

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 AUDIT

7-10 August 2017

DATE OF LAST UPDATE

23 October 2017

SCS Contact:

Brendan Grady | Director

Forest Management Certification

+1.510.452.8000

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

Foreword

Cycle in annual surveillance audits				
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 st annual audit	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 nd annual audit	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 rd annual audit	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 th annual audit	<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 audits to ascertain ongoing conformance with the requirements and standards of certification. A public summary of the initial evaluation is available on the FSC Certificate Database <http://info.fsc.org/>.

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

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

Organization of the Report

This report of the results of our evaluation is divided into two sections. Section A provides the public summary and background information that is required by the Forest Stewardship Council. This section is made available to the general public and is intended to provide an overview of the evaluation process, the management programs and policies applied to the forest, and the results of the evaluation. Section A will be posted on the FSC Certificate

Database (<http://info.fsc.org/>) no less than 90 days after completion of the on-site audit.
Section B contains more detailed results and information for the use by the FME.

Table of Contents

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY	5
1. GENERAL INFORMATION	5
1.1 Annual Audit Team.....	5
1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation	6
1.3 Standards Employed	6
2 ANNUAL AUDIT DATES AND ACTIVITIES	6
2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities	6
2.2 Evaluation of Management Systems	13
3. CHANGES IN MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	13
4. RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION.....	13
4.1 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations	13
4.2 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations	21
5. STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS	24
5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted	25
5.2 Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Responses from the Team, Where Applicable	25
6. CERTIFICATION DECISION	26
7. CHANGES IN CERTIFICATION SCOPE	26
8. ANNUAL DATA UPDATE	34
8.1 Social Information.....	34
8.2 Annual Summary of Pesticide and Other Chemical Use	34
SECTION B – APPENDICES (CONFIDENTIAL).....	38
Appendix 1 – List of FMUs Selected For Evaluation.....	38
Appendix 2 – List of Stakeholders Consulted.....	38
Appendix 3 – Additional Audit Techniques Employed.....	42
Appendix 4 – Pesticide Derogations	42
Appendix 5 – Detailed Observations.....	42
Appendix 6 – Chain of Custody Indicators for FMEs.....	89
Appendix 7 – Group Membership.....	89

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY

1. General Information

1.1 Annual Audit Team

Auditor Name:	Walter Mark	Auditor role:	FSC Lead Auditor
Qualifications:	<p>Dr. Mark is a professor emeritus of forestry at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo and former Director of Swanton Pacific Ranch, the University’s FSC Certified school forest. Dr. Mark specializes in forest health and silviculture. Dr. Mark is a consultant for Scientific Certification Systems. Dr. Mark is a registered professional forester in California (RPF No. 1250) with over 40 years of forestry experience in public and private forestry and higher education sectors. He has served as audit team member and leader for several certification, recertification and annual audits since 2003.</p>		
Auditor Name:	Mike Ferrucci	Auditor role:	SFI Lead Auditor and FSC Auditor
Qualifications:	<p>Mike Ferrucci is qualified as a RAB-QSA Lead Auditor (ISO 14001 Environmental Management Systems), as an SFI Lead Auditor for Forest Management, Procurement, and Chain of Custody, as an FSC Lead Auditor Forest Management and Chain of Custody, as a Tree Farm Group Certification Lead Auditor, and as a GHG Lead Auditor. Mike has led Sustainable Forest Initiative (SFI) certification and precertification reviews throughout the United States. He has also led or participated in joint SFI and Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) certification projects in nearly one dozen states and a joint scoping or precertification gap-analysis project on tribal lands throughout the United States. He also co-led the pioneering pilot dual evaluation of the Lakeview Stewardship Unit on the Fremont-Winema National Forest.</p> <p>Mike Ferrucci has 33 years of forest management experience. His expertise is in sustainable forest management planning; in certification of forests as sustainably managed; in the application of easements for large-scale working forests, and in the ecology, silviculture, and management of mixed species forests, with an emphasis on regeneration and management of native hardwood species. Mike has conducted or participated in assessments of forest management operations throughout the United States, with field experience in 4 countries and 33 states. Mike has been a member of the Society of American Foresters for over thirty-five years. He is Past Chair of the SFI Auditor’s Forum. Mike is also a Lecturer at the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, where he has taught graduate courses and workshops in forest management,</p>		

	harvesting operations, professional forest ethics, private forestry, and financial analysis.		
Auditor Name:	Michelle L. Matteo	Auditor role:	FSC and SFI Auditor
Qualifications:	Michelle L. Matteo is a lead auditor for SCS Global Services based in Southern New England. Michelle is a forester, arborist and maintains a (state) Massachusetts Forester License as well as an International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) Arborist Certification. Michelle has completed a 3-day ISO 19011 training designed & presented in relation to the FSC Standards, completed hundreds of CoC audits, certification audits of the Northeast Master Logger program, and is a lead auditor for Forest Management audits. She earned an MS in Forestry and BS in Wildlife & Fisheries Biology, both from the University of Massachusetts.		

1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation

A. Number of days spent on-site assessing the applicant:	3.0
B. Number of auditors participating in on-site evaluation:	3.0
C. Additional days spent on preparation, stakeholder consultation, and post-site follow-up:	4.0
D. Total number of person days used in evaluation:	13.0

1.3 Standards Employed

1.3.1. Applicable FSC-Accredited Standards

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

2 Annual Audit Dates and Activities

2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities

Date: 7 August 2017	
FMU / Location / sites visited	Activities / notes

1700 – 2030 - Drive from Madison to Minocqua	Discussions with Mark Heyde on WICFP background. Review of pertinent documents.
Date: 8 August 2017	
FMU / Location / sites visited	Activities / notes
0800 – 1000 DNR Service Center- Woodruff/Opening Meeting	Opening Meeting: Introductions, client update, review audit scope, audit plan, intro/update to FSC and SCS standards and protocols, review of open CARs/OBS, final site selection from spreadsheet with consideration given to additional data provided
1000 – 1730 – Iron County Forest/Various locations in Iron County	
Hurley Forestry Office	Brief opening meeting
Iron County Forest - Penokee Range Biological Reserve Area	HCVF – Penokee Range Biological Reserve Area - A high conservation value forest located in the towns of Anderson, Pence, and Kimball. Above 1550' elevation, a 1500 ac. parcel is set aside as a “no management zone”. Area was cutover in the early 1900’s with the first timber sales in the late 1880’s. Diversity of multiple RT&E species, numerous forested seeps, unique rock fissures, and microclimate present. Designated as an Important Bird Area (IBA) due to the exceptionally concentrations of Black-Throated Blue and Golden Winged Warblers. High concentrations of seasonal migrant raptors present. Discussion of ongoing Phenology Study by Bad River Tribe with GLIFWC.
Iron County Forest - Penokee Area - North County ATV Trail	ATV trail maintenance reviewed, including swale crossings and cross drain culverts. Erosion along the sides of the trail and sediment deposition at culvert sites was evident. See CAR 2017.7.
Iron County Forest - Maple sap collection area near North County ATV Trail	Roadside viewing of a maple sap collection area available by permit to Tribal members.
Iron County Forest - Sale #2607 (map #8), Tract 01-14	145 acres, Northern Hardwood (NH) single-tree selection with gap creation and gap expansion to encourage quality NH regeneration. Presence of a National Scenic Trail on the site. Sale partially cut. Loggers pulled out due to weather conditions and site conditions that approached rutting limits. Gaps are marked to expand. Some old gaps expanded. Bisected by the North Country Trail (NCT), a National Scenic Trail, ½ cut, no activity at this time. Cutting halted in Jan '17 due to wet soil conditions and rutting that was approaching the rutting limits

	<p>described in the sale contract. Rutting on 2 skid trails was close to/ exceeding rutting guidelines, some were well-slashed, others marginally slashed.</p> <p>Well-maintained boardwalk on the NCT present for a substantial portion of the trail, includes a foot bridge over an intermittent stream. Bridge work maintained by the North County Trail Association.</p> <p>National Scenic Trail to be lightly thinned with risk and hazard trees removed.</p> <p>Many potential future den/cavity trees marked for removal, potentially in excess of the amounts noted in the 2460 to retain or enhance.</p>
Iron County Forest - Sale #2649 (map #5), Tract 40-14	<p>184 acre NH single-tree selection with gap expansion to release dense, excellent quality NH advanced regeneration.</p> <p>Active sale, however not harvesting at the time of the field audit due to wet ground; small area of the sale remains to be harvested when site conditions improve. Threatened and species of special concern displayed in NHI, however, lack of suitable habitat found within project boundaries.</p> <p>Some wet areas, wetland boundaries respected. Small amount of residual stand damage, understory regen protected. Oak wilt timing restriction was imposed.</p> <p>Logger interview - confirmed safety and forestry training (FISTA), and process for walkthrough with forester on a sale, including receiving the site map and walking the site.</p>
Ferrucci and Matteo	
Iron County Forest (ICF): Sale #2675, Tract 19-15	<p>Shelterwood harvest, 70 acres and single tree selection with gaps, 51 acres.</p> <p>Logger interview - confirmed safety and forestry training (FISTA), and process for walkthrough with forester on a sale, including receiving the site map and walking the site. BMP applications and logger training discussed.</p> <p>Stakeholder comments about communication with Forester regarding rutting requirements and site operability.</p> <p>Marked and unmarked vernal ponds/seasonal wetlands protected. Blue and red line boundaries viewed and respected.</p>
ICF: Sale #2701, Tract 35-15	<p>Aspen cc, 34 acres, NH selection cut, 8 acres.</p> <p>Viewed retained yellow birch, aspen, & sugar maple, as well as a retained patch in the sale adjacent to the road. Edges of sale were feathered with some amount of edge. Woodcock foraging presence viewed. Slash low and good aspen regen present.</p>
ICF: Shirley Lake Road	<p>Forestry road maintained by Iron County. All-year truck road with crushed gravel surface, graded 2 times each year. Road is in good condition.</p>

<p>ICF: Sale #2630, Tract 22-14</p>	<p>Area 2: A 41 acre Aspen Regeneration/Conversion Harvest, completed. Stand had been predominantly spruce-fir with hardwoods, other conifers, and scattered Aspen. Converted to Aspen with other species by retaining all pine, larch, hemlock, and cedar and cutting all other trees 2”+ near Aspen and 5”+ elsewhere. This prescription was successful, with ample but not uniform coverage of Aspen suckers, other species in regeneration, no rutting, and much retention of snags and green trees. No large, live Aspen retained to ensure maximum sprouting potential, with concerns due to poor condition of Aspen and pockets of low, moist soil.</p> <p>Area 1: 50 acre Northern Hardwood Selection Harvest, completed. Observed retention of small and large snags and some trees with decay and potential to produce cavities.</p> <p>Area 3: 95 acre Northern Hardwood Selection Harvest, completed. Previously harvested in later 1990s mostly to residual BA of 90 sq.ft./acre with some areas not treated. Pre-harvest dense advance reproduction. Foresters marked 8 gaps. One such gap reviewed was 1/5 acre and had 3-4 foot tall Ash and 1 foot tall maple, as well as varied other vegetation. Expect establishment of another age class, though on very limited area (gaps total< 2 acres).</p>
<p>ICF: Sale #2665, Tract 4-15</p>	<p>53 acre Aspen Regeneration Harvest, completed. Conventional Aspen clear-cut, retaining spruce, cedar, and pine, but also retaining all trees except Aspen within 50 feet of game openings and structures on adjacent property, further diversifying the structure. Discussed long-term management of existing, mowed game openings and reviewed one of these which is supporting mostly ferns with encroaching woody vegetation. Wildlife is putting fewer resources into the mowing and maintenance, and DNR Iron County Biologist is planning to prioritize those openings that can be linked into hunter walking trails.</p>
<p>Date: 9 August 2017</p>	
<p>FMU / Location / sites visited</p>	<p>Activities / notes</p>
<p>0800 – 1000 Price County Forest Offices/Phillips</p>	<p>Brief review of selected field sites, possible changes to include active harvests, and the daily itinerary. Sale records reviewed and matched to retained fiber volumes per sale. Sample of Timber Sale/tree planting/ pesticide applicator contracts viewed and each contains training and BMP requirements.</p>
<p>Price County Forest/Variou locations in Price County – Mark and Matteo</p>	
<p>Price County Forest (PCF): Squaw Creek Flowage Dam removal</p>	<p>Water control structure was considered a high hazard dam with houses downstream that were located in the potential dam failure flood zone and could not be built on with the dam present. Public meetings were held and the consensus was that the public wanted the dam removed. Dam removal paid through a grant from the NRCS.</p>

	<p>Dam site now includes a rocked ford for forest access and an ATV trail. The ATV trail is a connector trail for Hurley, and the location and construction was in partnership with the USFS to bypass a private parcel.</p>
PCF: Solberg Lake County Park	<p>The peninsular county park site includes a dam, a flowage lake, a small campground with boating access at each site, and a day use area with parking, picnic tables, and playground, all well-maintained by Price County Forest Program. Firewood is provided at no charge to paid campers from timber program in County Forest.</p>
PCF: Sale # 2492, Tract 9-15	<p>Regeneration harvest on 151 acres, combination of mature red pine final harvest clearcut/ spray/ plant, white pine, and aspen. Red and white pine thinning on an additional 64 acres. Closed. Selected white pine and oak retained in cc. Green tree retention viewed in pockets and fingers. Site prep prior to planting included disc trenching. Planted red pine seedlings very healthy, some with a second flush of growth in the first growing season. Red pine was planted due to level of white pine blister rust in the stand prior to harvest and in the adjacent stands. Red pine seed source was Ontario zone 28. This is known to be a good match to the area and local seed was not available. Planting survival plots to be taken at years 1, 3, and 5 with regen code entered into WisFIRS. Snowmobile trail bisecting the sale was kept clean and accessible.</p> <p>White pine thinning area had some weevil damage and blister rust viewed in the stand. Thinning reduced the basal area from 144 sqft/A to 94 sqft/A. Wet area protected, low slash. Timber sale inspection report viewed with forester notes.</p>
PCF: Sale #5-15, Tract 5-15	<p>Aspen coppice with reserves, 105 acres in a stand damaged by the 1977 downburst. Closed. Sale boundaries viewed include red line, young aspen, tag alder, and ATV trail. Wetland boundaries respected. Aspen growth has some dieback from aspen leaf miner and anthracnose, somewhat evenly throughout the stand. Large retained maple in the middle of the stand.</p> <p>Adjacent trails mowed for use by multiple user groups (horseback riders, hikers, skiers).</p>
PCF: Georgetown ATV Trail	<p>Traversed the ATV trail between sites 5-15 and 14-14. Discussion of the trail maintenance and user groups responsibilities. Viewed new culvert install and trail grading at overflow wetland crossing.</p>
PCF: Sale #14-14, Tract 14-14	<p>Regeneration harvest, 116 acres. NH selection harvest, 35 acres. Active. Small wet areas viewed, minimal rutting observed, site was extremely well-slashed in spots, multiple haul trails throughout the sale. Job started in June then stopped due to wet weather, now back on-site since July. Viewed retained pockets and single trees, as well as mast and den/cavity retention.</p>

