices adhere to federal and state laws for exempt and non-exempt employees (see 4.1.a.). As observed in county offices, OSHA and anti-discrimination posters are posted in publicly-visible places.</p> <p>Timber contracts reviewed include stipulations to adhere to federal and state laws, including equal opportunity and non-discrimination.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>FME distributes bid prospectuses to a comprehensive list of potential bidders, including local operators. The size of timber sales is varied to allow access to a range of local companies.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>DNR liaisons and county forest staff support a large number and wide range of environmental education activities. For example, DNR staff attend public meetings related to the management of county forests and also provide educational opportunities to the public, such as tours. For example, at Site 9 the harvest unit was marked by a forestry class from University of Wisconsin Stevens Point (UWSP). Students were mentored by Oneida County forest staff and given direction on marking.</p> <p>Educating the public about Wisconsin’s county forests and the public benefits associated with sustainable forest management is a high priority for Wisconsin County Forests Association (WCFA). The quasi-governmental organization represents the forestry interests of the 29 counties in Wisconsin with lands enrolled under Wisconsin’s County Forest Law. Recent examples of educational efforts of WCFA include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Participating in Forest Fest held at Trees for Tomorrow in Eagle River on 28 July 2018. The event was open to the public and served to educate attendees about sustainable forest management;</li> <li>(2) Participated in several Great Lakes Timber Professionals Association (GLTPA) Log-a-Load-for Kids® events and educating hundreds of school children regarding multiple-use of forests.</li> </ol>

		<p>Member counties regularly host Log-a-Load-for-Kids® events on county forests;</p> <p>(3) Lincoln County assistant forest administrator and WCFA executive director assisted with a UWSP hardwood marking class on 29 March 2018;</p> <p>(4) Sponsored scholarships allowing high school students from urban and rural areas attend a natural resources careers session at Trees for Tomorrow in Eagle River; and</p> <p>(5) Vilas County forest administrator and WCFA executive director assisted with filming a 2<sup>nd</sup> episode of “Into the Outdoors” funded by Great Lakes Timber Professionals Association.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>FME supports local economic activity by providing access to employment opportunities for local community members, offering timber for bid, and offering other in-woods forestry contract work.</p> <p>Additionally, county forest and DNR employees reside in small, mid-sized, and large communities throughout Wisconsin and are engaged in civic activities throughout both as private citizens in off hours and as county and DNR representatives during work hours.</p>
<p><b>4.2. Forest management should meet or exceed all applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of employees and their families.</b></p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>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).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>There was one report in Douglas County of a snowmobile/log truck vehicular accident on an icy road, but no serious injuries or fatalities were reported in the last year. Likewise, operators interviewed indicated that no injuries had occurred. Counties reported that there have been no changes in the occupational health and safety regulatory framework in the last year. Accident records for staff are maintained in personnel files, and a sample was reviewed.</p>
<p>4.2.b. The forest owner or manager and their employees and contractors demonstrate a safe work environment. Contracts or other written agreements include safety requirements.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>All employees and contractors were observed using proper PPE at all times during the audit. Contracts reviewed for timber harvests contained safety requirements. Timber contracts reviewed include stipulations to adhere to federal and state laws, including those pertaining to health and safety.</p>

<p>4.2.c. The forest owner or manager hires well-qualified service providers to safely implement the management plan.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>All loggers interviewed had FISTA training; one was also a Wisconsin Master Logger certification. Records of contractors' FISTA training were viewed in county files and confirmed in the FISTA database.</p>
<p><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></p>	<p>NE</p>	
<p><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></p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>4.4.a. The forest owner or manager understands the likely social impacts of management activities, and incorporates this understanding into management planning and operations. Social impacts include effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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> <p>A summary is available to the CB.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>County forest and DNR staff that were interviewed are aware of likely social impacts of forest management activities. Examples of incorporating the public social impacts into management planning and operations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At Site 12, a no-management buffer was placed around the historic McCord Indian Village in order to protect artifacts and structures. Any management near the site is coordinated with the state archaeologist and Native American tribes.</li> <li>• County forests allow camping, hunting, and fishing. Firewood cutting is allowed with a permit. Implementation of Wisconsin BMPs help to protect water quality.</li> <li>• Aesthetic considerations in setting up harvests were common among the sales reviewed during audit. For example, Sale #T024-17-1 (Site 25) included aesthetic buffer along State Highway 8.</li> <li>• Among the community goals that county forests provide, recreational opportunities remain important. County forests work closely with recreational user groups such as ATV/UTV, snowmobile, mountain bike, horse riding, and cross-country ski clubs to ensure that ample opportunities for recreation are created while protecting natural resources. In Lincoln County (Site 15), a newly-constructed mountain bike trail was observed to connect a county and town</li> </ul>

		<p>bike trail. Oneida County (Site 10) has designated an area for use by silent sports such as cross-country skiing and mountain bikes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• County forests support local economic opportunities by providing employment for local community members, offering timber for bid, and offering other in-woods forestry contract work.</li> <li>• The county forestry program considers people who may be affected by management operations. For example, neighboring landowners are alerted to harvests, tribes are invited to provide input on management planning, and county board meetings are open to the public and invite comments.</li> </ul> <p>The comprehensive land use plan for each county includes a description of the likely social impacts of management activities and how this understanding is incorporated into management planning and operations.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>County board meetings and forestry committee meetings in which policies for resource management and work plans are set allow for public input. Those meetings are typically held monthly. County forest administrators are available for the public to provide feedback, and in this way they are constantly evaluating social impacts and incorporating them into management. WCFA oversaw the Wisconsin County Forest Practices Study, which evaluates many facets of forest management in the state, including social impacts.</p> <p>In Clark County, stakeholders call regularly with concerns or questions about various management activities occurring on the county forest, parks, and campgrounds. Concerns/questions are addressed in a timely manner by county forestry and parks staff. In the last year, all issues/questions were minor, were addressed at the staff level and did not require Forestry and Parks Committee involvement.</p> <p>Oneida County has regular contact with user groups such as the ski/bike clubs, ATV/UTV clubs, and snowmobile clubs. As issues arise, they are immediately dealt with via phone, in person meetings, or site visits. There have been comments regarding harvesting done along ski/bike trails.</p>



		<p>These issues have been addressed by conducting meetings with club members. The county has also had meetings with club members to get input on harvesting within the silent sports trails areas.</p> <p>Taylor County, like all counties, is dealing with a significant deer browse issue. The County Deer Advisory Committee aims to address deer management on the Taylor County forest, and much of the work with the county occurs through the Forestry and Recreation Committee. This involves a great deal of communication with local community members and others affected by management activities.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>County board meetings and forestry committee meetings in which policies for resource management and work plans are established allow for public input. Adjacent landowners are contacted in cases when management activities occur near property boundaries or otherwise may affect use rights. County forest administrators are available to the public for people to provide feedback, and in this way they are constantly evaluating social impacts and incorporating them into management.</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>	<p>C</p>	<p>The publicly-open county board and forestry committee meetings fulfill this requirement, as well as the administrators being available to the public.</p> <p>The County Forest Law establishes mechanisms for public participation in all planning processes. Annual work plans are open for public comment as advertised in local newspapers and on each county's website before management activities take place.</p> <p>Appeals are handled prior to plans becoming finalized to avoid conflicts; however, the public may contact their elected county representative or present information during monthly public meetings to appeal decisions. Draft and final plans are made available in county offices and on each county's website.</p>
<p><b>C4.5. Appropriate mechanisms shall be employed for resolving grievances and</b></p>	<p>NE</p>	

<p><b>for providing fair compensation in the case of loss or damage affecting the legal or customary rights, property, resources, or livelihoods of local peoples. Measures shall be taken to avoid such loss or damage.</b></p>		
<p><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>C5.1. Forest management should strive toward economic viability, while taking into account the full environmental, social, and operational costs of production, and ensuring the investments necessary to maintain the ecological productivity of the forest.</b></p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>5.1.a. The forest owner or manager is financially able to implement core management activities, including all those environmental, social and operating costs, required to meet this Standard, and investment and reinvestment in forest management.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Despite an ongoing agency-wide realignment of the DNR and a continued challenging budget situation for some counties, on-the-ground observations demonstrate that the FME is able to implement its core management activities. Still, with DNR staff being asked to do more with less and some counties losing FTEs, there remains the threat of this being an issue in the future.</p>
<p>5.1.b. Responses to short-term financial factors are limited to levels that are consistent with fulfillment of this Standard.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>While staff levels have fluctuated over time (e.g., Great Recession of 2007-09), including a slight reduction now as part of the DNR realignment, the FME has been able to maintain a level of harvesting that is within the AAC and that provides income for operations and counties. Evidence suggests that responses to these short-term financial factors are limited to levels that are consistent with fulfillment of the standard.</p>
<p><b>C5.2. Forest management and marketing operations should encourage the optimal use and local processing of the forest’s diversity of products.</b></p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>5.2.a. Where forest products are harvested or sold, opportunities for forest product sales and services are given to local harvesters, value-added processing and manufacturing facilities, guiding services, and other operations that are able to offer services at competitive rates and levels of service.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Through an examination of harvest contracts, interviews with county and DNR employees, and interviews with operators, all loggers and mills were verified as being local. Most harvested material is manufactured into lumber or pulp/paper products locally.</p>
<p>5.2.b. The forest owner or manager takes measures to optimize the use of</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Wisconsin has mills capable of using various grades of timber. Silvicultural prescriptions on the observed</p>