	<p>Logger interview - confirmed safety and forestry training, including FISTA training in the last few weeks to complete the full set of offered classes. Spill kit viewed in the truck, appropriate use of PPE. Discussed the process for walkthrough with forester on a sale, including receiving the site map & harvest prescription and walking the site. Discussion of site closeout at completion of sale with BMP application as needed.</p> <p>Sale contract was reviewed for inclusion of standard language such as performance and BMP requirements and OSHA compliance.</p> <p>Viewed sale in WisFIRS and notations for timber type, invasives, soils, regeneration type (natural regen), etc.</p>
PCF: Sale #17-16, Tract 17-16	<p>NH selection cut, 80 acres, regeneration harvest, 8 acres. Closed. Converting site from even-aged to uneven-aged. Gaps from previous harvest viewed, white ash sapling component is allowing large amounts of sugar maple to sprout. No sedimentation and extremely minimal erosion, however very steep slopes and no water bars placed on primary skid trail/haul roads. Trails are naturally starting to revegetate. 1 acre swamp conifer inclusion.</p> <p>See OBS 2017.3</p>
PCF: Sale #14-15, Tract # 14-15	<p>OS removal with reserves, 37 acres, NH selection harvest, 127 acres. Active, however not harvesting at this time. Site has been approximately 1/3 cut. Harvest restricted to period after leaf off to protect abundant advance regeneration. Red maple conversion to oak with an overstory removal. Oak wilt restrictions are in place on the sale. WIDNR NHI has multiple hits mammalian and plant species, however no sign of 2 of the species and timber sale area and activities will have minimal to no impact on the others. OS removal marked to retain or retained yellow birch, oak, and pine. Logger worked to keep dropped trees out of the gaps to protect existing regeneration. Lower wetter area on site includes more black ash – this area will be treated more as a coppice cut than OS removal due to EAB concerns. Signage used on the snowmobile trail that bisects the sale area.</p>
Date: 10 August 2017	
FMU / Location / sites visited	Activities / notes
Vilas County Forest Office	Opening Meeting for the day and FMU & District Briefs on FSC and SFI certification since Vilas County Forest is a new county in the certification program. Audit team reviewed documents in office, finalized audit field site plan for the day
Vilas County Forest/Various locations in Vilas County/	

<p>Vilas County Forest (VCF): Sale #943, Tract 10-15</p>	<p>Red Pine Thinning and regeneration harvests for a total of 58 acres, active. Mike Albrecht, Master Logger, FISTA-Trained, PPE/first aid/spill kit all viewed. Crews include mechanical and traditional felling. If sale is a lump sum sale, as Master Logger, he completes his own trip tickets and uses his Master Logger CoC certificate. Per interview with logger, forester clearly flagged woods roads to use. Terry Spencer, Processor operator – BMP training. White pine is naturally seeding into site. Sale file contains excellent notes displaying the communication between forester-NHC staff-wildlife biologist-County liaison forester. Comprehensive timber sale checklist was reviewed.</p>
<p>VCF: Great Headwaters Bike Trail (GHT)</p>	<p>GHT creation of a bike trail to connect the towns of Phelps and Conover on an old rail trail.</p>
<p>VCF: Pioneer Creek Trail</p>	<p>Graveled, good quality road, some portions recently had gravel added and other portions have been brushed out recently. Road used for ATVs since 2014.</p>
<p>VCF: Sale #932, Tract 11-14</p>	<p>Two shelterwood sales and an oak thinning. Harvest closed. Pine Shelterwood – convert aspen/pine stand to a pine stand, details noted in the 2460 form. Future site prep will include herbicide, anchor chain soil disturbance, and natural seed regeneration. Discussion regarding the concern about the larger amount of aspen present and the response to herbicide application. Oak Shelterwood – transition between the oak thinning and aspen stand. Flagging around wet area for herbicide application buffer. Red line buffer maintained on pond. Oak Thinning – no residual damage, slash low, variety of sizes of oaks retained, from 3” to 6” to 12-18” trees. Wildlife and potential wildlife trees retained. An area of reed canary grass, an identified invasive species will be treated to prevent the spread. Logger holds a WI Master Logger certification, confirmed on Master Logger database. Extensive timber sale inspection notes, Adjacent ski trail with heated bathrooms maintained by cooperative agreements with WI County and trail user groups.</p>
<p>VCF: ATV & Snowmobile Trail & Bridge</p>	<p>Crossing over the Wisconsin River on the trail is about 10 years old. Bridge was built with a grant from the Recreation Grants Fund, which is funded by registration fees. Recent repairs to road coming downhill to the bridge. Spotted knotweed invasive occurrence on the roadside/trailside.</p>
<p>VCF: Sale #967, Tract 7-17</p>	<p>Marked, uncut third thinning of Red Pine. This is the third thinning in this stand with a planned reduction to BA of 135 sqft/A. Due to the</p>

	close proximity of other landowners, contact to adjacent landowners was made and these were reviewed.
VCF: Sale #936, Tract 3-15	Whale Sale - NH single tree selection and varying patch creation from ¼ to 2 acres in size. Discussed, not visited. Discussion of the unique features and silviculture applied at the sale to address Kirkland’s warbler and spruce grouse habitat, an early and a late successional species. Marked, not cut.
DNR Service Center-Woodruff	Audit Team deliberations and preparation for closing meeting
DNR Service Center-Woodruff	Closing Meeting and Review of Findings: Convene with all relevant staff to summarize audit findings, potential non-conformities and next steps

2.2 Evaluation of Management Systems

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

3. Changes in Management Practices

There were no significant changes in the 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 the Evaluation

4.1 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations

Finding Number: 2016.1	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU): Sawyer County	
Deadline	<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
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US Forest Management Standard 4.2.b.
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): The FME’s employees and contractors demonstrate a safe work environment overall. As confirmed through a review of timber sale and chemical application contracts on all counties visited, contracts or other written agreements include safety requirements. However, contracted operators could improve performance with attention to their use of PPE. One logger on an active logging site was interviewed in Washburn County. The operator was FISTA trained, as confirmed through the FME’s records of contractor qualifications. However, the contractor did not have his or her hardhat inside the harvest machine, which meant that it could not be put on prior to exiting the machine. The contractor was aware of the need for this PPE, but it was stored in his or her truck back at the landing or parking area.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): The FME’s contractors should demonstrate a safe work environment.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	Following the finding in 2016 WI DNR worked with the Wisconsin County Forests Association (WCFA) and the Great Lakes Timber Professionals Association (GLTPA) to re-emphasize the importance of proper use of PPE on logging sites. A letter was sent from the WCFA to the Executive Director of the GLTPA which resulted in a letter from the WCFA being included in the April 2017GLTPA Magazine about the importance of the use of PPE. In addition all the County Forests are emphasizing this in their Timber Sale Inspections.
SCS review	During the 2017 field, many contracts for harvesting, planting, and pesticide application were reviewed and all included the required safety requirements. During the 2017 field audit portion of the audit, contractor’s use of PPE was observed and all contractors were in compliance at all times. In addition checks were made for spill kits, tools, and first aid kits and they were found to be present.
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2016.2	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU): Sawyer County	
Deadline	<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
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US Forest Management Standard 6.3.f (see also 7.1.q)
<p>Non-Conformity (or <i>Background/ Justification in the case of Observations</i>): Management maintains, enhances, or restores habitat components and associated stand structures, in abundance and distribution that could be expected from naturally occurring processes. Trees selected for retention are generally representative of the dominant species found on the site with the exception of larger aspen regeneration harvest blocks on counties visited in 2016. Site-specific retention practices for harvest are documented in Form 2460.</p> <p>Leaving standing aspen trees within aspen regeneration units is occasionally done, generally in association with the protection of other features such as vernal pools or small wetlands or seeps. Dead or live aspen trees may also be left as den trees. More often when aspen are left uncut they are located on the edges of regeneration units as part of riparian or visual buffers. Foresters are able to describe many good reasons for not retaining individual or groups of live, standing aspen trees in these units (e.g., Sawyer Form 2460 for 2851-15: “Aspen, the dominant tree species of this stand, is not being left as a component of green tree retention due to the high risk for blowdown and to not inhibit the natural regeneration of Aspen of which is the objective for this harvest”). However, there is less familiarity with reasons for leaving some.</p> <p>As part of the harvest planning, approval and record-keeping process a “Timber Sale Notice and Cutting Report” is prepared for all sales (Form 2460). The “Narrative” portion includes relevant sections including “b Ecological Considerations, including Management History, Silvicultural Systems, Green Tree Retention, Post-Harvest Regeneration Plan, Invasive Species Evaluation, Insect/Disease Concerns, Skidding/Seasonal Restrictions, Wildlife Action Plan/ Species of Greatest Conservation Need, Conservation Opportunity Area (COA), Results of NHI, and Comments” and “e. Wildlife Considerations, including Snag, Den and Mast Tree Retention, Game Openings, and Comments”. The level of documentation varies greatly, and could be improved to better document reasons for decisions to have levels of retention that are less than guidelines.</p> <p>For example, Washburn and Sawyer Counties, the 2460 Form’s site narrative or ecological considerations sections do not always follow the recommended practice of documenting reasons for not retaining the recommended level of 3-5% of stand area or crown cover or selecting retention trees generally representative of the dominant species found on the site.</p>	

<p>This recommendation is found in the CLUP in section 505.3.5 under Sawyer County and section 830.3.1 under Washburn County.</p> <p>More importantly, plan writers were instructed in the FME’s response to OBS 2014.2 “to provide reasonable written justification in the 2460 timber sale cutting notice narrative when green tree retention does not maintain species that are representative of the dominant species naturally found on the site.” Examples of sales prepared after this guidance was issued and do not reference aspen retention explicitly include Sawyer 2870-16 and 28701-16 (note: version of 2460 Form is 10-15 and sales were established 3/16); and Washburn 2-15 (unsold).</p> <p>Wildlife specialists interviewed have knowledge of the impacts of retained tree species and structures on certain groups of fauna, so there may be an opportunity to consult wildlife staff on this issue.</p> <p>There is an opportunity to examine and refine the criteria and implementation of stand level retention within larger aspen regeneration harvest blocks.</p>	
<p>Corrective Action Request (or Observation): Management should maintain, enhance or restore habitat components and associated stand structures, in abundance and distribution that could be expected from naturally occurring processes. These components include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) large live trees, live trees with decay or declining health, snags, and well-distributed coarse down and dead woody material. Legacy trees where present are not harvested; and b) vertical and horizontal complexity. <p>Trees selected for retention should be generally representative of the dominant species found on the site.</p>	
<p>FME response (including any evidence submitted)</p>	<p>The “Silviculture Handbook” and the “Dominant Tree Retention under Even-aged Management Justification for Guidance Variance” both address the retention under even-aged management. The “Silviculture Handbook” has undergone extensive review as part of the approval process and provides the main source of guidance for retention. The guidance document provides the County Forest with variance rationale to use in cases where retention of reserve trees may conflict with management objectives. County Forests must address retention guidelines in the 2460 prepared for a timber sale in cases where even-aged management is used. The narrative in the 2460 provides the rationale for variance from retention as outlined in the “Silviculture Handbook”.</p>
<p>SCS review</p>	<p>The audit team reviewed the marking guidelines in Chapter 24 of the Silviculture Handbook and the “Dominant Tree Retention under Even-Aged Management Justification for Guidance Variance” provided by WI DNR. Both of these provide opportunities for variance from retention as well as opportunities for retention. A section from the guidance document states: <u>“ Standard Guidance:</u> Tree retention guidance under even aged management generally recommends retention of 3 – 15% of tree cover, including representation</p>

	<p>of the dominant tree species present on the harvest unit. Guidance also recommends retention in individual trees or in islands and also cavity, den and mast trees.</p> <p><u>Variance Needs:</u></p> <p>Tree retention under even aged management schemes is an important wildlife habitat component. There are cases, however, when retention of reserve trees may conflict with management objectives. Variances from tree retention guidance must be documented, along with a description of management conflict, in the timber sale narrative. It is also acceptable to document variance rationale in the County Forest Comprehensive Land Use Plan in cases where the variance need is a common management occurrence.”</p> <p>During the field audit portion of the annual audit the audit team visited many examples of even-aged management including Iron County tracts 35-15 and 22-14, Price County Tract 5-15. On every example that was visited green tree retention was well documented in the 2460 form narrative and was evident on the site. The discussion of green tree retention in the 2460 and supporting documents fully meets the indicators in 6.3.f and 6.3.g.1 and follows the guidance document and the marking standards in the “Silvicultural Handbook”.</p>
<p>Status of CAR:</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i></p>

Finding Number: 2016.3	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU): Sawyer County	
Deadline	<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
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US Forest Management Standard 7.1.o
<p>Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): The management plan includes maps describing the resource base, the characteristics of general management zones, special management areas, and protected areas at a level of detail to achieve management objectives and protect sensitive sites.</p> <p>However, some maps prepared for timber sales in Sawyer County on 2460 Forms include incorrect symbology for perennial streams or do not include legends. In addition, some wetlands are difficult to identify since the symbol is not included in the legend.</p>	
<p>Corrective Action Request (or Observation): The management plan should include maps describing the resource base, the characteristics of general management zones, special management areas, and protected areas at a level of detail to achieve management objectives and protect sensitive sites.</p>	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	The management plan includes numerous maps representing the broad spectrum of maps required to describe the resource base, the characteristics of general management zones, special management areas, and protected areas. There are differences in the mapping software available in different counties and this does account for some variability in the maps produced in association with the production of the maps accompanying the 2460 documentation provided for timber sales. Those maps are primarily designed to provide the loggers with the necessary information required to perform the logging operation and to protect the resources present on the site. More complete maps are available in the WisFIRS system to represent all the items specified in the indicator.
SCS review	The audit team reviewed the mapping systems and the use of maps in support of the timber sales visited in the annual audit were reviewed in all three counties in this year’s sample. The WisFIRS database map included the features in a standard format in all counties audited. The maps prepared in association with the 2460’s were consistent among all the counties. Some of the counties audited had ARCGIS and utilized this as an additional way of preparing maps for use in association with the 2460.
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

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

<p>c) Promotional statement “The Mark of Responsible Forestry”, “Responsible Forest Management” or other claim provided or approved by FSC d) FSC website address</p>	
<p>FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i></p>	<p>January 2017: Ability to use up existing supplies of haul tickets – at one time the haul ticket format was approved as correct. While we realize that rules have changed that now makes the previously approved design out-of-date, we are asking for approval to use up existing supplies of haul tickets. We will move forward to redesign each county’s template so that reprints will be correct by current logo and license rules.</p>
<p>SCS review</p>	<p>January 2017: The old haul tickets were approved under the old standard and there is a provision in the current trademark standard that a certificate holder can use up existing stock before updating.</p> <p>March 2017: Evidence that the inconsistent trademark uses found in the 2016 audit were corrected and submitted to SCS was provided, including for contract templates.</p>
<p>Status of CAR:</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i></p>

4.2 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations

Finding Number: 2017.1	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU): Iron County	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Observation – response is optional <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify): None
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US Forest Management Standard 6.5.d
<p>Non-Conformity (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>Corrective Action Request (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>	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2017.2	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU): Iron County	
Deadline	<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
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US Forest Management Standard 7.3.a
Non-Conformity (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.	
Corrective Action Request (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.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2017.3	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU): Price County Forestry	
Deadline	<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
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US Forest Management Standard 6.5.d
Non-Conformity (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 <i>Wisconsin’s Forestry Best Management Practices for Water Quality, Chapter 4</i> . 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.	
Corrective Action Request (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.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

5. Stakeholder Comments

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

- To solicit input from affected parties as to the strengths and weaknesses of the FME’s management, relative to the standard, and the nature of the interaction between the company and the surrounding communities.
- To solicit input on whether the forest management operation has consulted with stakeholders regarding identifying any high conservation value forests (HCVFs).

Principal stakeholder groups are identified based upon results from past evaluations, lists of stakeholders from the FME under evaluation, and additional stakeholder contacts from other sources (e.g., chair of the regional FSC working group). The following types of groups and individuals were determined to be principal stakeholders in this evaluation:

5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted

Wisconsin County Forest Association	Logging Contractors
Ruffed Grouse Society	ATV Associations and Clubs

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

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

<input type="checkbox"/> <i>FME has not received any stakeholder comments from interested parties as a result of stakeholder outreach activities during this annual audit.</i>	
Stakeholder comments	SCS Response
Economic concerns	
All Stakeholders stated that the County Forest Program was a very important contributor to the local economy	The County Forest Program contributes as an employer of local contractors, supplier to local industry and in providing economic support to the Counties.
Social concerns	
Sometimes the County Forestry Staff shuts down our logging operations without justification. This costs us a	The communication between County staff and contractors can definitely be improved. Several examples of excellent communication were found during the course of the audit

lot of money. We have employees to pay and loan payments to make.	and these examples are noted in this audit report. See Observation 2017.2
The County Forests have provided field trip opportunities for education purposes whenever we have asked them.	The public involvement with the County Forestry Program is obvious in all the groups and committees they work with and the numerous opportunities provided for input.
Environmental concerns	
The County Forestry Program does a great job. The amount of active management provide the habitat required by wildlife.	Several examples of habitat improvement for a wide variety of wildlife species were noted during the 2017 audit. This is a real strength of the County Forestry Program.

6. Certification Decision

The certificate holder has demonstrated continued overall conformance to the applicable Forest Stewardship Council standards. The SCS annual audit team recommends that the certificate be sustained, subject to subsequent annual audits and the FME’s response to any open CARs.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Comments: The Wisconsin County Forest Program continues to provide exemplary management of the forest lands of the counties. Several examples of where the Counties and the DNR in partnership go beyond the FSC standards include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirements for planning are regularly exceeded • Outstanding provision for recreational uses provided with trails, marinas, and campgrounds • Outreach to the public for input is regular and county committees meet regularly • Public land planning and management activity efforts are state-wide • Documentation for timber sales are extensive and thorough • Communications between foresters and NHC, wildlife biologists and loggers improve management and prevent problems from occurring during management activities • Partnership between counties and state is unique in the country and all parties strive to make the system work well 	

7. Changes in Certification Scope

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

Name and Contact Information

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

FSC Sales Information

<input type="checkbox"/> FSC Sales contact information same as above.			
FSC salesperson	Sabina Dhungana, Forest Products Services Specialist		
Address		Telephone	(608) 261-0754
		Fax	(608) 266-8756
		e-mail	Sabina.Dhungana@wisconsin.gov
		Website	www.dnr.wi.gov

Scope of Certificate

Certificate Type	<input type="checkbox"/> Single FMU	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple FMU
	<input type="checkbox"/> Group	
SLIMF (if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/> Small SLIMF certificate	<input type="checkbox"/> Low intensity SLIMF certificate
	<input type="checkbox"/> Group SLIMF certificate	
# Group Members (if applicable)		
Number of FMUs in scope of certificate	21	
Geographic location of non-SLIMF FMU(s)	<i>Latitude & Longitude: See table later in this section for location of each county forest in general</i>	
Forest zone	<input type="checkbox"/> Boreal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Temperate
	<input type="checkbox"/> Subtropical	<input type="checkbox"/> Tropical
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is: Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac		
privately managed		
state managed		
community managed WICFP Note: (Rpt.50A 7/1/2017 - FSC only)	2,031,478.62	
Number of FMUs in scope that are:		

less than 100 ha in area		100 - 1000 ha in area	
1000 - 10 000 ha in area	4	more than 10 000 ha in area	17
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is included in FMUs that: Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac			
are less than 100 ha in area		0	
are between 100 ha and 1000 ha in area		0	
meet the eligibility criteria as <i>low intensity</i> SLIMF FMUs		0	
Division of FMUs into manageable units:			
FMU are individual County Forests which are further subdivided into compartments and stands.			

Production Forests

Timber Forest Products	Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac
Total area of production forest (i.e. forest from which timber may be harvested)	1,432,055 forested area scheduled for management (96.7% 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	133,915 (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	1,298,140
Silvicultural system(s)	Area under type of management
Even-aged management	
Clearcut (clearcut size range 1-351 (19.28 avg))-(WisFIRS export)	155,012 - 1/3 PJ, OX, ½ MR, Fb, SB, ½ T, ½ C
Shelterwood	172,225 PW, O & ½ MR
Other:	611,110 (A, BW, MC, SC, ½ T, ½ C)
Uneven-aged management	
Individual tree selection	232,809 NH
Group selection	71,323 BH, SH, CH, H, MD
Other:	

<input type="checkbox"/> Other (e.g. nursery, recreation area, windbreak, bamboo, silvo-pastoral system, agro-forestry system, etc.)	
The sustainable rate of harvest (usually Annual Allowable Harvest or AAH where available) of commercial timber (m3 of round wood)	<p style="text-align: right;">Acres:</p> (Rpt. 201) ASPEN 13,619 BTMLAND HDWDS 187 WHITE BIRCH 230 WHITE CEDAR 494 CENTRAL HDWDS 14 BALSAM FIR 195 FIR SPRUCE 273 HEMLOCK 131 MISC. CONIFEROUS 11 MISC. DECIDUOUS 4 RED MAPLE 835 NORTH. HDWDS 11,725 OAK 4,954 SCRUB OAK 485 JACK PINE 1,337 RED PINE 4,576 WHITE PINE 1,764 BLACK SPRUCE 964 SWAMP CONIFER 244 SWAMP HDWDS 2,341 WHITE SPRUCE 192 TAMARACK 650 45,225 Total acres
Non-timber Forest Products (NTFPs)	
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- 23,970 bales in 2016, typically <20,000 bales (0391B sub-product); N6.3.1 Christmas trees 7 trees and 11 tons of boughs (WisFIRS export product 40 & 42T)
Explanation of the assumptions and reference to the data source upon which AAH and NTFP harvest rates estimates are based:	

Data is derived from "WisFIRS" which is database that contains all recon, treatment, and timber sale data for State and County Lands. Sustainable rate of harvest is based on long term harvest goals (15yr avg.) under an area control system.

Species in scope of joint FM/COC certificate: (*Scientific / Latin Name* and Common / Trade Name)

Species	Scientific Name	Miscellaneous conifers:	
Aspen/Poplar:	<i>Populus tremuloides</i>	Scotch pine	<i>Pinus sylvestris</i>
	<i>Populus grandidentata</i>	European larch	<i>Larix decidua</i>
Balsam poplar	<i>Populus balsamifera</i>	Norway spruce	<i>Picea abies</i>
Bottomland hardwoods:		Eastern redcedar	<i>Juniperus virginiana</i>
Eastern		Blue spruce	<i>Picea pungens</i>
Cottonwood	<i>Populus deltoides</i>	Miscellaneous deciduous:	
Swamp white oak	<i>Quercus bicolor</i>	Norway maple	<i>Acer platanoides</i>
Silver maple	<i>Acer saccharinum</i>	Boxelder	<i>Acer negundo</i>
American elm	<i>Ulmus americana</i>		<i>Robinia</i>
River birch	<i>Betula nigra</i>	Black locust	<i>pseudoacacia</i>
Green ash	<i>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</i>		<i>Gleditsia triacanthos</i>
		Honey locust	
		Eastern	
		Hophornbeam,	
		Ironwood	<i>Ostrya virginiana</i>
		Musclewood,	<i>Carpinus caroliniana</i>
		Bluebeech	
		Northern hardwoods:	
Central hardwoods:		Sugar maple	<i>Acer saccharum</i>
White oak	<i>Quercus alba</i>		<i>Betula alleghaniensis</i>
Bur oak	<i>Quercus macrocarpa</i>	Yellow birch	<i>Fraxinus americana</i>
Black oak	<i>Quercus velutina</i>	White ash	<i>Fagus grandifolia</i>
Northern pin oak	<i>Quercus ellipsoidalis</i>	American beech	<i>Tilia americana</i>
Black walnut	<i>Juglans nigra</i>	American basswood	<i>Betula papyrifera</i>
Butternut	<i>Juglans cinerea</i>	White birch	<i>Quercus rubra</i>
Shagbark hickory	<i>Carya ovata</i>	Northern red oak	<i>Pinus resinosa</i>
Bitternut hickory	<i>Carya cordiformis</i>	Red Pine	<i>Pinus banksiana</i>
Black cherry	<i>Prunus serotina</i>	Jack Pine	<i>Pinus strobus</i>
Red maple	<i>Acer rubrum</i>	Eastern white pine	<i>Picea mariana</i>
Hackberry	<i>Celtis occidentalis</i>	Black spruce	<i>Larix laricina</i>
		Tamarack	<i>Fraxinus nigra</i>
		Black ash	

Balsam fir	<i>Abies balsamea</i>	White spruce	<i>Picea glauca</i>
Eastern hemlock	<i>Tsuga canadensis</i>	Northern white cedar	<i>Thuja occidentalis</i>

FSC Product Classification

Timber products		
Product Level 1	Product Level 2	Species
W1 Rough Wood	W1.1 Roundwood (logs)	23,026 MBF and 550,360 cds. (Rpt. 37A-total cordwood minus small diameter reported below) –All species listed above.
	W1.2 Fuel Wood	915 cds –All species listed above. (Rpt. 37A – Firewood)
	W1.3 Twigs	
W2 Wood charcoal		
W3 Wood in chips or particles	W3.1 Wood chips	<4" diameter (prod code 24/24T- (30% of total volume since combined cordwood and topwood), and 26/26T-topwood only). 10,786 cd eq. –All species listed above.
Other *		
Non-Timber Forest Products		
Product Level 1	Product Level 2	Product Level 3 and Species
N1 Bark		
N4 Straw, wicker, rattan and similar	N4.1 Rattan cane (rough form)	
	N4.3 Decorative objects and wickerwork	
	N4.4 Rattan furniture	
	N4.5 Rattan furniture components	
N6 Plants and parts of plants	N6.1 Flowers	
	N6.2 Grasses, ferns, mosses and lichens	Sphagnum moss (<i>Sphagnum</i> spp.)
	N6.3 Whole trees or plants	X N6.3.1 Christmas trees 7 trees and 11 tons of boughs – <i>Abies balsamea</i> (WisFIRS export product 42T)

Conservation Areas

Total area of forest and non-forest land protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for conservation objectives:			46,595
WIDNR-CFP Note: (WisFIRS report 101; prefix R, Y and Z)			
High Conservation Value Forest / Areas			
High Conservation Values present and respective areas:			Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac
Code	HCV Type	Description & Location	Area
HCV1	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g. endemism, endangered species, refugia).	Assorted bogs, Wetland communities, fens, kettle lakes, and other areas containing significant biodiversity values (including endangered & threatened species) - Numerous counties(13)	31,586
HCV2	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant large landscape level forests, contained within, or containing the management unit, where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance.	Upper Nemadji Floodplain Forest –Douglas Brazeau Cedar Swamp - Oconto Penokee Range Hardwood-Iron Silent Wood Benchmark Forest-Washburn	5,112
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, Gobler 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
Total Area of forest classified as 'High Conservation Value Forest / Area'			41,186

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

<input type="checkbox"/> N/A – All forestland owned or managed by the applicant is included in the scope.		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Applicant owns and/or manages other FMUs not under evaluation.		
<input type="checkbox"/> Applicant wishes to excise portions of the FMU(s) under evaluation from the scope of certification.		
Explanation for exclusion of FMUs and/or excision:	29 County Forests exist in WI. 21 of them have chosen to commit to FSC certification (Vilas and Oneida joined spring 2017). There are an additional 6 counties 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.	
Control measures to prevent mixing of certified and non-certified product (C8.3):	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.	
Description of FMUs excluded from, or forested area excised from, the scope of certification:		
Name of FMU or Stand	Location (city, state, country)	Size (<input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac)
Refer to table 1.1.2 of this section and Appendix 7.	Scattered across WI.	~750,000 acres. (Includes SFI-only counties, non-certified counties, and straight county land in FSC counties)