<p>harvested forest products and explores product diversification where appropriate and consistent with management objectives.</p>		<p>WCFP harvest sites promoted the development of high-quality stands of hardwood through TSI and shelterwood harvests. Pulp and paper, firewood, and biomass are options for most county lands on other sites. Examples of optimization were observed in pine thinnings through the use of processors so that varying grades of lumber could be obtained through better utilization.</p>
<p>5.2.c. On public lands where forest products are harvested and sold, some sales of forest products or contracts are scaled or structured to allow small business to bid competitively.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>A wide range of harvest sizes and minimum bid amounts are offered for sale to allow for both small and large businesses to purchase county wood. A review of bid lists verified this practice.</p>
<p><b>C5.3. Forest management should minimize waste associated with harvesting and on-site processing operations and avoid damage to other forest resources.</b></p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>5.3.a. Management practices are employed to minimize the loss and/or waste of harvested forest products.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>On all harvest sites visited, there was good utilization of harvested forest products. On pine thinnings and aspen regeneration harvests, the use of processors allow for a high level of utilization while spreading slash evenly over the harvest site to retain nutrients onsite.</p>
<p>5.3.b. Harvest practices are managed to protect residual trees and other forest resources, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• soil compaction, <i>rutting</i> and erosion are minimized;</li> <li>• residual trees are not significantly damaged to the extent that health, growth, or values are noticeably affected;</li> <li>• damage to NTFPs is minimized during management activities; and</li> <li>• techniques and equipment that minimize impacts to vegetation, soil, and water are used whenever feasible.</li> </ul>	<p>C</p>	<p>All of the loggers interviewed had FISTA training, which includes training on measures to implement this indicator. No significant damage to the resource was observed. Examples of measures to avoid damage to soil and water resources includes winter logging in wetlands so that compaction is avoided, using timber mats to cross trails and other sensitive areas, minimizing the number of stream crossings, and flagging no-equipment buffers in green tree retention areas and riparian buffers. Damage to residual stands was minimal.</p>
<p><b>C5.4. Forest management should strive to strengthen and diversify the local economy, avoiding dependence on a single forest product.</b></p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>5.4.a. The forest owner or manager demonstrates knowledge of their operation’s effect on the local economy</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>As confirmed through interviews, county forest and DNR staff have a high level of knowledge of local uses for forest products and recreation. The DNR has</p>

<p>as it relates to existing and potential markets for a wide variety of timber and non-timber forest products and services.</p>		<p>recently conducted an economic analysis of the WCFP for the counties sampled this year. Additionally, each of the counties makes its economic impact publicly available on county websites.</p>
<p>5.4.b The forest owner or manager strives to diversify the economic use of the forest according to Indicator 5.4.a.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>In 2013, Wisconsin’s legislature designated \$600,000 to WCFA in the form of a DNR grant for a study of Wisconsin’s forestry practices. Wisconsin’s Forest Practices Study (WFPS) is being used to identify areas where WCFP has opportunities to enhance to diversify its products or services offerings, among other activities to advance forestry and forest practices in the state.</p>
<p><b>C5.5. Forest management operations shall recognize, maintain, and, where appropriate, enhance the value of forest services and resources such as watersheds and fisheries.</b></p>	<p>NE</p>	
<p><b>C5.6. The rate of harvest of forest products shall not exceed levels which can be permanently sustained.</b></p>	<p>C</p>	
<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> <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>C</p>	<p>Reconnaissance (recon) of land is a tool utilized in all the county forestry programs in the assessment of geographical, structural, and compositional attributes of existing resources. This field information is stored in the Wisconsin Forest Inventory &amp; Reporting System (WisFIRS) management application. The database is used to analyze existing resources, evaluate management alternatives, and assist in the development and implementation of management plans. Recon is one tool used to assess forest resource information at the property level. All annual forest management activities that are carried out by any program (fish, wildlife, parks, endangered resources, etc.) that alter vegetation in any way (e.g., invasive species treatments, timber stand improvement, site preparation, tree planting, timber sales, and wildlife habitat management) is identified by compartment and stand within the WisFIRS database. Needs listed in the database, in addition to other multi-disciplinary input, is used in determining property budgets and annual work plans.</p> <p>Minor changes to annual allowable harvest rates occur each year when planning is conducted for each county forest. During planning, if harvest intervals or early or late constraints are changed, the</p>

<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>calculated annual allowable harvest changes accordingly. If harvest dates are updated on a large amount of the property, then the AAC can also be impacted.</p> <p>Harvest rates are established using area control methods and the data from WisFIRS. County forestry committees and county boards develop budgets annually, during which AAC acres are considered.</p> <p>There been any no major adjustments in the FME’s annual allowable harvest rate. Minor changes to AAC occur each year when planning is conducted for each county forest. During planning, if harvest intervals or operating season constraints are changed, then the calculated AAC will change accordingly. Additionally, if harvest dates are updated on a large portion of any one county forest, then the AAC can also be impacted.</p>
<p>5.6.b. Average annual harvest levels, over rolling periods of no more than 10 years, do not exceed the calculated sustained yield harvest level.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>During the audit, the actual acreage harvested between 2008 and 2018 was compared with AAC acres for each county sampled. For Taylor and Lincoln Counties, the average 10-year actual harvested acres were far below AAC. Oneida’s average 10-year actual harvested acres were consistent with its AAC.</p> <p>For all county forests combined, the 15-year plans call for 37,370 acres to have been cut in the last year, and the actual harvest was slightly under this at 37,013 acres.</p>
<p>5.6.c. Rates and methods of timber harvest lead to achieving desired conditions, and improve or maintain health and quality across the FMU. Overstocked stands and stands that have been depleted or rendered to be below productive potential due to natural events, past management, or lack of management, are returned to desired stocking levels and composition at the earliest practicable time as justified in management objectives.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>WCFP uses standard harvest scheduling established in WisFIRS for each stand type. Future entries are based on ecological goals for the site, species composition, stocking, and past management. A combination of moving harvests forward and delaying harvest is used to ensure a balanced age class distribution over time across the landscape.</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</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The only significant commercial operations of NTFPs occur on counties with sphagnum moss resources. Harvest areas and intervals are established based on data from past years that show how quickly the</p>

<p>traditional or customary use rights may be impacted by such harvests. In other situations, the forest owner or manager utilizes available information, and new information that can be reasonably gathered, to set harvesting levels that will not result in a depletion of the non-timber growing stocks or other adverse effects to the forest ecosystem.</p>		<p>resource can recover. No counties that harvest and sell sphagnum were visited in 2018.</p> <p>Other NTFPs are small scale and are controlled and harvest volumes monitored through issuing permits (e.g., Christmas trees, firewood). Permits are also issued to tribal members for gathering of boughs, tree bark, lodge poles, marsh hay, jack pine stumps, and maple syrup. See 3.2.b.</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>C6.1. Assessments of environmental impacts shall be completed -- appropriate to the scale, intensity of forest management and the uniqueness of the affected resources -- and adequately integrated into management systems. Assessments shall include landscape level considerations as well as the impacts of on-site processing facilities. Environmental impacts shall be assessed prior to commencement of site-disturbing operations.</b></p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>6.1.a. Using the results of <i>credible scientific analysis, best available information</i> (including relevant databases), and local knowledge and experience, an assessment of conditions on the FMU is completed and includes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Forest community types and development, size class and/or successional stages, and associated <i>natural disturbance regimes</i>;</li> <li>2) <i>Rare, Threatened and Endangered (RTE) species</i> and <i>rare ecological communities</i> (including plant communities);</li> <li>3) Other habitats and species of management concern;</li> <li>4) Water resources and associated riparian habitats and hydrologic functions;</li> <li>5) <i>Soil resources</i>; and</li> <li>6) <i>Historic conditions</i> on the FMU related to forest community types and</li> </ol>	<p>C</p>	<p>These topics are covered in each county's comprehensive land use plan. Forest community types and natural disturbance regimes in Wisconsin are described the <i>Silviculture Handbook</i> (No. 2431.5).</p> <p>The WisFIRS database has these resources mapped. Counties also use supplemental information such as soil maps, LiDAR data for wetland locations, wildlife action plans, and DNR manuals. An inquiry to the Natural Heritage Inventory (NHI) database is included for each project planned on the county forests. These inquiries and the results were confirmed on the Timber Sale Notice and Cutting Reports reviewed during site visits.</p>