8. Annual Data Update

8.1 Social Information

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

8.2 Annual Summary of Pesticide and Other Chemical Use

<input type="checkbox"/> FME does not use pesticides.				
Commercial name of pesticide / herbicide	Active ingredient	Quantity applied annually (kg or lbs)	Size of area treated during previous year	Reason for use
Oust	Sulfomethuron Methyl	2.25 (lb)	24	Invasive Control
Accord	Glyphosate	312 (lb)	39	Invasive Control / site prep
Garlon 3A & 4	triclopyr	32 (lb)	16	Invasive Control
Escort	metasulfuron methyl	.5 (lb)	1	Invasive control
Garlon 4 Ultra/Element 4	Triclopyr	1.72 gallons	19.5	Buckthorn Control
Milestone	Aminopyralid	5.38	240	Spotted Knapweed Control
Accord XRT	Glyphosate	184.5 gallons	492	Site Preparation for Reforestation
Chopper	Imazapyr	77 gallons	492	Site Preparation for Reforestation
Oust Extra	Sulfometuron methyl	30.75 lbs	492	Site Preparation for Reforestation
Garlon 4	Triclopyr	35 oz	2 ac	Oak Wilt treatment project
Rodeo	Glyphosate	1.5 qt/ac	120 ac	Red Pine Release
Garlon XRT	Triclopyr	1 pint/ac	120 ac	Red Pine Release
Penatron Surfactant		10 oz/ac	120 ac	Red Pine Release
Alligare	Triclopyr	0.53 gals	87 oak stumps	Oak Wilt Suppression
Garlon 4 Ultra	Triclopyr	66.48 oz	40 acres	Garlic Mustard Eradication
Oust XP	Sulfometuron Methyl	1.62 oz	40 acres	Garlic Mustard Eradication

Garlon 4 Ultra	Triclopyr	4.5 gal.	9.6	Oak Release
Arsenal AC	Imazapyr	15 oz	Spot Treatments	Oak Wilt Treatments
Sulfomet Xtra	Sulfometuron Methyl	0.88 oz	Spot Treatments	Invasive Control
Element 4	Triclopyr	20.75 gal.	22 acres + Spot Treatments	Oak Release/Invasives
Accord XRT II	Glyphosate	80 gal.	140	Site Prep
Transline	Clopyralid	98.4 oz	13 acres + Spot Treatments	Invasive Control
Milestone	Aminopyralid	64.6 oz	13 acres + Spot Treatments	Invasive Control
Tordon K	Picloram	153.75 oz	13 acres + Spot Treatments	Invasive Control
Oust XP	Sufometuron Methyl	9 lbs	140	Site Prep
Chopper Gen2	Imazapyr	18 gal.	140	Site Prep
Activator 90 Surfactant	Surfactant	9 gal.	140	Site Prep
Preference Surfactant	Surfactant	6.2 gal.	13 acres + Spot Treatments	Invasives/oak wilt
Aquaneat	glyphosate	54 gallons (3% solution)	About 1 acre	Invasive vegetation management on utility ROW
Rodeo	Glyphosate	99.6 gallons	376	Plantation release
Penetron/TA-40	Prodiamine	31 gallons	376	Plantation release
Oust	Sulfometuronmethyl	362.5 Oz.	376	Plantation release
Cornerstone Plus/Round up Custom	Gyphosate	62.5 gallons	203	site prep/release
Milstone	Aminopyralid	.25 gallons	2	Knapweed
Arsenal	Imazapyr	2 gallons	6.5	Phragmites
Garlon 4, Garlon 3a, Vastlan, Element 4	Triclopyr	147 gallons	416	release and buckthorn
Bullzeye and Oust XP	Isopropylamine salt of glyphosate and sulfometuron methyl	3328 gallons	595 acres	garlic mustard control
Progeny	Dicamba	200 gallons	roads treated	garlic mustard control- Roads
Garlon 4	triclopyr	3.5 gallons	70 acres	buckthorn
Cornerstone Plus	Glyphosate	3% Solution	5 acres	Garlic Mustard

Element 4	Triclopyr	2% Solution	20 acres	Garlic Mustard
Oust	Sulfometuron methyl	1 oz.acre	25 acres	Garlic Mustard
2, 4-D	Dimethylamine salt of 2,4-D	2% Solution	1 acre	Crown Vetch
Milestone	Aminopyralid	3-7 ounces per acre	Spot Treatments	Invasive Species
Escort XP	metasulfuron	2 ounces per acre	Spot Treatments	Invasive Species
Spike 20P	tebuthrion	.5 lbs per acre	Spot Treatments	Opening Maintenance
Element 4	Triclopyr	2-6 quarts per acre	Spot Treatments	Opening Maintenance
Tordon K	Picloram	75 lbs. Total	186 Acres	Planting Site Prep
Element 4	Triclopyr	375 lbs. Total	186 Acres	Planting Site Prep
Element 4	Triclopyr	10 lbs. Total	~2 Acres	Oak Wilt Control Cut Stump Treatment
Cellutreat	Disodium octabonate Tetrahydrate	135 lbs	159 acres	Control of HRD
Capstone	Aminopyralid and triclopyr	0.01 lb and 0.1 lb	0.77 ac on 10 sites	Wild Parsnip
				Invasive honeysuckles
				Woodland forget-me-not
				Canada thistle
				Plumeless thistle
Makaze	Glyphosate	0.3 lb	0.34 ac	Garlic mustard
Killzall	Glyphosate	3 gallons	4.5 acres & Spot treatment	weed/shrub control
Accord XRT	glyphosate	.08985 kg	174 acres	Site Prep for planting
Chopper	Imazapyr	.02742 kg	174 acres	Site Prep for planting
Oust xp	Sufometuron Methyl	175.5oz	174 acres	Site Prep for planting
Escort XP	metasulfuron methyl	2 oz	spot treatment	Invasive control
Garlon 4	Triclopyr	10 gallons	approximate 28 acres	Oak Wilt control
			64 pockets	
Cornerstone	Glyphosate	One gallon	15 acres	Invasive plants
Chopper	Isopropylamine salt of Imazapyr	29.1 lbs	116 (acres)	Site Preparation - control competition
Accord XRT	Glyphosate	142.64 lbs	116 (acres)	Site Preparation - control competition

Oust XP	Sulfometuron methyl	5.46 lbs	116 (acres)	Site Preparation - control competition
Spike 20P	tebuthiuron	23.4 lb	36.1 Acres	Wildlife Openings Maint.
Accord	Glyphosate	2 qt./acre	101 acres	preplanting chem. Site prep
Chopper	Isopropylamine salt of Imazapyr	20 oz./acre	101 acres	See above
Oust	Sulfometuron methyl	1 oz./acre	101 acres	See above
Cellutreat	borax	according to label	278 acres	Annosum prevention

SECTION B – APPENDICES (CONFIDENTIAL)

Appendix 1 – List of FMUs Selected For Evaluation

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

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

FMU Name	FMU Size Category: - SLIMF - non-SLIMF - Large > 10,000 ha	Forest Type: - Plantation - Natural Forest	Rationale for Selection: - Random Sample - Stakeholder issue - Ease of access - Other – please describe
Iron County Forest	- Non-SLIMF, Large >10,000 ha	Natural Forest	Random Sample
Price County Forest	- Non-SLIMF, Large >10,000 ha	Natural Forest	Ease of access
Vilas County Forest	- Non-SLIMF, Large >10,000 ha	Natural Forest	Ease of access, new FSC Certified County in 2017

Appendix 2 – List of Stakeholders Consulted

List of FME Staff Consulted

OPENING MEETING ATTENDEES	
NAME	TITLE/POSITION

Mike Ferrucci Michelle Matteo Walter Mark Fred Souba, Jr. Heather Berklund Carmen Hardin Mark Heyde (DNR-Madison) Gary Zimmer (WCFA) Doug Brown (DNR-Madison) C.E. Zinsmaster Eric Peterson John Gagnon Michelle Woodford Jeremiah Oftedahl Karl Linnemarstons Tyler Wickund Jenna Kosnicki Eric Holm Fred Freeman Joe Grapa Jim Warren Tom Duke Dave Kafura Fred Freeman Kyle Schmidt Derik Jochimsen Paul Teska	SFI Lead Auditor Team Auditor FSC Lead Auditor Division Administrator, Forestry Deputy Administrator, Forestry DNR Forestry Bureau Director Forest Certification Coordinator Assistant Executive Director, WCFA County Forest & Public Lands Specialist DNR Iron County Liaison Iron County Administrator Vilas County Administrator DNR Wildlife Biologist Vilas County Assistant Administrator Iron County Forester Iron County Forester DNR Wildlife Biologist Price County Administrator Price County Forester Price County Forester DNR Private/Public Lands Section Chief DNR NWD District Forestry Leader DNR Hydrologist Pike County Forester DNR Price County DNR Rusk County Liaison Rusk County Administrator
IRON COUNTY FILED AUDIT ATTENDEES	
NAME	TITLE/POSITION
Mike Ferrucci Michelle Matteo Walter Mark Fred Souba, Jr. Heather Berklund Carmen Hardin* Mark Heyde (DNR-Madison) Gary Zimmer (WCFA) Doug Brown (DNR-Madison) C.E. Zinsmaster Eric Peterson Karl Linnemanstons Tyler Wickund	SFI Lead Auditor Team Auditor FSC Lead Auditor Division Administrator, Forestry Deputy Administrator, Forestry DNR Forestry Bureau Director Forest Certification Coordinator Assistant Executive Director, WCFA County Forest & Public Lands Spec. DNR Iron County Liaison Iron County Administrator Iron County Forester Iron County Forester

Jenna Kosnicki Dan Schumacher Gena Abramson Dave Kafura Colleen Matula Angelo Aimone Ryan Magana Tara Krall (Office Only)	DNR Wildlife Biologist Forestry Team Leader Forester - LTE-DNR Forest Hydrologist - DNR Ecologist/Silviculturist - DNR Iron County Forestry Scaler NHC - DNR Office Manager/Trail Coordinator
PRICE COUNTY FIELD AUDIT ATTENDEES	
NAME	TITLE/POSITION
Michelle Matteo Walter Mark Joe Grapa Fred Freeman Kyle Schmidt Derek Johnson Eric Holm Colleen Matula Dan Schumacher Doug Brown	Team Auditor FSC Lead Auditor Price County Assistant Administrator Price County Forester Price County Liaison - DNR Price County Wildlife Biologist - DNR Price County Forest Administrator Ecologist/Silviculturist - DNR Forestry Team Leader - DNR DNR
VILAS COUNTY FIELD AUDIT ATTENDEES	
NAME	TITLE/POSITION
Michelle Matteo Walter Mark John Gagnon John Gillen Jeremiah Oftedahl Michele Woodford Carly Lapin Heidi Putnam Mark Heyde Doug Brown Jill Nemeč Brian Spencer Dale Mayo Jim Warren Gary Zimmer Dave Kafura	Team Auditor FSC Lead Auditor Vilas County Forest Administrator Forestry Team Leader - DNR Vilas County Forest Assistant Admin Wildlife Management - DNR NHC - DNR NHC Intern - DNR Forest Certification Coordinator - DNR County Forest & Public Lands Specialist - DNR Vilas County Liaison - DNR Forestry Staff Specialist - DNR Vilas County Parks and Recreation DNR Private/Public Lands Section Chief Assistant Executive Director, WCFA Forest Hydrologist - DNR

CLOSING MEETING ATTENDEES	
NAME	TITLE/POSITION
Mike Ferrucci	SFI Lead Auditor
Michelle Matteo (auditor)	Team Auditor
Walter Mark	FSC Lead Auditor
Fred Souba, Jr.	Division Administrator, Forestry
Heather Berklund	Deputy Administrator, Forestry
Carmen Hardin	DNR Forestry Bureau Director
Mark Heyde (DNR-Madison)	Forest Certification Coordinator
Gary Zimmer (WCFA)	Assistant Executive Director, WCFA
Doug Brown (DNR-Madison)	County Forest & Public Lands Specialist
C.E. Zinsmaster	DNR Iron County Liaison
Eric Peterson	Iron County Administrator
John Gagnon	Vilas County Administrator
Michelle Woodford	DNR Wildlife Biologist
Jeremiah Oftedahl	Vilas County Assistant Administrator
Karl Linnemanstons	Iron County Forester
Tyler Wickund	Iron County Forester
Jenna Kosnicki	DNR Wildlife Biologist
Eric Holm	Price County Administrator
Fred Freeman	Price County Forester
Joe Grapa	Price County Forester
Jim Warren	DNR Private/Public Lands Section Chief
Tom Duke	DNR NWD District Forestry Leader
Dave Kafura	DNR Hydrologist
Fred Freeman	Pike County Forester
Kyle Schmidt	DNR Price County
Derik Jochimsen	DNR Rusk County Liaison
Paul Teska	Rusk County Administrator

List of other Stakeholders Consulted

Name	Organization	Contact Information	Consultation method	Requests Cert. Notf.
Gary Zimmer	Wisconsin County Forests Association	715.282.5951	Personal Interview	N
Jane F. Severt	Wisconsin County Forests Association	715.282.5951	Letter	N

Cheryl Todea	Trees for Tomorrow	715.479.6456	Telephone	N
Lee Hoffman	Boulder Junction ATV Club	715.385.3736	Telephone	N
Michael Stafford	North Country Trail Association	414.403.4575	Telephone	N
Dale Tenut	Price County ATV Association	715.820.1185	Telephone	N
Tony Blattler	Ruffed Grouse Society	715.332.5121	Telephone	N
Terry Spencer	Albrecht Logging		Personal Interview	N
Mike Albrecht	Albrecht Logging		Personal Interview	N
Eric Sitte	Schloer Logging LLC		Personal Interview	N

Appendix 3 – Additional Audit Techniques Employed

None.

Additional techniques employed (*describe*):

Appendix 4 – Pesticide Derogations

<input type="checkbox"/> There are no active pesticide derogations for this FME.		
Name of pesticide / herbicide (active ingredient)		Date derogation approved
FME has derogation for hexazinone, which has not been used since before 2014; no use was reported in 2014, 2015 or 2016. The derogation is no longer required since hexazinone is not on the 2015 list of FSC HHP.		09 December 2014
Condition	Conformance (C / NC)	Evidence of progress
	NA	

Appendix 5 – Detailed Observations

Criteria required by FSC at every surveillance audit (<i>check all situations that apply</i>)	<input type="checkbox"/> NA – all FMUs are exempt from these requirements. <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>):

Evaluation Year	FSC P&C Reviewed
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	

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

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

DNR liaison:

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

Wisconsin County Forests Association (WCFA)

- Strategic Plan (2016)

- Documentation and training programs to support the Strategic Plan Individual Counties:
- Comprehensive Land Use Plans (CLUP or county plan)
- Annual Work Plans (AWP)
- Partnership meeting minutes
- Timber Sale Contracts

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

FSC Principles Checklist

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

REQUIREMENT	C/NC	COMMENT/CAR
<p>Principle #1: Compliance with Laws and FSC Principles 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.</p>		
<p>1.1 Forest management shall respect all national and local laws and administrative requirements.</p>	C	
<p>1.1.a Forest management plans and operations demonstrate compliance with all applicable federal, state, county, municipal, and tribal laws, and administrative requirements (e.g., regulations). Violations, outstanding complaints or investigations are provided to the Certifying Body (CB) during the annual audit.</p>	C	<p>The Wisconsin County Forest Program (WCFP) was established per County Forest Law (s 28.11 Wis. Stats.) (County Forest Comprehensive Land Use Plans (CLUP) – Ch. 905 typically), 28.11 Wis. stats., NR 47, NR 48, & NR 51, Wis. Admin. Code.). All management planning documents are based on applicable laws and regulations cited in 2.1 of the FSC report. Forest Management Plans (FMPs) were reviewed for all counties visited.</p> <p>A description of the role of DNR liaison foresters working with County Forests can be found in the resource titled “WDNR Public Forest Lands Handbook 24605”, beginning on page 210-10. Their primary involvement, as required by</p>

		<p>statute, is assistance in long-term and annual planning, delivery of technical assistance, and county forest timber sale approvals.</p> <p>County Forest Administrators maintain a file with documentation of any violations or lawsuits. No counties reported violations to legal requirements or any new or on-going lawsuits related to their county forest lands since the last annual surveillance audit.</p>
<p>1.1.b To facilitate legal compliance, the <i>forest owner</i> or <i>manager</i> ensures that employees and contractors, commensurate with their responsibilities, are duly informed about applicable laws and regulations.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Contracts reference applicable laws and regulations (e.g., Price County Timber Sale contract, Iron County Timber Sale contract, and Vilas Timber Sale contract), including OSHA requirements. Similarly other contracts, such as pesticide contracts reference applicable laws and regulations, including OSHA requirements. Wisconsin DNR & county staff have access to several training opportunities that deal with compliance to BMPs, RTE species, and other legal/ regulatory requirements. These were confirmed through staff interviews, training records and online resources, e.g., http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/forestry.html).</p>
<p>1.2. All applicable and legally prescribed fees, royalties, taxes and other charges shall be paid.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>1.2.a The forest owner or manager provides written evidence that all applicable and legally prescribed fees, royalties, taxes and other charges are being paid in a timely manner. If payment is beyond the control of the landowner or manager, then there is evidence that every attempt at payment was made.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>10% of stumpage payments are made from County Forests (county government) to municipalities (towns & villages) in the form of Severance Tax. These payments are verified during periodic (every 3 years) internal audits of the County Forest program conducted by DNR in each county. The most recent internal audits for each of the three counties visited during the 2017 audit were reviewed and payment was confirmed in each of the audits. The payment for Vilas County was verified during the audit through</p>

		<p>review of the documentation of the transfer of the funds to DNR for dispersal. In addition in Vilas County the County Forest Program transfers 10% of the revenues to Revenues the fund for Segregated Land in the County.</p> <p>The procedures for the internal audits are included in the WDNR Public Forest Lands Handbook. In addition, some County Forests work with a Citizen Advisory Committee that tracks fiscal performance and payments.</p>
<p>1.3. In signatory countries, the provisions of all binding international agreements such as CITES, ILO Conventions, ITTA, and Convention on Biological Diversity, shall be respected.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>1.3.a. Forest management plans and operations comply with relevant provisions of all applicable binding international agreements.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>County forest staff demonstrated knowledge of indigenous people’s rights and uses. There is a permitting system in place that is well established for collection of materials such as birch lodge poles. This permit system was reviewed in all counties visited and in no case were any permit applications denied.</p> <p>Based on a review of the agreements referenced in the indicator, the U.S. is not a signatory and/or has not ratified several of the agreements referenced in the indicator (e.g. many ILO Conventions and Convention on Biodiversity) and others have very limited, or no, direct impact/applicability to County Forest management. Any wild ginseng harvests, which are subject to CITES, are regulated according to WDNR protocols: http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/endangeredresources/ginseng.html).</p>

<p>1.4. Conflicts between laws, regulations and the FSC Principles and Criteria shall be evaluated for the purposes of certification, on a case by case basis, by the certifiers and the involved or affected parties.</p>	<p>NE</p>	
<p>1.5. Forest management areas should be protected from illegal harvesting, settlement and other unauthorized activities.</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 Forest Management Unit (FMU).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Timber theft and trespass issues on County Forest properties are dealt with locally, and are typically investigated by county law enforcement, DNR forester-rangers, or county forest patrol officers, as confirmed in interviews. Through these cooperative efforts, Counties patrol each FMU daily or weekly during monitoring of active timber sales, use of gates and other mechanisms to control access. County sheriffs issue citations for ordinance violations throughout the year (i.e. off trail ATV use, unpermitted firewood cutting, illegal deer stands in trees, etc.).</p> <p>Wisconsin County Forest Programs take considerable actions to limit illegal and unauthorized activities in the forest. Observances of gates, berms, road closures and other techniques including posted signs indicating allowed uses. Confidential surveillance techniques may also be employed in cases of recurring vandalism or trespass.</p> <p>County Forests mark boundaries in timber sales, and, in most cases, ensure that timber sales avoid cutting right up to the property line.</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</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Timber theft and trespass issues on County Forest properties are dealt with locally, and are typically investigated by county law enforcement, DNR forester-rangers, or county forest patrol officers. Wisconsin Statute Chapter 26 offers</p>

<p>management objectives with consideration of available resources.</p>		<p>some 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</p> <p>https://docs.legis.wisconsin.gov/statutes/statutes/26/05).</p> <p>Iron County has had some problems with illegal harvest of birch poles. The person was detected during forestry activities and the case was turned over to the local county law enforcement. They normally contact the local DNR wardens to take care of any enforcement needs.</p> <p>No significant instances of timber theft and other illegal or unauthorized activities were detected or reported, as confirmed in review of records and interviews with staff in either Price or Vilas Counties.</p>
---	--	--

<p>1.6. Forest managers shall demonstrate a long-term commitment to adhere to the FSC Principles and Criteria.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>1.6.a. The forest owner or manager demonstrates a long-term commitment to adhere to the FSC Principles and Criteria and FSC and FSC-US policies, including the FSC-US Land Sales Policy, and has a publicly available statement of commitment to manage the FMU in conformance with FSC standards and policies.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>All County Forests which are FSC Certified have made commitments For example, the following is from the Price County Management Plan; “To that end, Price County will commit to the Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI) and Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) in the management of the Price County Forest. These certification standards fit within the framework of the County Forest Law program (s. 28.11, Wis. Stats.)” Likewise Vilas County Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution on 22 August 2017 that stated; “Whereas, the Vilas County Board of Supervisors on 28 February 2017 formally accepted and committed to dual certification and</p>

		<p>participation in the Sustainable Forestry Initiative® (SFI®) and the Forest Stewardship Council® (FSC®) forest certification systems and management of the Vilas County Forest”.</p>
<p>1.6.b. If the certificate holder does not certify their entire holdings, then they document, in brief, the reasons for seeking partial certification referencing FSC-POL-20-002 (or subsequent policy revisions), the location of other managed forest units, the natural resources found on the holdings being excluded from certification, and the management activities planned for the holdings being excluded from certification.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Each county with forests under the Wisconsin County Forest program has the option to be certified to either or both of the FSC or SFI standard (http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/TimberSales/countyForests.html). Of the 29 counties, 21 have attained FSC Certification. Certified county forests may have limited amount of forestlands they hold outside of the FSC certificate, which are documented in the CLUP. In general, excluded forestlands are unsuitable for timber management due to species composition (i.e., low timber value), difficulty in regeneration, and other reasons as stated in each county’s CLUP.</p>
<p>Principle #2: Long-term tenure and use rights to the land and forest resources shall be clearly defined, documented and legally established.</p>		

<p>2.1. Clear evidence of long-term forest use rights to the land (e.g., land title, customary rights, or lease agreements) shall be demonstrated.</p>	<p>NE</p>	
<p>2.1.a The forest owner or manager provides clear evidence of <i>long-term</i> rights to use and manage the FMU for the purposes described in the management plan.</p>	<p>NE</p>	
<p>2.1.b The forest owner or manager identifies and documents legally established use and access rights associated with the FMU that are held by other parties.</p>	<p>NE</p>	

<p>2.1.c Boundaries of land ownership and use rights are clearly identified on the ground and on maps prior to commencing management activities in the vicinity of the boundaries.</p>	<p>NE</p>	
<p>2.2. Local communities with legal or customary tenure or use rights shall maintain control, to the extent necessary to protect their rights or resources, over forest operations unless they delegate control with free and informed consent to other agencies.</p>	<p>NE</p>	
<p>2.2.a The forest owner or manager allows the exercise of <i>tenure</i> and <i>use rights</i> allowable by law or regulation.</p>	<p>NE</p>	
<p>2.2.b In FMUs where tenure or use rights held by others exist, the forest owner or manager consults with groups that hold such rights so that management activities do not significantly impact the uses or benefits of such rights.</p>	<p>NE</p>	
<p>2.3. Appropriate mechanisms shall be employed to resolve disputes over tenure claims and use rights. The circumstances and status of any outstanding disputes will be explicitly considered in the certification evaluation. Disputes of substantial magnitude involving a significant number of interests will normally disqualify an operation from being certified.</p>	<p>C</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>No new tenure claims or use rights other than illegal harvesting have taken place since the last annual surveillance audit per records reviewed and staff interviewed in 2017. Counties work to resolve issues such as encroachment and timber theft as quickly and peacefully as possible through open communication and, where necessary, legal mechanisms using DNR wardens or local law enforcement.</p>
<p>2.3.b The forest owner or manager documents any significant disputes over tenure and use rights.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>No significant disputes over tenure and use rights have arisen since the last annual surveillance audit.</p>

<p>Principle #3: The legal and customary rights of indigenous peoples to own, use and manage their lands, territories, and resources shall be recognized and respected.</p>		
<p>3.1. Indigenous peoples shall control forest management on their lands and territories unless they delegate control with free and informed consent to other agencies.</p>	<p>NE</p>	
<p>3.2. Forest management shall not threaten or diminish, either directly or indirectly, the resources or tenure rights of indigenous peoples.</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 the FMU to avoid harming their resources or rights.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>An extract from the Price County Management Plan states the following: “The County will collaborate with Tribal representatives on projects that have potential to impact Native American archeological or cultural resources. Native American tribes are also encouraged to contribute during the Forest planning process. Gathering rights for Tribal members on County Forest land is provided and detailed in Chapter 525 of this Plan.”</p> <p>County Board meetings and forestry committee meetings in which policies for resource management and work plans are set provide for public input, including representatives of indigenous people. The DNR and counties also</p>

		<p>maintain relationships with local Tribes and solicit input as needed. Indian treaty rights, and specifically Lake Superior Bands of Chippewa, were granted reserved rights to hunt, fish and gather on all ceded lands in eastern Minnesota and northwest Wisconsin as part of the treaties of 1837 and 1842.</p> <p>According to interviews with staff, local tribal offices are committed to government-to-government relationships. This has been a challenge to counties since most dealing are between state and federal governments with tribes. Nevertheless, tribal representatives do attend county committee meetings to provide feedback.</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>On those public lands within the ceded territory, including County Forests, a permit process is used to provide for tribal gathering of firewood, boughs, tree bark, lodge poles, marsh hay, jack pine stumps, and maple syrup. The tribal member must provide their tribal ID card for this access, which is recorded by the counties. The permit system was checked on all the counties included in the 2017 audit. All properly identified applicants were granted the permit sought. Some permits include the collection of a fee.</p> <p>The Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission (GLIFWC) is a consortium of tribal representatives that represents tribal resources interests within the ceded territory.</p> <p>Staff interviewed are aware of procedures for identifying known archaeological sites and implement measures to protect them. Staff at various county offices stated that oftentimes tribal members are reluctant to participate in</p>

		trainings and do not wish to share locations of sites unless absolutely necessary.
--	--	--

3.3. Sites of special cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance to indigenous peoples shall be clearly identified in cooperation with such peoples, and recognized and protected by forest managers.	NE	
--	----	--

3.4. Indigenous peoples shall be compensated for the application of their traditional knowledge regarding the use of forest species or management systems in forest operations. This compensation shall be formally agreed upon with their free and informed consent before forest operations commence.	NE	
--	----	--

Principle #4: Forest management operations shall maintain or enhance the long-term social and economic well-being of forest workers and local communities.