<p>development, size class and/or successional stages, and a broad comparison of historic and current conditions.</p>		
<p>6.1.b. Prior to commencing site-disturbing activities, the forest owner or manager assesses and documents the potential short and long-term impacts of planned management activities on elements 1-5 listed in Criterion 6.1.a.</p> <p>The assessment must incorporate the <b>best available information</b>, drawing from scientific literature and experts. The impact assessment will at minimum include identifying resources that may be impacted by management (e.g., streams, habitats of management concern, soil nutrients). Additional detail (i.e., detailed description or quantification of impacts) will vary depending on the uniqueness of the resource, potential risks, and steps that will be taken to avoid and minimize risks.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Impacts to these resources are evaluated when completing a Timber Sale Notice and Cutting Report for each harvest. The forms include the results of evaluations of these resources. Each County’s comprehensive land use plan also contains general information on impacts.</p> <p>Items included in the ecological considerations portion of the Timber Sale Notice and Cutting Report include management history, green tree retention, post-harvest regeneration plan, invasive species evaluation, insect/disease concerns, skidding/seasonal restrictions, landscape considerations, wildlife action plan/species of greatest conservation need, results of NHI review, and forest chemical use. Also included on Timber Sale Notice and Cutting Reports are sections on water quality considerations, aesthetic considerations, wildlife considerations, recreation considerations, and resources of special concern (archeological/historical review).</p>
<p>6.1.c. Using the findings of the impact assessment (Indicator 6.1.b), management approaches and field prescriptions are developed and implemented that: 1) avoid or minimize negative short-term and long-term impacts; and, 2) maintain and/or enhance the long-term ecological viability of the forest.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Timber Sale Notice and Cutting Reports document the harvest or management prescriptions and ecological considerations.</p> <p>When setting up and implementing harvest units, WCFP uses manuals developed by the Wisconsin DNR: <i>Wisconsin’s Forestry Best Management Practices for Water Quality</i> (PUB FR-093-2010), <i>Timber Sale Handbook</i> (No. 2461), <i>Public Forest Lands Handbook</i>, <i>Ecological Landscapes Handbook</i> (No. 2460.5), and <i>Silviculture Handbook</i> (2431.5). These manuals help the county forests avoid negative impacts and meet ecological objectives of management. The Kotar Habitat Classification System is used to assist in making ecological-based harvest plans.</p>
<p>6.1.d. On public lands, assessments developed in Indicator 6.1.a and management approaches developed in Indicator 6.1.c are made available to the public in draft form for review and comment prior to finalization. Final assessments are also made available.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Each timber sale is posted in a local newspaper and many are posted on county websites prior to the sale (typically at least 30 days). Confidential portions of the timber sale planning documents, including information on RTE species, sensitive habitats, and archaeological sites, is maintained in a confidential</p>

		<p>portion of the file and is not available to the general public.</p> <p>Management plans that include broad overviews of 6.1.a are available online and by request. Public input is sought on these drafts. Annual work plans are made available to the public prior to finalization, and any relevant comments received are responded to during public meetings.</p> <p>All final management planning documents are available to the public in county offices, upon request, and many are also posted on county websites.</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. Inappropriate hunting, fishing, trapping, and collecting shall be controlled.</b></p>	<p>C</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>The Wisconsin NHI database is consulted prior to all forest management activities, and the results are documents in Timber Sale Notice and Cutting Reports. Foresters work in consultation with DNR Wildlife and Endangered Resources staff to address any occurrences in order to ensure protection. Additional site surveys for species often conduct additional site surveys for species if the NHI database indicates the need. Sites visited during the audit included protection measures in place for RTE species to avoid the risk of impacts of forest management activities.</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</p>	<p>C</p>	



<p>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>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>	C	<p>The US Fish and Wildlife Service has developed statewide Habitat Conservation Plans for several species (e.g., Karner Blue Butterfly). Funding of \$0.05/acre is provided to county forests by the DNR to perform habitat improvement work, which can be used for game or non-game species.</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>	C	<p>Activities that may impact RTE species may be conducted under the authority of a broad or site-specific incidental take permit as approved by the DNR. Sites visited included protection measures in place for RTE species to avoid the risk of impacts of forest management activities.</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>	C	
<p><b>C6.3.a. Landscape-scale indicators</b></p>		
<p>6.3.a.1. The forest owner or manager maintains, enhances, and/or restores under-represented <i>successional</i> stages in the FMU that would naturally occur on the types of sites found on the FMU. Where old growth of different community types that would naturally occur on the forest are under-represented in the landscape relative to natural conditions, a portion of the forest is managed to enhance and/or restore old growth characteristics.</p>	C	<p>Assessments of under-represented, naturally-occurring successional stages occur during comprehensive land use planning processes and annual reconnaissance surveys. Specific FMU goals for management of these areas are described in each county's comprehensive land use plan and/or in annual work plans. Some of these areas are considered as HCV.</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,</p>	C	<p>Some of the counties and sites visited during the 2018 audit include ecosystems which not only are rare but also support RTE species. Common</p>

<p>restore or enhance the viability of the community. Based on the vulnerability of the existing community, <b>conservation zones</b> and/or <b>protected areas</b> are established where warranted.</p>		<p>modifications included no-entry buffer strips and green tree retention areas.</p>
<p>6.3.a.3. When they are present, management maintains the area, structure, composition, and processes of all <b>Type 1</b> and <b>Type 2 old growth</b>. Type 1 and 2 old growth are also protected and buffered as necessary with conservation zones, unless an alternative plan is developed that provides greater overall protection of old growth values.</p> <p>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>C</p>	<p>Relict old growth stands (Type 1) are typed as reserved; there is no active management except for protection from invasive species. In managed old-growth stands, any forest management is conducted primarily to maintain or enhance old growth characteristics. Only one of these stands has a planned treatment and that is not until 2099.</p> <p>Site 1 contained approximately 9 acres of Type 1 old growth forest. The stand is not classified as HCVF, although it does have old growth characteristics. Mechanical removal of buckthorn encroaching from adjoining landowner was recently performed in order to protect the old growth resource.</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> <li>5. Conservation zones representative of old growth stands are established.</li> <li>6. Landscape level considerations are addressed.</li> <li>7. Rare species are protected.</li> </ol>		
<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>DNR wildlife biologists work with liaison foresters and county forest administrators to plan and carry out projects for wildlife habitat improvement.</p> <p>Some recent examples of efforts to benefit wildlife include the Young Forest Initiative, barrens restoration and management, grouse/woodcock habitat enhancement, and turkey habitat enhancement. Projects are often conducted in partnership with other groups including Ruffed Grouse Society, National Wild Turkey Federation, and US Fish and Wildlife Service.</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> <ol 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> </ol>	C	<p>Forest management activities regularly occur near riparian and other wetland areas. <i>Wisconsin's Forestry Best Management Practices for Water Quality</i> are followed when conducting management near these areas. BMP, soil disturbance, and ephemeral pond monitoring projects are conducted on county forest lands by the DNR forest hydrologist. Numerous examples of protecting vernal pools, bogs, wetlands, ponds, and streams were observed during sites visits.</p>

<p>e) stream shading and inputs of wood and leaf litter into the adjacent aquatic ecosystem.</p>		
<p><b>Stand-scale Indicators</b> 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>	<p>C</p>	<p>The harvests observed in 2018 are consistent the natural disturbance regimes that would maintain conditions for the species groups found on those sites. For example, aspen regeneration harvests mimic wind and fire events that would naturally keep aspen on the landscape. Oak thinnings and northern hardwood selections harvests are consistent with wind throw and natural mortality events that would promote the growth of healthy trees.</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 for regeneration.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>None of the sites visited in 2018 required planting; all relied on natural regeneration. However, when planting is required, seed sources predominantly come from areas around the state’s current and past nurseries (Boscobel and Wisconsin Rapids). Some counties send local seed sources to out-of-state nurseries to be container grown. In some cases, local seed sources are not available for use; in those cases, the next seed source is utilized. FME provided records of seed sources for each county that planted in the last year.</p>
<p>6.3.f. Management maintains, enhances, or restores habitat components and associated stand structures, in abundance and distribution that could be expected from naturally occurring processes. These components include: a) large live trees, live trees with decay or declining health, <b>snags</b>, and well-distributed coarse down and dead woody material. <b>Legacy trees</b> where present are not harvested; and b) vertical and horizontal complexity. Trees selected for <b>retention</b> are generally representative of the dominant species found on the site.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Completed harvests observed contained snags left, as well as some legacy trees such as conifers within aspen regeneration harvests. Also observed were retained den and cavity trees.</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</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>When even-aged harvests are conducted, guidelines for green tree retention areas, biomass harvesting, coarse woody debris are followed, as confirmed in field observation. These guidelines are intended to represent a proportion and configuration that is consistent with the characteristic natural disturbance regime.</p>

<p>within the harvest unit as described in Appendix C for the applicable region.</p> <p>In the Lake States Northeast, Rocky Mountain and Southwest Regions, when even-aged silvicultural systems are employed, and during salvage harvests, live trees and other native vegetation are retained within the harvest unit in a proportion and configuration that is consistent with the characteristic natural disturbance regime unless retention at a lower level is necessary for the purposes of restoration or rehabilitation. See Appendix C for additional regional requirements and guidance.</p>		
<p>6.3.g.2 Under very limited situations, the landowner or manager has the option to develop a qualified plan to allow minor departure from the opening size limits described in Indicator 6.3.g.1. A qualified plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <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</li> </ol>	<p>C</p>	<p>There are no additional restrictions on even-aged management for the Lake States-Central Hardwoods region.</p>

<p>ecology, to confirm the preceding findings.</p>		
<p>6.3.h. The forest owner or manager assesses the risk of, prioritizes, and, as warranted, develops and implements a strategy to prevent or control <b>invasive species</b>, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. a method to determine the extent of invasive species and the degree of threat to native species and ecosystems;</li> <li>2. implementation of management practices that minimize the risk of invasive establishment, growth, and spread;</li> <li>3. eradication or control of established invasive populations when feasible: and,</li> <li>4. monitoring of control measures and management practices to assess their effectiveness in preventing or controlling invasive species.</li> </ol>	<p>C</p>	<p>The threat of invasive species varies between counties. However, each of the counties visited in 2018 have active invasive species control programs.</p> <p>For example, Lincoln County locates via GPS every incident of invasive species plant for use when controlling and monitoring; the county has an impressive program of spraying garlic mustard, which it has been doing annually for 10 years. At Site 18, there was signage warning the public of invasives, and a horse trail had been sealed off with detour signs rerouting trail to an alternate route.</p> <p>Also in Oneida County, Gobbler Lake State Natural Area (Site 11)—a 1,085-acre HCV area featuring an esker, open bog, and 20-acre lake—is annually surveyed for invasive species by the DNR ecologist.</p> <p>In the last year, treatments (chemical or mechanical/hand-pulling) have also occurred in Ashland County (garlic mustard), Bayfield County (common buckthorn, black locust, and spotted knapweed), Chippewa County (garlic mustard), Clark County (spotted knapweed, leafy spurge, cypress spurge, Japanese honeysuckle, and purple loosestrife), Douglas County (reed canary grass, bird’s foot trefoil, Canada thistle, bull thistle, purple loosestrife, buckthorn, honeysuckle, and spotted knapweed), Florence County (buckthorn), Forest County (garlic mustard), Jackson County (buckthorn, spotted knapweed, and phragmites), Lincoln County (garlic mustard, buckthorn, and crown vetch), Price County (buckthorn), and Wood County (buckthorn).</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>Most prescribed burns in Wisconsin are conducted for wildlife habitat purposes. Counties work with the DNR to complete burn plans and coordinate burns on county forests. Barrens management, red oak regeneration, and suppressing woody vegetation in grasslands are common objectives for prescribed fire. No prescribed burn plans were visited during the 2018 audit. At the sites visited, the volume of slash on the ground did not increase fire risk.</p>

		In 2017, there were 767 wildfires that burned 717 acres in Wisconsin. Current fire data is posted online at <a href="http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/ForestFire/report.asp">dnr.wi.gov/topic/ForestFire/report.asp</a> .
<b>C6.4. Representative samples of existing ecosystems within the landscape shall be protected in their natural state and recorded on maps, appropriate to the scale and intensity of operations and the uniqueness of the affected resources.</b>	NE	
<b>C6.5. Written guidelines shall be prepared and implemented to control erosion; minimize forest damage during harvesting, road construction, and all other mechanical disturbances; and to protect water resources.</b>	C	
6.5.a. The forest owner or manager has written guidelines outlining conformance with the Indicators of this Criterion.	C	WCFP uses BMPs developed by the Wisconsin DNR ( <i>Wisconsin's Forestry Best Management Practices for Water Quality, PUB FR-093-2010</i> ). Per the DNR <i>Timber Sale Handbook</i> (No. 2461), BMPs are mandatory on those county forests that are certified to the FSC FM Standard.
6.5.b. Forest operations meet or exceed Best Management Practices (BMPs) that address components of the Criterion where the operation takes place.	C	<p>At Site 6 (Forest Timber Sale 7-16 #64), an improperly constructed water bar on a skid trail was observed on the closed-out unit. The water bar was installed perpendicular to the trail and had no outlet. The same trail crossed an ephemeral stream, showing signs of erosion and compaction at the equipment crossing.</p> <p>At Site 27, Poplar County Road was observed as having extensive sections with many parallel, shallow (1- to 2-inch deep) ruts which are not causing erosion or movement of sediment off of the road. There were no water quality impacts observed. The road surface is fine-textured native material, with no crown, so the ruts hold rainwater which impairs the ability of the road surface to sustain use without further rutting.</p> <p>See <b>OBS 2018.1</b>.</p>
6.5.c. Management activities including site preparation, harvest prescriptions, techniques, timing, and equipment are selected and used to protect soil and water resources and to avoid erosion, landslides, and significant soil	C	<p>Wisconsin BMPs form the base for conformance to this indicator. The 2018 audit team saw good compliance to BMPs during the audit. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At Site 24 (T019-18-1), slash was evenly distributed on an aspen regen harvest to</li> </ul>

<p>disturbance. Logging and other activities that significantly increase the risk of landslides are excluded in areas where risk of landslides is high. The following actions are addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Slash is concentrated only as much as necessary to achieve the goals of site preparation and the reduction of fuels to moderate or low levels of fire hazard.</li> <li>• Disturbance of topsoil is limited to the minimum necessary to achieve successful regeneration of species native to the site.</li> <li>• Rutting and compaction is minimized.</li> <li>• Soil erosion is not accelerated.</li> <li>• Burning is only done when consistent with natural disturbance regimes.</li> <li>• Natural ground cover disturbance is minimized to the extent necessary to achieve regeneration objectives.</li> <li>• Whole tree harvesting on any site over multiple rotations is only done when research indicates soil productivity will not be harmed.</li> <li>• Low impact equipment and technologies is used where appropriate.</li> </ul>		<p>encourage nutrient retention. On all sites with vernal pools (e.g., Sites 8 and 24), there was no sign of equipment or logging slash in the ponds, per prescriptions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disturbance of topsoil was minimal. The only exceptions were at sites in which scarification is necessary for regeneration (e.g., birch seedling regeneration at Site 13, Oneida County #1677).</li> <li>• The DNR also implemented guidance for whole tree harvesting in biomass harvesting, as research has shown that enough crowns break off during skidding to distribute nutrients over the site. Examples of this were seen during the audit.</li> <li>• Also at Site 24, the processor and forwarder had “Ecotracks” and “Eco-treaded” tires to minimize soil compaction. The use of this low impact equipment was observed to be effective.</li> </ul>
<p>6.5.d. The transportation system, including design and placement of permanent and temporary haul roads, skid trails, recreational trails, water crossings and landings, is designed, constructed, maintained, and/or reconstructed to reduce short and long-term environmental impacts, habitat fragmentation, soil and water disturbance and cumulative adverse effects, while allowing for customary uses and use rights. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• access to all roads and trails (temporary and permanent),</li> </ul>	<p>C</p>	<p>Counties follow Wisconsin BMPs, which address many of these issues. The road systems in Taylor and Oneida County were especially impressive, due in part to the gated closure of many roads not needed.</p> <p>The harvest areas were designed to minimize road infrastructure, and crossing of streams was limited. The road entrance to Site 26 (closed out aspen regeneration harvest) was blocked to ATV use by a berm; an intermittent stream crossing on the road was seeded with clover and herbaceous vegetation to minimize erosion and sedimentation.</p>



<p>including recreational trails, and off-road travel, is controlled, as possible, to minimize ecological impacts;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• road density is minimized;</li> <li>• erosion is minimized;</li> <li>• sediment discharge to streams is minimized;</li> <li>• there is free upstream and downstream passage for aquatic organisms;</li> <li>• impacts of transportation systems on wildlife habitat and migration corridors are minimized;</li> <li>• area converted to roads, landings and skid trails is minimized;</li> <li>• habitat fragmentation is minimized;</li> <li>• unneeded roads are closed and rehabilitated.</li> </ul>		<p>Other examples of reducing the short- and long-term environmental impacts include Bear Avenue in Taylor County (Site 7), which was damaged during a recent rain event with two failures at culverted crossings. The failures had been temporarily repaired, and within the next 30 days the road will be rehabilitated, including graded with a crown and both culverts replaced.</p>
<p>6.5.e.1. In consultation with appropriate expertise, the forest owner or manager implements written <b><i>Streamside Management Zone (SMZ) buffer</i></b> management guidelines that are adequate for preventing environmental impact, and include protecting and restoring water quality, hydrologic conditions in rivers and stream corridors, wetlands, vernal pools, seeps and springs, lake and pond shorelines, and other hydrologically sensitive areas. The guidelines include vegetative buffer widths and protection measures that are acceptable within those buffers.</p> <p>In the Appalachia, Ozark-Ouachita, Southeast, Mississippi Alluvial Valley, Southwest, Rocky Mountain, and Pacific Coast regions, there are requirements for minimum SMZ widths and explicit limitations on the activities that can occur within those SMZs. These are outlined as requirements in Appendix E.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Riparian Management Zones (RMZs) are described in Chapter 7 of Wisconsin’s BMP manual. Chapter 8 deals with wetlands. These include recommended vegetative buffer widths. The BMP manual includes examples of RMZ widths for common situations, such as even-aged aspen harvests. Harvest is permitted within RMZs, but in the three county forests visited in 2018, no harvesting occurs in RMZs.</p>

<p>6.5.e.2. Minor variations from the stated minimum SMZ widths and layout for specific stream segments, wetlands and other water bodies are permitted in limited circumstances, provided the forest owner or manager demonstrates that the alternative configuration maintains the overall extent of the buffers and provides equivalent or greater environmental protection than FSC-US regional requirements for those stream segments, water quality, and aquatic species, based on site-specific conditions and the best available information. The forest owner or manager develops a written set of supporting information including a description of the riparian habitats and species addressed in the alternative configuration. The CB must verify that the variations meet these requirements, based on the input of an independent expert in aquatic ecology or closely related field.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>All RMZ buffer widths observed during the 2018 audit were consistent with those recommended by Wisconsin’s BMP manual.</p>
<p>6.5.f. Stream and wetland crossings are avoided when possible. Unavoidable crossings are located and constructed to minimize impacts on water quality, hydrology, and fragmentation of <b>aquatic habitat</b>. Crossings do not impede the movement of aquatic species. Temporary crossings are restored to original hydrological conditions when operations are finished.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Wisconsin’s BMP manual covers stream crossings with specific examples. The recommended specifications described in the manual are in line with this indicator. Field sites visited in 2018 showed adherence with BMPs. No impediments to aquatic organisms were observed. Timber mats and/or woody debris are typically used to cross sensitive areas, and examples of both were observed.</p>
<p>6.5.g. Recreation use on the FMU is managed to avoid negative impacts to soils, water, plants, wildlife and wildlife habitats.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>BMPs are designed with compatible multiple uses in mind. Recreation trails such as ATV/UTV and mountain bike trails are constructed to minimize negative impacts to soils, water, plants, wildlife, and wildlife habitats. For example, at Site 15 (Lincoln County) a newly-constructed mountain bike trail followed the contour of land and included water bars to control water movement and prevent erosion.</p>
<p>6.5.h. Grazing by domesticated animals is controlled to protect in-stream habitats and water quality, the species composition and viability of the riparian</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>No grazing with domesticated animals is permitted on county forests.</p>