4.1. The communities within, or adjacent to, the forest management area should be given opportunities for employment, training, and other services.	NE	
--	----	--

4.2. Forest management should meet or exceed all applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of employees and their families.	C	
--	---	--

<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>Counties only reported no serious accidents to employees or contractor’s employees. Since logging contractors are insured independently, they may not always report accidents to the County. Counties reported that there have been no changes in the occupational health & safety regulatory framework.</p> <p>Accident records for staff are maintained in personnel files and were reviewed for all counties in 2017.</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>Counties reported that there have been no changes in contract language. Required labor law postings were viewed in each county office visited. All employees and contractor’s employees were observed using proper PPE at all times during the audit. Contracts reviewed for timber harvests, planting, and chemical use for all counties in 2017 contained safety requirements. Specific contracts reviewed from Price County included: planting contract for Fifield Road, Camp 5, and Hicks Landing, Timber Sale Contracts for Tracts 03-17, 09-15, and 14-14. Contracts were also reviewed for other counties.</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>Employees of contractors interviewed had FISTA training. For dual FSC-SFI-certified counties, records of contractors’ FISTA training were viewed in county files and confirmed on the FISTA database. Contractors for planting and pesticide application all had the proper certifications. Employees who had pesticide responsibility had the proper certifications from the state. Certificates were verified at the County Forest Offices.</p>
<p>4.3 The rights of workers to organize and voluntarily negotiate with their employers shall be guaranteed as outlined in Conventions 87 and 98 of the International Labor Organization (ILO).</p>	<p>NE</p>	
<p>4.4. Management planning and operations shall incorporate the results of evaluations of social impact. Consultations shall be maintained with people and groups (both men and women) directly affected by management operations.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>4.4.a The forest owner or manager understands the likely social impacts of management activities, and incorporates this understanding into management planning and operations. Social impacts include effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Archeological sites and sites of cultural, historical and community significance (on and off the FMU; • Public resources, including air, water and food (hunting, fishing, collecting); • Aesthetics; <p>Community goals for forest and natural resource use and protection</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>County board and forestry committee meetings in which policies for resource management and work plans are set allow for public input. Those meetings are typically held monthly and are public-noticed. Each County Forest Program prepares an annual work plan which is reviewed and approved prior to implementation. For Example in Vilas County the Vilas County Forestry, Recreation, and Land Committee approves the County Forest Work Plan. The 2016 and 2017 plans were reviewed during this audit. As follow-up the County Forest Program prepares an Annual Report and this is presented to the County Forestry, Recreation, and Land Committee. The 2016 Annual Report was reviewed. County Forestry staff are available to the public for people to provide feedback, in this way they are</p>

<p>such as employment, subsistence, recreation and health;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community economic opportunities; • Other people who may be affected by management operations. • A summary is available to the CB. 		<p>constantly evaluating social impacts and incorporating them into management.</p> <p>The WCFA website includes many statistics as to the impact of the County Forest Program. For example the following statement is from the WCFA website; “The importance of the County Forests to Wisconsin’s economic health continues to rise. County Forests sustain over 60,000 full-time jobs derived from logging, trucking, paper production, manufactured building materials, and lumber.</p> <p>http://www.wisconsincountyforests.com/economic-impact-2/</p> <p>Refer to County Forest Comprehensive Land Use Plans– Chapter 300, County Forest annual work plans, County Forestry Committee meetings, WDNR Timber Sale and Public Forest Lands Handbooks, and Timber Sale Cutting Notice & Report (Form 2460).</p> <p>http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/CountyForests/forms.html</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 Forest Administrators respond to any stakeholder comments as they are received, as confirmed in interviews with stakeholders and staff. No major issues other have been brought forward since the last annual surveillance audit.</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 set allow for public input. Adjacent land owners are contacted in cases when management activities occur near property boundaries or otherwise may affect use rights. Letters to adjacent landowners were reviewed for the planned thinning on Tract 7-17 in Vilas County. County Forest Administrators are available to the public for people to provide</p>

		<p>feedback, in this way they are constantly evaluating social impacts and incorporating them into management.</p>
<p>4.4.d For <i>public forests</i>, consultation shall include the following components:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clearly defined and accessible methods for public participation are provided in both long and short-term planning processes, including harvest plans and operational plans; 2. Public notification is sufficient to allow interested stakeholders the chance to learn of upcoming opportunities for public review and/or comment on the proposed management; 3. An accessible and affordable appeals process to planning decisions is available. Planning decisions incorporate the results of public consultation. All draft and final planning documents, and their supporting data, are made readily available to the public. 	<p>C</p>	<p>The County board and forestry committee meetings fulfill this requirement, as well as the administrators being available to the general public upon request. For example, in Vilas County, The minutes from the Vilas County Forestry, Recreation, and Land Committee’s meetings were provided and included a list of attendees for each meeting. The minutes included reference to attendees not on the committee addressing the committee. The County Forest Law establishes mechanisms for public participation in all planning processes. Annual work plans are open for public comment as advertised in local newspapers and on each County’s website well before management activities take place. For example the following is the link to the Price County Forestry and Recreation website: http://www.co.price.wi.us/181/Forestry-Parks-Department Appeals are dealt with prior to plans becoming finalized as to avoid any conflicts; however, the public may contact their elected county representative or present information during monthly public meetings to appeal decisions. All draft and final plans are made available in County offices and on each County’s website. Specific data may be requested from county forest managers.</p>

<p>4.5. Appropriate mechanisms shall be employed for resolving grievances and for providing fair compensation in the case of loss or damage affecting the legal or customary rights, property, resources, or livelihoods of local peoples. Measures shall be taken to avoid such loss or damage.</p>	<p>NE</p>	
---	-----------	--

Principle #5: Forest management operations shall encourage the efficient use of the forest’s multiple products and services to ensure economic viability and a wide range of environmental and social benefits.

<p>5.1. Forest management should strive toward economic viability, while taking into account the full environmental, social, and operational costs of production, and ensuring the investments necessary to maintain the ecological productivity of the forest.</p>	<p>NE</p>	
<p>5.2. Forest management and marketing operations should encourage the optimal use and local processing of the forest’s diversity of products.</p>	<p>NE</p>	
<p>5.3. Forest management should minimize waste associated with harvesting and on-site processing operations and avoid damage to other forest resources.</p>	<p>NE</p>	
<p>5.4. Forest management should strive to strengthen and diversify the local economy, avoiding dependence on a single forest product.</p>	<p>NE</p>	
<p>5.5. Forest management operations shall recognize, maintain, and, where appropriate, enhance the value of forest services and resources such as watersheds and fisheries.</p>	<p>NE</p>	
<p>5.6. The rate of harvest of forest products shall not exceed levels which can be permanently sustained.</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"> • documented growth rates for particular sites, and/or acreage of forest types, ageclasses and species distributions; • mortality and decay and other factors that affect net growth; • areas reserved from harvest or subject to harvest restrictions to meet other management goals; • silvicultural practices that will be employed on the FMU; • management objectives and desired future conditions. <p>The calculation is made by considering the effects of repeated prescribed harvests on the product/species and its ecosystem, as well as planned management treatments and projections of subsequent regrowth beyond single rotation and multiple re-entries.</p>	<p>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 & 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) that alter vegetation in any way (e.g. invasive species treatments, timber stand improvement, site preparation, tree planting, timber sales, wildlife habitat management) will be identified by compartment and stand within the WisFIRS database. The listed needs in the database, in addition to other multi-disciplinary input, will be used in determining property budgets and annual work plans.</p> <p>Minor changes to annual allowable harvest rate occur each year when planning is conducted for each county forest. During planning, if harvest intervals or early or late constraints are changed, the calculated annual allowable harvest will change accordingly. Additionally, if harvest dates are updated on a large amount of the property the annual allowable harvest can also be impacted.</p> <p>Harvest rates are established using area control methods and the data from WisFIRS. County Forestry Committees and County Boards develop budgets annually, during which annual allowed harvest acres are considered. During the audit</p>
---	----------	---

		<p>the actual versus planned harvests were compared and it was determined that the overall rate of harvest is less than the planned rate. County Forest Administrators provided documentation of Department budgets and annual harvests. WisFIRS Reports 36A and 37A contain stumpage value for sales completed by year.</p> <p>Minor changes to annual allowable harvest rate occur each year when planning is conducted for each county forest. During planning, if harvest intervals or early or late constraints are changed the calculated annual allowable harvest will change accordingly.</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>As a whole, the three certified counties audited in 2017 reported for the period of 2012 – 2016, a combined total of 38,176 established sale acres and deferred acres (evaluated but not ready for harvest) vs. 42,245 allowable acres. WCFP records show that timber harvests remain within the AAH on average over the past 5 years.</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 species composition, stocking, and past management. A combination of moving harvests forward and delaying harvest is being used to ensure a more balanced age class distribution over time.</p>
<p>5.6.d For NTFPs, calculation of quantitative sustained yield harvest levels is required only in cases where products</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Currently, the only significant commercial operations of NTFPs occur on counties with Sphagnum moss resources. Harvest areas and</p>

<p>are harvested in significant commercial operations or where traditional or customary use rights may be impacted by such harvests. In other situations, the forest owner or manager utilizes available information, and new information that can be reasonably gathered, to set harvesting levels that will not result in a depletion of the non-timber growing stocks or other adverse effects to the forest ecosystem.</p>		<p>intervals are set according to data from past years that shows how quickly the resource can recover. No counties that harvest and sell Sphagnum were visited in 2017.</p> <p>For small-scale NTFPs, permits were observed for Price and Iron Counties for items such as boughs and tree sap, no permits had been issued for Vilas County.</p>
--	--	--

<p>Principle #6: Forest management shall conserve biological diversity and its associated values, water resources, soils, and unique and fragile ecosystems and landscapes, and, by so doing, maintain the ecological functions and the integrity of the forest.</p>		
<p>6.1. Assessments of environmental impacts shall be completed -- appropriate to the scale, intensity of forest management and the uniqueness of the affected resources -- and adequately integrated into management systems. Assessments shall include landscape level considerations as well as the impacts of on-site processing facilities. Environmental impacts shall be assessed prior to commencement of site-disturbing operations.</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: 1) Forest community types and development, size class and/or successional stages, and associated <i>natural disturbance regimes</i>; 2) <i>Rare, Threatened and Endangered (RTE) species</i> and <i>rare ecological</i></p>	<p>C</p>	<p>These topics are covered in Chapter 100 of each County’s CLUP, such as soil types, communities, biodiversity (including RTE species) disturbance regimes, water resources, and historic conditions. Community types and natural disturbance regimes common to Wisconsin are described the Silvicultural Manual. The WisFIRS database has all these resources mapped and indicated. This was confirmed in the Iron County Forest Offices. Counties also use supplemental information such as soil maps, LiDAR data for wetland locations, wildlife action plan, and DNR manuals. An inquiry to the NHI</p>

<p>communities (including plant communities);</p> <p>3) Other habitats and species of management concern;</p> <p>4) Water resources and associated riparian habitats and hydrologic functions;</p> <p>5) Soil resources; and</p> <p>Historic conditions on the FMU related to forest community types and development, size class and/or successional stages, and a broad comparison of historic and current conditions.</p>		<p>database is included for each project planned on the County Forests. These inquiries and the results were confirmed on each 2460 reviewed for timber sales during the field audit.</p>
<p>6.1.b Prior to commencing site-disturbing activities, the forest owner or manager assesses and documents the potential short and long-term impacts of planned management activities on elements 1-5 listed in Criterion 6.1.a.</p> <p>The assessment must incorporate the best available information, drawing from scientific literature and experts. The impact assessment will at minimum include identifying resources that may be impacted by management (e.g., streams, habitats of management concern, soil nutrients). Additional detail (i.e., detailed description or quantification of impacts) will vary depending on the uniqueness of the resource, potential risks, and steps that will be taken to avoid and minimize risks.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Impacts to these resources are evaluated when completing 2460 forms for each timber harvest. The forms are comprehensive and include the results of the evaluation of these resources. Each County’s CLUP also contains general information on common impacts. Items included in the ecological considerations portion of the 2460 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 (Natural Heritage Inventory) review, and forest chemical use. Also included are sections on water quality considerations, aesthetic considerations, wildlife considerations, recreation considerations, and resources of special consideration (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>The 2460 forms are used to document the harvest or management prescriptions and the ecological considerations. Counties use “Wisconsin’s Forestry Best Management Practices for Water Quality”, Timber Sale Handbook, Public Forest Lands Handbook, Ecological Landscapes Handbook, and Forestry Silviculture and Aesthetics Handbook to develop prescriptions to 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). Management plans that include broad overviews of 6.1.a are available online and by request. The public is involved in preparing 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. All final management planning documents are available to the public in public offices, upon request, and many are also posted on county websites. Information from 2460 forms may be available upon request during draft form and upon finalization. Confidential portions of the timber sale planning documents including information on RTE species, sensitive habitats, and archaeological sites is maintained in a confidential portion of the file and is not made available to the general public.</p>

<p>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.</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</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Assessments to detect the presence or potential presence of RTE species and ecosystems are completed during the preparation of each county's CLUP.</p> <p>The Wisconsin Natural Heritage Inventory (NHI) is consulted prior to forest management activities.</p> <p>Foresters work in consultation with Wildlife and Endangered Resources staff to address any</p>
<p>appropriate expertise in the species of interest and with appropriate qualifications to conduct the surveys. If a species is determined to be present, its location should be reported to the manager of the appropriate database.</p>		<p>occurrences. Forestry, wildlife and ER staffs often conduct additional site surveys for species if the NHI database indicates the need. The NHI system allows for reporting of any additional occurrences by a variety of staff. Staff explained any modifications or protections made for management when a NHI hit was detected during compartment planning in the 2016 audit.</p>

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

<p>6.3.a.1 The forest owner or manager maintains, enhances, and/or restores underrepresented successional 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 underrepresented in the landscape relative to natural conditions, a portion of the forest is managed to enhance and/or restore old growth characteristics.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Assessments of under-represented, naturally occurring successional stages occur during comprehensive land use planning processes including the reconnaissance procedure and WisFIRS data entry (refer to each county’s CLUP). Specific property goals for management of these areas are described in the CLUP (e.g., chapter 500) and/or in annual work plans. Some of these areas are considered HCVF and are included in the discussion of HCVF resources in the CLUP. The DNR has developed some species-specific analysis of forest cover types, which are available on the DNR webpage.</p>
<p>6.3.a.2 When a rare ecological community is present, modifications are made in both the management plan and its implementation in order to maintain, restore or enhance the viability of the community. Based on the vulnerability of the existing community, conservation zones and/or protected areas are established where warranted.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Some of the counties and sites visited during the 2017 audit include ecosystems, which not only are rare, but support a number of RTE species or species of concern such as spruce grouse and Kirtland’s warbler. Common modifications included buffer strips and reserve tree pockets as well as larger openings with little to no retention.</p>
<p>6.3.a.3 When they are present, management maintains the area, structure, composition, and processes of all Type 1 and Type 2 old growth. Type 1 and 2 old growth are also protected and buffered as necessary with conservation zones, unless an alternative plan is developed that provides greater overall protection of old growth values.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Relict old growth stands (Type 1) are typed as reserved; there is no active management. There are 5 stands in three FSC County Forests (Eau Claire, Bayfield, and Forest). On any managed old-growth stand – any forest management is conducted primarily to maintain or enhance old growth characteristics, such as invasive species control. Only one of these stands has a planned treatment and</p>

<p>Type 1 Old Growth is protected from harvesting and road construction. Type 1 old growth is also protected from other timber management activities, except as needed to maintain the ecological values associated with the stand, including old growth attributes (e.g., remove exotic species, conduct controlled burning, and thinning from below in dry forest types when and where restoration is appropriate).</p> <p>Type 2 Old Growth is protected from harvesting to the extent necessary to maintain the area, structures, and functions of the stand. Timber harvest in Type 2 old growth must maintain old growth structures, functions, and components including individual trees that function as refugia (see Indicator 6.3.g).</p> <p>On public lands, old growth is protected from harvesting, as well as from other timber management activities, except if needed to maintain the values associated with the stand (e.g., remove exotic species, conduct controlled burning, and thinning from below in forest types when and where restoration is appropriate).</p> <p>On American Indian lands, timber harvest may be permitted in Type 1 and Type 2 old growth in recognition of their sovereignty and unique ownership. Timber harvest is permitted in situations where:</p>	<p>that is not until 2099. No activity in these areas has occurred since the last audit.</p> <p>*Note: while some counties may use the term ‘old growth’ to describe older stands or stands that will eventually develop old-growth characteristics (i.e., late seral), these areas do not meet the FSC-US definition of old growth.</p>
--	--

<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Old growth forests comprise a significant portion of the tribal ownership.2. A history of forest stewardship by the tribe exists.3. High Conservation Value Forest attributes are maintained.4. Old-growth structures are maintained.		
---	--	--

<p>5. Conservation zones representative of old growth stands are established.</p> <p>6. Landscape level considerations are addressed.</p> <p>7. Rare species are protected.</p>		
<p>6.3.b To the extent feasible within the size of the ownership, particularly on larger ownerships (generally tens of thousands or more acres), management maintains, enhances, or restores habitat conditions suitable for well-distributed populations of animal species that are characteristic of forest ecosystems within the landscape.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>DNR wildlife biologists work with liaison foresters and county forest administrators to plan and carry out projects for wildlife habitat improvement. A good example of this was the timber sale planning on Tract 3-15 in Vilas County Funding of \$.05/ acre is provided to county forests by the DNR to perform habitat improvement work. Vilas County shows a Wildlife Habitat Grant amount of \$1,936.36 in the 2016 Annual Report.</p> <p>Several additional examples where individual biologists, foresters, and county forest administrators pursued projects for the benefit of wildlife at a local level were observed during the 2017 audit. Some recent examples of efforts to benefit wildlife include: Young Forest Initiative, barrens restoration and management, grouse/woodcock habitat, Kirtland’s Warbler habitat, turkey habitat, etc. Projects are often conducted in partnership with other groups including Ruffed Grouse Society, National Wild Turkey Federation, and USFWS.</p>

<p>6.3.c Management maintains, enhances and/or restores the plant and wildlife habitat of Riparian Management Zones (RMZs) to provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) habitat for aquatic species that breed in surrounding uplands; b) habitat for predominantly terrestrial species that breed in adjacent aquatic habitats; c) habitat for species that use riparian areas for feeding, cover, and travel; d) habitat for plant species associated with riparian areas; and, e) stream shading and inputs of wood and leaf litter into the adjacent aquatic ecosystem. 	<p>C</p>	<p>Forest management activities regularly occur near riparian areas. “Wisconsin’s Forestry Best Management Practices for Water Quality” are followed when conducting management near riparian areas. BMP, soil disturbance, and ephemeral pond monitoring projects are conducted on county forest lands by the DNR forest hydrologist. BMP monitoring was completed in 2013 on county forest lands and a report has recently been published. The Forest Guilds report completed in 2016 (cited in C8.2) also contains some evaluation of BMPs that affect riparian habitats.</p>
<p>Stand-scale Indicators</p> <p>6.3.d Management practices maintain or enhance plant species composition, distribution and frequency of occurrence similar to those that would naturally occur on the site.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The harvests observed in 2017 are consistent with 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 selection harvests are consistent with wind-throw and natural mortality events that would promote the growth of healthier trees. See also the discussion under 8.2.</p>

<p>6.3.e When planting is required, a local source of known provenance is used when available and when the local source is equivalent in terms of quality, price and productivity. The use of non-local sources shall be justified, such as in situations where other management objectives (e.g. disease resistance or adapting to climate change) are best served by non-local sources. Native species suited to the site are normally selected for regeneration.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>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 that case the next best match is utilized.</p> <p>In Price County a large planting of red pine was visited. The seed source for this planting was seed zone 28 in Ontario. This was determined to be a good match based on input from the nursery and discussions with other counties on the performance of this seed stock in this area of Wisconsin. For jack pine, a local seed source is available. Planting stock utilized in the planting on Tract 9-15 was from the PRT nursery, seed zone 28 and was container stock. The survival rate appeared to be excellent, although plots will not be put in to determine survival rate until next year. Other counties in the audit were similar in their seed source usage.</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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> c) large live trees, live trees with decay or declining health, snags, and well distributed coarse down and dead woody material. Legacy trees where present are not harvested; and d) vertical and horizontal complexity. Trees selected for retention are generally representative of the dominant species found on the site. 	<p>C</p>	<p>Sites observed contained large, legacy trees such as conifers within aspen regeneration harvests. Selection harvests observed had snags retained. Den and cavity trees were retained in harvests observed.</p> <p>See site notes for more information.</p>
<p>6.3.g.1 In the Southeast, Appalachia, Ozark-Ouachita, Mississippi Alluvial Valley, and Pacific Coast Regions, when even-aged systems are employed, and during salvage harvests, live trees and other native vegetation are retained within the harvest unit as described in Appendix C for the applicable region.</p> <p>In the Lake States Northeast, Rocky Mountain and Southwest Regions, when even-aged silvicultural systems are employed, and during salvage harvests, live trees and other native vegetation are retained within the harvest unit in a proportion and configuration that is consistent with the characteristic natural disturbance regime unless retention at a lower level is necessary for the purposes of restoration or rehabilitation. See Appendix C for additional regional requirements and guidance.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>When even-aged harvests are conducted green tree retention guidelines, biomass harvesting and coarse woody debris guidelines are all followed, as confirmed in field observation. See discussion under OBS 2016.2.</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</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>There are no additional restrictions on even-aged management for the Lake States-Central Hardwoods region.</p>
--	-----------	---

<p>described in Indicator 6.3.g.1. A qualified plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is developed by qualified experts in ecological and/or related fields (wildlife biology, hydrology, landscape ecology, forestry/silviculture). 2. Is based on the totality of the best available information including peerreviewed science regarding natural disturbance regimes for the FMU. 3. Is spatially and temporally explicit and includes maps of proposed openings or areas. 4. Demonstrates that the variations will result in equal or greater benefit to wildlife, water quality, and other values compared to the normal opening size limits, including for sensitive and rare species. 5. Is reviewed by independent experts in wildlife biology, hydrology, and landscape ecology, to confirm the preceding findings. 		
---	--	--

<p>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 <i>invasive species</i>, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. a method to determine the extent of invasive species and the degree of threat to native species and ecosystems; 2. implementation of management practices that minimize the risk of invasive establishment, growth, and spread; 3. eradication or control of established invasive populations when feasible: and, 4. monitoring of control measures and management practices to assess their effectiveness in preventing or controlling invasive species. 	<p>C</p>	<p>The counties in the audit this year did not have extensive problems with invasive species. All have sections in their management plans that address policies and plans for dealing with invasive species if they are found. The only case of invasive control in the audit was in Vilas County where a planned treatment to prevent the spread of Reed Canary Grass was planned as part of a timber sale.</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 DNR to complete burn plans and coordinate burns on County Forests. Barrens mgt., red oak regeneration and suppressing woody vegetation in grasslands are three of the more common objectives for prescribed fire. No prescribed burn plans were visited during the 2017 audit. There was discussion about the possible use of fire in habitat management for Kirtland’s warbler in jack pine.</p>
---	----------	---

<p>6.4. Representative samples of existing ecosystems within the landscape shall be protected in their natural state and recorded on maps, appropriate to the scale and intensity of operations and the uniqueness of the affected resources.</p>	<p>NE</p>	
<p>6.5 Written guidelines shall be prepared and</p>	<p>NE</p>	

<p>implemented to control erosion; minimize forest damage during harvesting, road construction, and all other mechanical disturbances; and to protect water resources.</p>		
<p>6.6. Management systems shall promote the development and adoption of environmentally friendly non-chemical methods of pest management and strive to avoid the use of chemical pesticides. World Health Organization Type 1A and 1B and chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides; pesticides that are persistent, toxic or whose derivatives remain biologically active and accumulate in the food chain beyond their intended use; as well as any pesticides banned by international agreement, shall be prohibited. If chemicals are used, proper equipment and training shall be provided to minimize health and environmental risks.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>6.6.a No products on the FSC list of Highly Hazardous Pesticides are used (see FSC-POL-30-001 EN FSC Pesticides policy 2005 and associated documents).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>All chemicals reported during 2017 were not on the Highly Hazardous list provided by FSC.</p>
<p>6.6.b All toxicants used to control pests and competing vegetation, including rodenticides, insecticides, herbicides, and fungicides are used only when and where</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Herbicides are primarily used to control invasive species and in site preparation for sites that need mineral soil exposure or to liberate shade intolerant species from competition. In the case</p>

<p>non-chemical management practices are: a) not available; b) prohibitively expensive, taking into account overall environmental and social costs, risks and benefits; c) the only effective means for controlling invasive and exotic species; or d) result in less environmental damage than non-chemical alternatives (e.g., top soil disturbance, loss of soil litter and down wood debris). If chemicals are used, the forest owner or manager uses the least environmentally damaging formulation and application method practical.</p> <p>Written strategies are developed and implemented that justify the use of chemical pesticides. Whenever feasible, an eventual phase-out of chemical use is included in the strategy. The written strategy shall include an analysis of options for, and the effects of, various chemical and non-chemical pest control strategies, with the goal of reducing or eliminating chemical use.</p>		<p>of invasive species, herbicides are the most effective method, and result in lower environmental and social costs due to avoidance of ground disturbance that could create conditions for invasive species regeneration. In the case of site prep for replanting Red pine or other shade-intolerant species, the use of broadcast herbicide provides a better planting environment and gives the trees a chance to get established before the regrowth of the competing vegetation. In one case in Vilas County, the site preparation usage was also going to provide control of and invasive species.</p> <p>Trained and licensed County Forest staff apply some herbicides, although often larger prescriptions are contracted to third parties. WDNR's BMPs for invasive species and water quality are adhered to, which include instructions for following label recommendations and choosing least damaging methods of application. A contract for herbicide application was reviewed in Price County and County staff certification for pesticide application was verified.</p>
<p>6.6.c Chemicals and application methods are selected to minimize risk to non-target species and sites. When considering the choice between aerial and ground application, the forest owner or manager evaluates the comparative risk to non-target species and sites, the comparative risk of worker exposure, and the overall amount and type of chemicals required.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Aerial application is typically used only over large treatment areas where extensive site prep is required to establish shade intolerant species such as Jack pine or Red pine. Retention islands and areas to protect from herbicide application are included on maps so that aerial applicators know where not to apply the treatment. Ground treatments may be used in site prep and are usually applied using machinery or backpack sprayers. Spot treatments are applied with backpack sprayers to control invasive species.</p>

<p>6.6.d Whenever chemicals are used, a written prescription is prepared that describes the sites specific hazards and environmental risks, and the precautions that workers will employ to avoid or minimize those hazards and risks, and includes a map of the treatment area. Chemicals are applied only by workers who have received proper training in application methods and safety. They are made aware of the risks, wear proper safety equipment, and are trained to minimize environmental impacts on non-target species and sites.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Observed chemical applicator’s licenses for staff of Jackson, Chippewa, and Eau Claire. Staff in Juneau had expired licenses, but were not conducting any applications in the near future and are aware of the need for recertification. Prescriptions are recorded in WisFIRS and Form 2460) and also serve as a record of application.</p> <p>A written prescription was reviewed for Price County along with a pesticide application contract. It contained a map, requirement to adhere to chemical label safety and dosage requirements. Environmental precautions and site specific hazards cited included wind and sensitive features. The contract included language requiring use of proper PPE and meeting of OSHA requirements as well as safe disposal of chemicals and containers.</p>
<p>6.6.e If chemicals are used, the effects are monitored and the results are used for adaptive management. Records are kept of pest occurrences, control measures, and incidences of worker exposure to chemicals.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Pesticide use records are maintained by County Forest Administrators and are entered in WisFIRS. Prescriptions and evaluations of prescriptions are maintained in County offices. Records of pest occurrence are usually taken as part of field recon (inventory). Incidences of exposure are recorded per labor requirements cited in Principle 1 and Criterion 4.1.</p> <p>A red pine clearcut with herbicide application and planting of containerized red pine seedlings was visited in Price County. Ongoing monitoring was discussed and the plans called for monitoring in years 1, 3, and 5.</p>
<p>6.7. Chemicals, containers, liquid and solid non-organic wastes including fuel and oil shall be disposed of in an environmentally appropriate manner at off-site locations.</p>	<p>C</p>	