<p>vegetation, and the banks of the stream channel from erosion.</p>		
<p><b>C6.6. Management systems shall promote the development and adoption of environmentally friendly non-chemical methods of pest management and strive to avoid the use of chemical pesticides. World Health Organization Type 1A and 1B and chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides; pesticides that are persistent, toxic or whose derivatives remain biologically active and accumulate in the food chain beyond their intended use; as well as any pesticides banned by international agreement, shall be prohibited. If chemicals are used, proper equipment and training shall be provided to minimize health and environmental risks.</b></p>	<p>NE</p>	
<p>6.6.d. Whenever chemicals are used, a written prescription is prepared that describes the site-specific hazards and environmental risks, and the precautions that workers will employ to avoid or minimize those hazards and risks, and includes a map of the treatment area. Chemicals are applied only by workers who have received proper training in application methods and safety. They are made aware of the risks, wear proper safety equipment, and are trained to minimize environmental impacts on non-target species and sites.</p>	<p>NE</p>	<p>On two occasions, an Oneida County forester applied chemical herbicide after the expiration of this person’s Wisconsin Pesticide Applicator’s certification. The forester’s certification expired on 3/31/18. Chemical herbicide applications occurred on 6/18/18 (0.5 Gal of Garlon Ultra) and 7/3/18 (0.1 Gal of Garlon Ultra). The forester has signed up for the required training to reinstate certification. Documentation confirming that the training will occur on 9/19/18 was reviewed.</p> <p>See <b>OBS 2018.2</b>.</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>NE</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>NE</p>	

<p><b>C6.9. The use of exotic species shall be carefully controlled and actively monitored to avoid adverse ecological impacts.</b></p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>6.9.a. The use of <i>exotic species</i> is contingent on the availability of credible scientific data indicating that any such species is non-invasive and its application does not pose a risk to native biodiversity.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Exotic species are not used on the FMUs for commercial or management purposes. <i>Wisconsin Forestry Best Management Practices for Water Quality</i> (Appendix D) lists non-native species suitable for cover crops for short term erosion control. <i>Wisconsin’s Forestry Best Management Practices for Invasive Species Field Manual</i> (Appendix H) lists species recommended for revegetation.</p>
<p>6.9.b. If exotic species are used, their provenance and the location of their use are documented, and their ecological effects are actively monitored.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Wisconsin DNR analyzed the risk of using non-native species listed in these BMP manuals. County staff follow the guidelines from this evaluation, which indicated low risk of invasiveness and low risk of establishment of a seed bank.</p>
<p>6.9.c The forest owner or manager shall take timely action to curtail or significantly reduce any adverse impacts resulting from their use of exotic species</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p><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></p>	<p>NE</p>	
<p><b>P7 A management plan -- appropriate to the scale and intensity of the operations -- shall be written, implemented, and kept up to date. The long-term objectives of management, and the means of achieving them, shall be clearly stated.</b></p>		
<p><b>C7.1. The management plan and supporting documents shall provide:</b>  <b>a) Management objectives. b) description of the forest resources to be managed, environmental limitations, land use and ownership status, socio-economic conditions, and a profile of adjacent lands.</b>  <b>c) Description of silvicultural and/or other management system, based on the ecology of the forest in question and information gathered through resource inventories. d) Rationale for rate of annual harvest and species selection. e) Provisions for monitoring</b></p>	<p>NE</p>	

<p><b>of forest growth and dynamics. f) Environmental safeguards based on environmental assessments. g) Plans for the identification and protection of rare, threatened and endangered species.</b></p> <p><b>h) Maps describing the forest resource base including protected areas, planned management activities and land ownership.</b></p> <p><b>i) Description and justification of harvesting techniques and equipment to be used.</b></p>		
<p><b>C7.2. The management plan shall be periodically revised to incorporate the results of monitoring or new scientific and technical information, as well as to respond to changing environmental, social and economic circumstances.</b></p>	-	
<p>7.2.a The management plan is kept up to date. It is reviewed on an ongoing basis and is updated whenever necessary to incorporate the results of monitoring or new scientific and technical information, as well as to respond to changing environmental, social and economic circumstances. At a minimum, a full revision occurs every 10 years.</p>	NE	
<p><b>C7.3. Forest workers shall receive adequate training and supervision to ensure proper implementation of the management plans.</b></p>	C	
<p>7.3.a. Workers are qualified to properly implement the management plan; All forest workers are provided with sufficient guidance and supervision to adequately implement their respective components of the plan.</p>	C	<p>All operators interviewed in 2018 were FISTA-trained (one was also certified as a Wisconsin Master Logger); training records were reviewed. Harvest maps were onsite during active operations.</p> <p>As confirmed in interviews with county and DNR staff and operators, pre-work meetings are conducted immediately prior to harvesting activity; a sample of pre-sale checklists was reviewed. Additionally, interviews with operators and a review of written inspection forms confirmed regular visits by county foresters during operations. Operators stated that county foresters are accessible if questions arise and that there is regular communication.</p>

<p><b>C7.4. While respecting the confidentiality of information, forest managers shall make publicly available a summary of the primary elements of the management plan, including those listed in Criterion 7.1.</b></p>	<p>NE</p>	
<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>		
<p><b>C8.1. The frequency and intensity of monitoring should be determined by the scale and intensity of forest management operations, as well as, the relative complexity and fragility of the affected environment. Monitoring procedures should be consistent and replicable over time to allow comparison of results and assessment of change.</b></p>	<p>NE</p>	
<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></p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>8.2.a.1. For all commercially harvested products, an inventory system is maintained. The inventory system includes at a minimum: a) species, b) volumes, c) stocking, d) regeneration, and e) stand and forest composition and structure; and f) timber quality.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>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 the <i>Wisconsin DNR Public Forest Lands Handbook</i> (No. 2460.5). In 2017, reconnaissance surveys were completed on 151,627 acres.</p>
<p>8.2.a.2. Significant, unanticipated removal or loss or increased vulnerability of forest resources is monitored and recorded. Recorded</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Data on any such losses would be gathered by a special reconnaissance inventory and entered into WisFIRS before annual updates of harvest scheduling. No significant, unanticipated removal or</p>

<p>information shall include date and location of occurrence, description of disturbance, extent and severity of loss, and may be both quantitative and qualitative.</p>		<p>loss or increased vulnerability of forest resources has occurred in the last year in the three counties sampled.</p>
<p>8.2.b The forest owner or manager maintains records of harvested timber and NTFPs (volume and product and/or grade). Records must adequately ensure that the requirements under Criterion 5.6 are met.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Harvest volumes are entered into WisFIRS before annual harvest scheduling. Records for harvest of firewood and other NTFPs, including by members of tribes. Harvest data from TimberBase or other timber sale accounting software are manually entered into WisFIRS, as is data from the Timber Sale Notice &amp; Cutting Reports. In this respect, WisFIRS is the central repository and mechanism for monitoring the volume harvested timber and NTFPs over time. In FY 18, harvests on FSC-certified county forests totaled 729,589 cord equivalents.</p>
<p>8.2.c. The forest owner or manager periodically obtains data needed to monitor presence on the FMU of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Rare, threatened and endangered species and/or their <b>habitats</b>;</li> <li>2) Common and rare plant communities and/or habitat;</li> <li>3) Location, presence and abundance of invasive species;</li> <li>4) Condition of protected areas, set-asides and buffer zones;</li> <li>5) High Conservation Value Forests (see Criterion 9.4).</li> </ol>	<p>C</p>	<p>The DNR conducts wildlife surveys on county forests: nesting bird surveys, grouse transects, summer deer observations, winter track surveys, bear surveys, and a variety of other wildlife and plant monitoring. Reports can be found at <a href="http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/WildlifeHabitat/reports.html">http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/WildlifeHabitat/reports.html</a></p> <p>The NHI database is updated based on the results of statewide inventories, data generated by NHI cooperators at universities, nonprofit organizations, federal and state agencies and individuals; and published literature and reports submitted to the DNR.</p> <p>Foresters are trained to assess sites for invasive plants during routine forest reconnaissance. Invasives were added to the recon data sheet a few years ago to allow for retention of this information. Over 75,000 acres currently have invasive plants listed as being present on the FSC-certified county forests. Several counties also participate in Cooperative Weed Management Associations. Additionally, the DNR also has a system for gathering invasives information (aquatic, wetland, terrestrial) from the general public available on its website: <a href="http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/Invasives/report.html">http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/Invasives/report.html</a>.</p> <p>Forest health monitoring, including gypsy moth and EAB surveys, occurs at the state level. During routine forest reconnaissance, foresters are trained to assess sites for invasives.-Lincoln County locates via</p>

		<p>GPS every incident of invasive species plant species for use when controlling and monitoring.</p> <p>As part of monitoring active harvest sites, as well as closing out such sites, county foresters ensure that protected areas, set-asides, and buffer zones are implemented according to the prescription. Notes from visits to active sites were reviewed, as were harvest close-out checklists.</p> <p>HCVs are monitored regularly. For example, also in Oneida County, Gobbler Lake State Natural Area (Site 11)—a 1,085-acre HCV area featuring an esker, open bog, and 20-acre lake—is annually surveyed for invasive species by the DNR ecologist.</p>
<p>8.2.d.1. Monitoring is conducted to ensure that site specific plans and operations are properly implemented, environmental impacts of site disturbing operations are minimized, and that harvest prescriptions and guidelines are effective.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>In addition to regular monitoring of active harvests and close-out, BMP monitoring for water quality, soil disturbance monitoring, and vernal pond monitoring occurs. Examples of timber sale inspection reports and checklists for sites visited were reviewed.</p> <p>A report produced in February 2016 by the Forest Stewards Guild, <i>Wisconsin Forest Practices and Harvesting Constraints Assessment</i>, evaluates the collective impact of constraints (BMPs, etc.) on forest management and ecological consequences of those constraints. The report found “that overall, guidelines, best practices, and other constraints intended to protect forest resources have positive effects on forest composition and structure and in protecting forest productivity.” This suggests that harvest prescriptions and guidelines are effective in minimizing environmental impacts of site disturbing operations associated with active forest management.</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>WCFP requires annual reports and annual work plans for each county. These annual plans routinely include information on the system of forest roads. <i>Wisconsin’s Forestry Best Management Practices for Water Quality</i> includes the need for inspection at regular intervals for active roads and inspection of inactive roads. County staff interviewed indicated that their regular presence in the forest is an important mechanism for monitoring road conditions. Any problems noted by staff are promptly reported to the county administrator.</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>With county board meetings being open to the public and most documents available for public review, the county administrators are continually aware of relevant socio-economic issues. They often receive stakeholder comments and respond to those comments. Individual county comprehensive land use plans, as well as the WCFA website, contain monitoring information.</p>
<p>8.2.d.4. Stakeholder responses to management activities are monitored and recorded as necessary.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Meeting minutes with the public and Citizen Advisory Councils serve as a record of stakeholder interaction.</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 ongoing, assuring that any opportunities for joint monitoring of cultural sites are made available to tribes. In Oneida County, for example, the administrator invited tribal members to participate in a tour of the McCord Indian Village. He has been working closely with the tribe to ensure protection of the culturally-significant site.</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>Quarterly and annual accomplishment reports show progress throughout the year for various work goals (timber sale establishment, reforestation, etc.). Timber sale inspections constitute monitoring at harvest sale level.</p>
<p><b>C8.3. Documentation shall be provided by the forest manager to enable monitoring and certifying organizations to trace each forest product from its origin, a process known as the "chain of custody."</b></p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>8.3.a. When forest products are being sold as FSC-certified, the forest owner or manager has a system that prevents mixing of FSC-certified and non-certified forest products prior to the point of sale, with accompanying documentation to enable the tracing of the harvested material from each harvested product from its origin to the point of sale.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>County forests use a trip-ticket system for tracking FSC-certified products. Tickets have three parts. When a load leaves the landing, one part is deposited in a lockbox on site. When delivered to the mill, a second ticket is maintained by the mill, and the third is returned to the county, along with mill weight or tally. See COC indicators for FMEs.</p>
<p>8.3.b The forest owner or manager maintains documentation to enable the tracing of the harvested material from each harvested product from its origin to the point of sale.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>See 8.3.a and COC indicators for FMEs.</p>

<p><b>C8.4. The results of monitoring shall be incorporated into the implementation and revision of the management plan.</b></p>	<p>NE</p>	
<p><b>C8.5. While respecting the confidentiality of information, forest managers shall make publicly available a summary of the results of monitoring indicators, including those listed in Criterion 8.2.</b></p>	<p>NE</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>Examples of forest areas that <i>may have</i> high conservation value attributes include, but are not limited to:</b></p> <p>Central Hardwoods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Old growth – (see Glossary) (a)</li> <li>• Old forests/mixed age stands that include trees &gt;160 years old (a)</li> <li>• Municipal watersheds –headwaters, reservoirs (c)</li> <li>• Rare, Threatened, and Endangered (RTE) ecosystems, as defined by GAP analysis, Natural Heritage Inventory, and/or the World Wildlife Fund’s Forest Communities of Highest Conservation Concern, and/or Great Lakes Assessment (b)</li> <li>• Intact forest blocks in an agriculturally dominated landscape (refugia) (a)</li> <li>• Intact forests &gt;1000 ac (valuable to interior forest species) (a)</li> <li>• Protected caves (a, b, or d)</li> <li>• Savannas (a, b, c, or d)</li> <li>• Glades (a, b, or d)</li> <li>• Barrens (a, b, or d)</li> <li>• Prairie remnants (a, b, or d)</li> </ul> <p>North Woods/Lake States:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Old growth – (see Glossary) (a)</li> </ul>		

- Old forests/mixed age stands that include trees >120 years old (a)
- Blocks of contiguous forest, > 500 ac, which host RTEs (b)
- Oak savannas (b)
- Hemlock-dominated forests (b)
- Pine stands of natural origin (b)
- Contiguous blocks, >500 ac, of late successional species, that are managed to create old growth (a)
- Fens, particularly calcareous fens (c)
- Other non-forest communities, e.g., barrens, prairies, distinctive geological land forms, vernal pools (b or c)
- Other sites as defined by GAP analysis, Natural Heritage Inventory, and/or the World Wildlife Fund’s Forest Communities of Highest Conservation Concern (b)

*Note: In the Lake States-Central Hardwoods region, old growth (see Glossary) is both rare and invariably an HCVF.*

*In the Lake States-Central Hardwoods region, cutting timber is not permitted in old-growth stands or forests.*

*Note: Old forests (see Glossary) may or may not be designated HCVFs. They are managed to maintain or recruit: (1) the existing abundance of old trees and (2) the landscape- and stand-level structures of old-growth forests, consistent with the composition and structures produced by natural processes.*

*Old forests that either have or are developing old-growth attributes, but which have been previously harvested, may be designated HCVFs and may be harvested under special plans that account for the ecological attributes that make it an HCVF.*

*Forest management maintains a mix of sub-climax and climax old-forest conditions in the landscape.*

<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>	NE	
<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>	NE	
<b>C9.3. The management plan shall include and implement specific measures that ensure the maintenance and/or enhancement of the applicable conservation attributes consistent with the precautionary approach. These measures shall be specifically included in the publicly available management plan summary.</b>	NE	

<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	Periodic reconnaissance updating and targeted monitoring visits to some HCVMs each year as needed. HCV areas mostly undergo passive management. Interviews with staff indicate that these are visited periodically to ensure that there is little to no visible anthropogenic disturbance. For example, Gobbler Lake State Natural Area (Site 11) is annually surveyed for invasive species. HCVMs within harvest units are primarily in sensitive areas that are identified during pre-harvest reconnaissance and monitored during post-harvest close-out to ensure effective protection measures.
9.4.b. When monitoring results indicate increasing risk to a specific HCV attribute, the forest owner/manager re-evaluates the measures taken to maintain or enhance that attribute, and adjusts the management measures in an effort to reverse the trend.	C	According to FME staff, no increasing risks to HCVMs have been detected.
<p><b>P10 Plantations shall be planned and managed in accordance with Principles and Criteria 1-9, and Principle 10 and its Criteria. While plantations can provide an array of social and economic benefits, and can contribute to satisfying the world's needs for forest products, they should complement the management of, reduce pressures on, and promote the restoration and conservation of natural forests.</b></p> <p>This principle is not applicable for the FME.</p>		

### Appendix 6 – Chain of Custody Indicators for FMEs Conformance Table

Chain of Custody indicators were not evaluated during this evaluation.

REQUIREMENT	C/NC	COMMENT / CAR
<b>1. Quality Management</b>		
1.1 The organization shall appoint a management representative as having overall responsibility and authority for the organization’s compliance with all applicable requirements of this standard.	C	The COC administrator is the certificate manager for the counties, who currently is Doug Brown.

<p>1.2 The FME shall maintain complete records of all FSC-related COC activities, including sales and training, for at least 5 years.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>1.3 The FME shall define its forest gate(s) (check all that apply):  <i>The forest gate is defined as the point where the change in ownership of the certified-forest product occurs.</i></p>		<p><b>Stump</b>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Stumpage sale or sales of standing timber; transfer of ownership of certified-forest product occurs upon harvest.</i></p> <p><b>On-site concentration yard</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Transfer of ownership of certified-product occurs at concentration yard under control of FME.</i></p> <p><b>Off-site Mill / Log Yard</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Transfer of ownership occurs when certified-product is unloaded at purchaser's facility.</i></p> <p><b>Auction house / Brokerage</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Transfer of ownership occurs at a government-run or private auction house / brokerage.</i></p> <p><b>Lump-sum sale / Per Unit / Pre-Paid Agreement</b>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>A timber sale in which the buyer and seller agree on a total price for marked standing trees or for trees within a defined area before the wood is removed — the timber is usually paid for before harvesting begins. Similar to a per-unit sale.</i></p> <p><b>Log landing</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Transfer of ownership of certified-product occurs at landing / yarding areas.</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other (Please describe):</b></p>
<p>1.4 The FME shall have sufficient control over its forest gate(s) to ensure that there is no risk of mixing of FSC-certified forest products covered by the scope of the FM/COC certificate with forest products from outside of the scope prior to the transfer of ownership.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The legal transfer point is defined within each timber sale contract. For field-scaled sales, specification that logs cannot be transferred prior to scaling is included in specific language. Transfer of ownership in those cases occurs either upon scaling or approval from county forest staff.</p>
<p>1.5 The FME and its contractors shall not process FSC-certified material prior to transfer of ownership at the forest gate without conforming to applicable chain of custody requirements.  <i>NOTE: This does not apply to log cutting or de-barking units, small portable sawmills or on-site processing of chips / biomass originating from the FMU under evaluation.</i></p>	<p>C</p>	<p>No processing occurs prior to legal transfer of ownership.</p>

<b>2. Product Control, Sales and Delivery</b>		
<p>2.1. Products from the certified forest area shall be identifiable as certified at the forest gate(s).</p>	C	<p>Most harvested timber is transferred upon severance from the stump (stumpage sales) or prior to harvest (lump-sum sales). Haul tickets may be used in stumpage sales to track harvested materials once they leave the site, but ownership lies with the buyer upon ownership transfer. In lump-sum sales, the buyer is responsible for any COC requirements. For field-scaled sales, in which logs are scaled at the landing prior to transport, county staff and/or DNR scale each log and mark it with paint. This lets the buyer know that the item is okay to transport.</p>
<p>2.2 The FME shall maintain records of quantities / volumes of FSC-certified product(s).</p>	C	<p>County staff showed how TimberBase 2013 is used to tally and track harvest timber volumes. Information from TimberBase 2013 is then entered into WisFIRS for comparison of pre-harvest and post-harvest volume information. Scale tickets for mixed hardwood pulp and an associated invoice #30431 from Domtar for Timber Sale T005-10-1 (Lincoln County) was reviewed.</p>
<p>2.3. The FME shall ensure that all sales documents issued for outputs sold with FSC claims include the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) name and contact details of the organization;</li> <li>b) name and address of the customer;</li> <li>c) date when the document was issued;</li> <li>d) description of the product;</li> <li>e) quantity of the products sold;</li> <li>f) the organization’s FSC Forest Management (FM/COC) or FSC Controlled Wood (CW/FM) code;</li> <li>g) clear indication of the FSC claim for each product item or the total products as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. the claim “FSC 100%” for products from FSC 100% product groups;</li> <li>ii. the claim “FSC Controlled Wood” for products from FSC Controlled Wood product groups.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	C	<p>Current County Forest Timber Sale Contracts and haul tickets are maintained by county forest administrators. Whenever changes are made relative to forest certification information, the WCFP manager is consulted. Contracts contain the correct certificate code and FSC claim, as well as elements a)-e). The timber sale contract for Timber Sale T005-16-1 (Lincoln County) with Marth Wood Shaving Supply, Inc. was reviewed. Haul tickets examined for Oneida and Lincoln Counties also have elements a)-g) and are assigned to each timber sale so that they can be traced to the contract.</p>

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

3.1 Describe where / how the organization uses the SCS and FSC trademarks for promotion.	C	WCFP uses FSC trademarks on haul tickets and the WDNR website. Some counties use FSC trademarks on timber sale prospectuses.
3.2 The FME shall request authorization from SCS to use the FSC on-product labels and/or FSC trademarks for promotional use.	C	WCFP has sought prior authorization from SCS. Records of approval were emailed to the audit team on August 20, 2014.
3.3 Records of SCS and/or FSC trademark use authorizations shall be made available upon request.	C	Records of approval were emailed to the audit team on August 20, 2014.
<b>4. Outsourcing</b>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
4.1 The FME shall provide the names and contact details of all outsourced service providers.		All logging and transport activities are contracted by timber buyers.
4.2 The FME shall have a control system for the outsourced process which ensures that: a) The material used for the production of FSC-certified material is traceable and not mixed with any other material prior to the point of transfer of legal ownership; b) The outsourcer keeps records of FSC-certified material covered under the outsourcing agreement; c) The FME issues the final invoice for the processed or produced FSC-certified material following outsourcing; d) The outsourcer only uses FSC trademarks on products covered by the scope of the outsourcing agreement and not for promotional use.		
<b>5. Training and/or Communication Strategies</b>		
5.1 All relevant FME staff and outsourcers shall be trained in the FME’s COC control system commensurate with the scale and intensity of operations and shall demonstrate competence in implementing the FME’s COC control system.	C	Staff interviewed in Taylor, Oneida, and Lincoln Counties demonstrated awareness of when to use haul tickets and how to assign them to each sale. There is low risk for failure to pass COC claims on to buyers since information from 2.3 is included in contract templates. Informal training occurs at WCFA meetings to review certification issues, including COC. Operators also showed proper understanding of how to use the trip ticket system and the purpose of the COC procedures.



<p>5.2 The FME shall maintain up-to-date records of its COC training and/or communications program, such as a list of trained employees, completed COC trainings, the intended frequency of COC training (i.e. training plan), and related program materials (e.g., presentations, memos, contracts, employee handbooks, etc).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Training on COC procedures occurs for new employees that learn timber sale administration. Since the current COC system is largely automated as information is included in contracts and load tickets by default, training records of training are minimal.</p>
--	----------	--

## Appendix 7 – Trademark Standard Conformance Table

Trademark Standard was not evaluated during this evaluation.

**SCS Trademark Annex for FMEs: FSC Trademarks, FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2**

N/A, does not use/intend to use FSC trademarks for any purposes (finished with this section); or  
 N/A, is fully integrated and all trademark uses are treated under the COC Annex to this report that includes a full review of FSC-STD-40-004 and FSC-STD-50-001.

NOTE: This section is **applicable for all organizations that use or intend to use any FSC trademarks** for promotional and/or on-product purposes. For evaluation audits, it is acceptable to mark C if the client demonstrates an adequate awareness of the requirements through interviews and other applicable evidence. A requirement should be marked NC and a corresponding CAR should be issued for any nonconformance identified, such as use of FSC trademarks prior to granting of certification.

<p><b>Description</b> of how the organization currently uses, or intends to use, FSC trademarks and/or labels, including but not limited to printed materials, Internet applications, on-product labeling, and other public-facing media:</p>	<p>FME exercises limited use of the FSC trademark on public-facing media. The Wisconsin DNR website includes the FSC logo, but none of the counties uses the logo.</p> <p>Compilation of trademark uses for three counties sampled in 2018 (Y means trademark use, N means no trademark use):</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">2018 Audit</th> <th style="text-align: left;">TS Contracts</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Prospectus</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Letterhead</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Web</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Invoice</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Woods Scale</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Langlade</b></td> <td>Y</td> <td>N</td> <td>N</td> <td>N</td> <td>Y</td> <td>N</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Lincoln</b></td> <td>Y</td> <td>Y</td> <td>N</td> <td>N</td> <td>Y</td> <td>N</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Oneida</b></td> <td>N</td> <td>N</td> <td>N</td> <td>N</td> <td>Y</td> <td>Y</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Taylor</b></td> <td>Y</td> <td>N</td> <td>N</td> <td>N</td> <td>Y</td> <td>N</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2018 Audit	TS Contracts	Prospectus	Letterhead	Web	Invoice	Woods Scale	<b>Langlade</b>	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	<b>Lincoln</b>	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	<b>Oneida</b>	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	<b>Taylor</b>	Y	N	N	N	Y	N
2018 Audit	TS Contracts	Prospectus	Letterhead	Web	Invoice	Woods Scale																														
<b>Langlade</b>	Y	N	N	N	Y	N																														
<b>Lincoln</b>	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N																														
<b>Oneida</b>	N	N	N	N	Y	Y																														
<b>Taylor</b>	Y	N	N	N	Y	N																														

FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 1.9  
 Products intended to be labeled or promoted as FSC certified are included in the organization’s certified **product group list**.

X	C
	NC
	C w/Obs

**Evidence:** Reviewed produce group list in FM Standard. All products on list fall under certification.

<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 1.4, 1.6 – 1.8, 1.13 – 1.14</p> <p>The organization does <u>not</u> use the FSC trademarks in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ in connection with the sale or promotion of <b>FSC Controlled Wood</b> (§1.4)</li> <li>■ in any way that could cause <b>confusion</b>, misinterpretation or loss of credibility to the FSC certification scheme (§1.6)</li> <li>■ to imply any <b>FSC endorsement</b> or responsibility of the organization’s activities outside of the certificate scope (§1.7)</li> <li>■ to imply any <b>FSC responsibility</b> for the production of products, documents or promotional materials (§1.8)</li> <li>■ in product brand names, company names or website domain <b>names</b> (§1.13)</li> <li>■ <b>translated</b> to another language with no English included (§1.14)</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs
<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 7.2</p> <p>The FSC trademarks are not used together with the marks of <b>other forest certification</b> schemes in a way <b>which implies equivalence</b> or in a way which is disadvantageous to the FSC trademarks in terms of size or placement.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs
<p><b>Sections 1.4, 1.6 – 1.8, 1.13, 1.14, and 7.2 Evidence:</b> Reviewed trademark uses listed in Description section above. All uses adhere to these Trademark Standard indicators.</p>	
<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 1.11</p> <p>Any <b>information about FSC</b> that is in addition to FSC trademarks and labels included in any material has been given prior <b>approval</b> by SCS.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs <input type="checkbox"/> N/A, no additional FSC information
<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 1.15</p> <p>The use of the FSC “checkmark-and-tree” logo is directly accompanied by the <b>appropriate trademark symbols</b> ® or ™ (in superscript font). The appropriate symbol also accompanies the <b>first use</b> of “FSC” and “Forest Stewardship Council” in any text.</p> <p><b>NOTES:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The use of trademark registration symbol is not required for FSC claims in sales and delivery documents, or for the disclaimer/ statement specified in requirement 7.5 of FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2. The registration symbol is required for any other use of initials “FSC” on documents; however, the omission of the use of trademark registration symbol in promotional texts related to FSC on invoice templates, delivery notes and similar documents is possible if the software used to produce these documents does not support trademark registration symbols. This exception only applies to the use of the trademark registration symbol for the initials “FSC” and the name “Forest Stewardship Council”.</li> <li>2. In January 2014, in Hong Kong, FSC changed the trademark symbol from ® back to ™. Companies affected by this change which have approved artwork with the ® registered trademark symbol for distribution in Hong Kong may continue to produce, distribute and sell into the market product using the registered trademark symbol on the FSC trademarks until 1 September 2015, with an additional liquidation period of six months, which expires 1 March 2016. All <b>new</b> artwork must use the ™ trademark symbol.</li> <li>3. Where the FSC initials are used vertically in the traditional way of writing for Asian nations, the registration status symbol may be used in superscript font in either the top right corner</li> </ol>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs <input type="checkbox"/> N/A, one or more of the noted exceptions apply

<p>(alongside F), or the bottom right corner (alongside C) as preferred. In this instance, mark "C".</p>	
<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 1.16 All FSC <b>trademark uses</b> have been submitted to SCS for <b>approval</b>.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs
<p><b>Sections 1.11, 1.15 and 1.16 Evidence:</b> Client provided evidence of SCS approval of Wisconsin DNR logo use. Other uses also approved where required. Reviewed trademark uses listed in Description section and confirmed conformance with trademark symbol requirement.</p>	
<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 1.10 All (previously approved) FSC labels <b>only use the FSC label artwork</b> provided on the label generator or otherwise issued or approved by SCS or FSC.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs <input type="checkbox"/> N/A, no approved FSC labels
<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, Sections 10, 11 and 12 All (previously approved) FSC labels and logos conform to the standard requirements for <b>color and font</b> (§10.1-10.3, 11.5, 11.7, 11.9), <b>format and size</b> (§10.4 - 10.7, 11.2, 11.3, 11.8), <b>trademark symbol</b> (§10.8, 11.4), <b>FSC trademark license code</b> (§10.9), <b>label text</b> (§10.10 - 10.15) and/or <b>mini label</b> requirements (§10.16 - 10.18). The label or logo is not being <b>misused</b> in any manner described in section 12.2.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs <input type="checkbox"/> N/A, no approved FSC labels
<p><b>Sections 1.10, 10, 11 and 12.2 Evidence:</b> Reviewed trademark uses listed in Description section and confirmed conformance with these indicators.</p>	
<p><b>Promotional use of the FSC trademarks</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> N/A, does not use/intend to use FSC trademarks for promotional purposes (Skip Promotional section)</p>	
<p>NOTE: This section is applicable for all organizations that use or <i>intend</i> to use FSC trademarks for <b>promotional purposes</b>. For evaluation audits, it is acceptable to mark C if the client demonstrates an adequate awareness of the requirements through interviews and other applicable evidence. A requirement should be marked NC and a corresponding CAR should be issued for any nonconformance identified, such as use of FSC trademarks prior to granting of certification.</p>	
<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 1.12, 4.4 The FSC trademarks are not used to promote <b>product quality</b> aspects not covered by FSC certification (§ 1.12). Any claims regarding <b>qualities outside the control of FSC</b>, such as other environmental attributes of the product, are separated from text about FSC (§ 4.4).</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs <input type="checkbox"/> N/A, no additional quality claims

<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 6.1  <b>Catalogues, brochures, and websites</b> meet the following requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The promotional panel, or at least the FSC trademark license code, is in a prominent place.</li> <li>b) When the products are not all on the same page, a link or text such as “Look for FSC certified products” is included next to the panel / code.</li> <li>c) FSC certified products are indicated by using the logo or with “FSC certified” in the product description.</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs <input type="checkbox"/> N/A, do not use trademarks in these items
<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 4.1            For labeled <b>stationery and brochures printed on FSC-certified paper, the label is not in such a prominent position</b> as to make it appear that any organization (or its products) represented in the publication is endorsed by FSC. (E.g. the FSC label is not placed on the front cover of the brochure or next to images of forest-based products which are not FSC certified.)</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A, no such labeled items
<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 6.2            FSC certified products are not promoted using only the <b>SCS Kingfisher</b> and/or <b>SCS Global Services logo</b>.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs
<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 7.3            FSC trademarks are <b>not used</b> at the top of <b>document templates</b> such as letterheads, sales documents and emails.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs
<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 7.4            The FSC trademarks are not used on <b>business cards to promote</b> the organization’s certification.            NOTE: If authorization was duly received under the previous trademark standard, the organization may use the existing supply until it is depleted. In this case, the approval must be available and must have been granted prior to July 1, 2011.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A, approval granted prior July 1, 2011
<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 4.2            If a <b>business card is printed on FSC-certified paper</b>, the mini label with product type is used at minimum size. The use of the mini label does not imply that the organization is affiliated with FSC.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A, no labeled business cards
<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 8.1, 8.2            All <b>promotional items</b> (e.g., mugs, pens, T-shirts, caps, banners, vehicles, etc.) display, at minimum, the FSC logo and FSC trademark license code (§8.1). Any promotional items made wholly or partly of wood (e.g., pencils, memory sticks, etc.) meet the applicable labeling requirements specified by FSC-STD-40-004 (§8.2).</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs

	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A, no FSC labels on promotional items
<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 8.3                  For FSC trademarks used for promotion at <b>trade fairs</b> the organization has clearly marked which products are FSC certified and the products carry an FSC label; or if no products are displayed, a visible disclaimer stating, “Ask for our FSC certified products,” or, “We can provide FSC certified products upon request,” is present.                  NOTE: Use of text to describe the FSC certification of the organization does not require a disclaimer.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A, no FSC trademarks used for promotional trade fairs
<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 9.1, 9.2                  The organization takes full responsibility for the use of FSC trademarks by <b>investment companies</b> and others making <b>financial claims</b> based on their FSC certified operations (§9.1). Any such claims are accompanied by the disclaimer, “FSC is not responsible for and does not endorse any financial claims on returns on investments” (§9.2).</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A, no investment claims about FSC operations
<p><b>Promotional Trademarks Section Evidence:</b> Reviewed trademark uses listed in Description section above. All uses adhere to these Trademark Standard indicators. FME uses acronym “FSC” on timber sale contracts, invoices, prospectuses, and woods scales all adhere to Indicator 7.3, pertaining to document templates.</p>	
<p><b>Number and variety of promotional trademarks and associated approval records reviewed:</b> DNR website and samples of sales documents reviewed.</p>	
<p><b>Rationale that sample choice is sufficient to confirm system is functioning effectively and as described:</b> FME has limited use of FSC trademarks, including only one logo use.</p>	
<p><b>Using the FSC labels on products</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A, does not use/intend to use FSC on-product/packaging labels (Skip section 11)</p>	
<p>NOTE: This section is applicable for all organizations that use or <i>intend</i> to use FSC trademarks for <b>on-product purposes</b>. For evaluation audits, it is acceptable to mark C if the client demonstrates an adequate awareness of the requirements through interviews and other applicable evidence. A requirement should be marked NC and a corresponding CAR should be issued for any nonconformance identified, such as use of FSC trademarks prior to granting of certification.</p>	
<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 2.1</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC

<p>For each on-product claim, the organization has selected the <b>correct FSC label</b> based upon the FSC claim that the product has been supplied with or is qualified for. <i>NOTE: For FM/COC certificates, the FSC label and claim is FSC 100%.</i></p>	<input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs
<p><b>Sections FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 2.1 Evidence: n/a</b></p>	
<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 2.3 The FSC label is <b>clearly visible</b> on the product, its packaging or both.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs
<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 2.6 Marks of <b>other forestry certification schemes</b> are not used on the <b>same product</b> (except for product promotion or educational purposes in an FSC labeled publication, as long as there are no claims about the paper of the publication being certified against the other certification scheme (§2.6.1)).</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs
<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 2.7 When products are being made for sale to retailers who may wish to use the FSC trademarks to promote them, the products carry the FSC label either on the product or on packaging which will be <b>visible to the consumer</b>.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs <input type="checkbox"/> N/A, products not being made for sale to retailers
<p>FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 4.3 Where the FSC logo with the license code is applied as a <b>heat brand or stencil</b> directly to the product without all required label elements, a <b>standard label is also used</b> either on the packaging or attached as a sticker or hang-tag.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/Obs <input type="checkbox"/> N/A, no brand/stencil <input type="checkbox"/> N/A, brand/stencil includes all elements
<p><b>Sections 2.2 – 2.7, 4.3 Evidence: n/a</b></p>	
<p><b>Number and variety of on-product logos and associated approval records reviewed: n/a</b></p>	
<p><b>Rationale that sample choice is sufficient to confirm system is functioning effectively and as described: n/a</b></p>	

## Appendix 8 – Group Management Program

This is not a group certificate, so this appendix is not applicable.