<p>6.7.a The forest owner or manager, and employees and contractors, have the equipment and training necessary to respond to hazardous spills.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Loggers, County staff, and WIDNR staff interviewed stated that FISTA training includes procedures for using spill kits. Spill kits were located at landing areas near transportation vehicles during the field audit, for example the in Iron County the logging contractor on Tract 14-14 had the required spill kit in his truck at the main landing along the road.</p>
<p>6.7.b In the event of a hazardous material spill, the forest owner or manager immediately contains the material and engages qualified personnel to perform the appropriate removal and remediation, as required by applicable law and regulations.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>No spills were reported on any of the County properties visited in 2017. Logging equipment observed was in working conditions and with no evidence of persistent leaks.</p>
<p>6.7.c. Hazardous materials and fuels are stored in leak-proof containers in designated storage areas, that are outside of riparian management zones and away from other ecological sensitive features, until they are used or transported to an approved offsite location for disposal. There is no evidence of persistent fluid leaks from equipment or of recent groundwater or surface water contamination.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Fuels and other hazardous materials were stored in landing areas observed on active logging sites, which were well-away from sensitive areas. No leaks were observed on any of the equipment on site during the field audit</p>
<p>6.8. Use of biological control agents shall be documented, minimized, monitored, and strictly controlled in accordance with national laws and internationally accepted scientific protocols. Use of genetically modified organisms shall be prohibited.</p>	<p>C</p>	

<p>6.8.a Use of <i>biological control agents</i> are used only as part of a pest management strategy for the control of invasive plants, <i>pathogens</i>, insects, or other animals when other pest control methods are ineffective, or are expected to be ineffective. Such use is contingent upon peer-reviewed scientific evidence that the agents in question are noninvasive and are safe for native species.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Although biological control agents may occasionally be recommended for use in the control of invasive plants and insects per State and Federal regulations, County staff do not have the authority to release them. No recent use of biological control agents was reported on Counties visited.</p>
<p>6.8.b If biological control agents are used, they are applied by trained workers using proper equipment.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Only WDNR or other state employees that have been trained in application methods release them (primarily insects or aerial bacterial sprays). County staff is not authorized to release biological control agents.</p>
<p>6.8.c If biological control agents are used, their use shall be documented, monitored and strictly controlled in accordance with state and national laws and internationally accepted scientific protocols. A written plan will be developed and implemented justifying such use, describing the risks, specifying the precautions workers will employ to avoid or minimize such risks, and describing how potential impacts will be monitored.</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>See restrictions on County staff for the use of biological control agents.</p>
<p>6.8.d Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) are not used for any purpose</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>No use of GMOs was reported by County staff. All seed sources from nurseries are documented and traceable to the provenance or collection area.</p>
<p>6.9. The use of exotic species shall be carefully controlled and actively monitored to avoid adverse ecological impacts.</p>	<p>NA</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 noninvasive 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 other than a WDNR seed mix used in erosion control from the approved list in the Wisconsin’s Forestry Best Management Practices for Water Quality in Appendix D. WDNR analyzed the risk of using this seed mix and recommends a limited number of non-native species for this purpose. 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.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>See discussion in 6.9.a</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>NA</p>	<p>See discussion in 6.9.a</p>

<p>6.10. Forest conversion to plantations or non-forest land uses shall not occur, except in circumstances where conversion: a) Entails a very limited portion of the forest management unit; and b) Does not occur on High Conservation Value Forest areas; and c) Will enable clear, substantial, additional, secure, long-term conservation benefits across the forest management unit.</p>	<p>NE</p>	
---	-----------	--

Principle #7: A management plan -- appropriate to the scale and intensity of the operations -- shall be written, implemented, and kept up to date. The long-term objectives of management, and the means of achieving them, shall be clearly stated.

<p>7.1 The management plan and supporting documents shall provide:</p> <p>a. Management objectives. b) description of the forest resources to be managed, environmental limitations, land use and ownership status, socio-economic conditions, and a profile of adjacent lands.</p> <p>b. Description of silvicultural and/or other management system, based on the ecology of the forest in question and information gathered through resource inventories. d) Rationale for rate of annual harvest and species selection. e) Provisions for monitoring of forest growth and dynamics. f) Environmental safeguards based on environmental assessments. g) Plans for the</p> <p>b) identification and protection of rare, threatened and endangered species. h) Maps describing the forest resource base including protected areas, planned management activities and land ownership.</p>	<p>NE</p>	<p>•</p> <p>The FME’s employees and contractors should to 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.</p>
---	-----------	--

<p>i) Description and justification of harvesting techniques and equipment to be used.</p>		
---	--	--

<p>7.2 The management plan shall be</p>	<p>NE</p>	
--	-----------	--

<p>periodically revised to incorporate the results of monitoring or new scientific and technical information, as well as to respond to changing environmental, social and economic circumstances.</p>		
<p>7.3 Forest workers shall receive adequate training and supervision to ensure proper implementation of the management plans.</p>	<p>NC</p>	
<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>	<p>NC</p>	<p>The FME’s employees and contractors should to 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. See OBS 2017.3</p>
<p>7.4 While respecting the confidentiality of information, forest managers shall make publicly available a summary of the primary elements of the management plan, including those listed in Criterion 7.1.</p>	<p>NE</p>	
<p>Principle #8: Monitoring shall be conducted -- appropriate to the scale and intensity of forest management - to assess the condition of the forest, yields of forest products, chain of custody, management activities and their social and environmental impacts.</p>		
<p>8.1 The frequency and intensity of monitoring should be determined by the scale and intensity of forest management operations, as well as, the relative complexity and fragility of the affected environment. Monitoring procedures should be consistent and replicable over time to allow comparison of results and assessment of change.</p>	<p>NE</p>	

<p>8.2. Forest management should include the research and data collection needed to monitor, at a minimum, the following indicators: a) yield of all forest products harvested, b) growth rates, regeneration, and condition of the forest, c) composition and observed changes in the flora and fauna, d) environmental and social impacts of harvesting and other operations, and e) cost, productivity, and efficiency of forest management.</p>	<p>C</p>	
--	----------	--

<p>8.2.a.1 For all commercially harvested products, an inventory system is maintained. The inventory system includes at a minimum: a) species, b) volumes, c) stocking, d) regeneration, and e) stand and forest composition and structure; and f) timber quality.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Reconnaissance completed in CY 2015 – 193,938 acres (WisFIRS Rpt. 115). WisFIRS is a comprehensive system for guiding the reconnaissance and inventory of forest compartments as well as for scheduling harvest and other management options of stands. All of the elements listed in this indicator are included in compartment reconnaissance (WDNR Public Forest Lands Handbook 2460.5).</p>
<p>8.2.a.2 Significant, unanticipated removal or loss or increased vulnerability of forest resources is monitored and recorded. Recorded information shall include date and location of occurrence, description of disturbance, extent and severity of loss, and may be both quantitative and qualitative.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Data on any such losses would be gathered by a special reconnaissance inventory and entered into WisFIRS before annual updates of harvest scheduling. Timber thefts reported under C1.5 were recorded per protocols for law enforcement.</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>As a whole, counties reported 550,950 cord equivalents harvested, plus an additional 915 cords of fuelwood, and 10,786 cords of small diameter wood. Records are kept of harvested timber and then entered into WisFIRS before annual updates on harvest scheduling. Records for harvest of firewood and NTFPs are maintained, as well as for any products harvested by members of tribes. Harvest data from TimberBase or other timber sale accounting software are manually entered into WisFIRS and the Timber Sale Notice & Cutting Reports for long-term tracking.</p> <p>Reviewed scale tickets and harvest contracts for all counties visited in 2017.</p>
<p>8.2.c The forest owner or manager</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Wildlife Surveys: Nesting bird surveys, grouse</p>

<p>periodically obtains data needed to monitor presence on the FMU of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Rare, threatened and endangered species and/or their habitats; 2) Common and rare plant communities and/or habitat; 3) Location, presence and abundance of invasive species; 4) Condition of protected areas, set-asides and buffer zones; 5) High Conservation Value Forests (see Criterion 9.4). 		<p>transects, summer deer observations, winter track surveys, bear surveys, and a variety of other wildlife and plant monitoring. Forest Health Monitoring which includes gypsy moth and EAB surveys. DNR partners with the general public in monitoring a number of wildlife species. Reports can be found at: http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/WildlifeHabitat/reports.html</p> <p>Plants: During routine forest reconnaissance foresters also are trained to assess sites for invasives. Invasives were added to the recon data sheet a few years back to allow for retention of this information.</p> <p>Over 75,000 acres currently have invasive plants listed as being present on the FSC-certified County Forests. Several counties also participate in Cooperative Weed Management Associations (CWMA).</p> <p>DNR also has a system for gathering invasives information (aquatic, wetland, terrestrial) from the general public available on their website. http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/Invasives/report.html</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 was reported by the Counties since the last audit. The County Forest committee meetings for each Forest are also a regular opportunity for the public to participate in the management of the County Forest and provide a good means of keeping tabs on social issues on the forests.</p> <p>Examples of timber sale inspection reports and checklists were included with all of the timber sales visited during the audit.</p> <p>Recently the Forest Stewards Guild completed a study, "Wisconsin Forest Practices and Harvesting</p>

		<p>Constraints Assessment,” on the impacts of harvest constraints in Wisconsin. http://www.forestguild.org/WFPS As stated in the Executive Summary of the report: “Our analysis of the ecological consequences of forest management constraints indicates 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. These constraints also have less economically tangible, but equally valuable, positive outcomes for wildlife, biodiversity, and water quality.”</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. Annual Work Plans routinely include information on the system of forest roads and make annual requests. Wisconsin’s Forestry Best Management Practices for Water Quality include in chapter 4 includes the need for inspection at a regular interval for active roads and inspection of inactive roads. The Wisconsin Forest Practices and Harvesting Constraints Assessment includes information on roads.</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>See County Forest Comprehensive Land Use Plans Ch. 500. Additional monitoring information is available through WCFA http://www.wisconsincountyforests.com) and WDNR http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/CountyForests/monitoring.html). WCFA is sponsoring a forestry practices study that is expected to cover the information required in this indicator for long-term socioeconomic impacts http://www.wisconsinforestry.org/initiatives/current/forestry-practices-study).</p>
<p>8.2.d.4 Stakeholder responses to management activities are</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Meeting minutes with the public and Citizen Advisory Council serve as a record of stakeholder interaction.</p>

monitored and recorded as necessary.		
8.2.d.5 Where sites of cultural significance exist, the opportunity to jointly monitor sites of cultural significance is offered to tribal representatives (see Principle 3).	C	Communication with tribal representatives is ongoing, assuring that any opportunities for joint monitoring of cultural sites are made available to tribes.
8.2.e The forest owner or manager monitors the costs and revenues of management in order to assess productivity and efficiency.	C	Quarterly and annual accomplishment reports show progress throughout the year for various work goals (timber sale establishment, reforestation, etc.). Timber sale inspections monitor at sale level.
8.3 Documentation shall be provided by the forest manager to enable monitoring and certifying organizations to trace each forest product from its origin, a process known as the "chain of custody."	NE	
8.4 The results of monitoring shall be incorporated into the implementation and revision of the management plan.	NE	

8.5 While respecting the confidentiality of information, forest managers shall make publicly available a summary of the results of monitoring indicators, including those listed in Criterion 8.2.	NE	
---	----	--

Principle #9: Management activities in high conservation value forests shall maintain or enhance the attributes which define such forests. Decisions regarding high conservation value forests shall always be considered in the context of a precautionary approach.

High Conservation Value Forests are those that possess one or more of the following attributes:

<p>a) Forest areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant: concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g., endemism, endangered species, refugia); and/or large landscape level forests, contained within, or containing the management unit, where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance</p> <p>b) Forest areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems</p> <p>c) Forest areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g., watershed protection, erosion control)</p> <p>d) Forest areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g., subsistence, health) and/or critical to local communities' traditional cultural identity (areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in cooperation with such local communities).</p>		
<p>9.1 Assessment to determine the presence of the attributes consistent with High Conservation Value Forests will be completed, appropriate to scale and intensity of forest management.</p>	NE	
<p>9.2 The consultative portion of the certification process must place emphasis on the identified conservation attributes, and options for the maintenance thereof.</p>	NE	
<p>9.3 The management plan shall include and implement specific measures that ensure the maintenance and/or enhancement of the applicable conservation attributes consistent with the precautionary approach. These measures shall be specifically included in the publicly available management plan summary.</p>	NE	
<p>9.4 Annual monitoring shall be conducted to assess the effectiveness of the measures employed to maintain or enhance the applicable conservation attributes.</p>	C	
<p>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.</p>	C	<p>Periodic reconnaissance updating and targeted monitoring visits to some HCVFs each year as needed. In 2014 field season a contracted (UW Superior) biological survey team completed plot sampling across HCVFs to establish some</p>

		<p>baseline vegetation monitoring data.</p> <p>Iron County has initiated the installation of permanent monitoring plots in the Penokee Range Biological Reserve Area with the installation of 250 plots to date. In counties visited in 2017, HCV areas mostly undergo passive management. Interviews with staff indicate that these are visited periodically to ensure that there is little to no visible anthropogenic disturbance. HCVs within harvest units are mostly within sensitive areas that are identified during pre-harvest recon and monitored during post-harvest close-out to ensure effective protection measures.</p>
<p>9.4.b When monitoring results indicate increasing risk to a specific HCV attribute, the forest owner/manager re-evaluates the measures taken to maintain or enhance that attribute, and adjusts the management measures in an effort to reverse the trend.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>According to FME staff, no increasing risks to HCVs have been detected.</p>

Appendix 6 – Chain of Custody Indicators for FMEs

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

Appendix 7 – Group Membership

WI County Forest FMU Summary

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

Co. Name	Cert Status	Gen Loc Lat	Gen Loc Long	Forest Admin	Email Address	Co. Forest Lands	Spec Use Lands	Total Acres

Ashland	FSC/S FI	46° 12' 45" N	-90° 28' 56" W	Chris Hoffman	choffman05@ centurytel.net	40,305.19	0	40,305.19
Barron	FSC/S FI	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/S FI	46° 47' 12" N	-90° 58' 52" W	Jason Bodine	jbodine@bayfi eldcounty.org	171,913.0 6	0	171,913.06
Burnett	SFI	45° 52' 29" N	-92° 10' 38" W	Jason Nichols	jnichols@burn ettcounty.org	111,097.5 6	0	111,097.56
Chippewa	FSC	45° 11' 50" N	-91° 14' 53" W	Mike Dahlby	mdahlby@co. chippewa.wi.u s	32,819.28	1,654.5 6	34,473.84
Clark	FSC	44° 35' 54" N	-90° 47' 46" W	Rick Dailey	rick.dailey@co .clark.wi.us	134,629.9 1	63.5	134,693.41
Douglas	FSC/S FI	46° 17' 39" N	-92° 0' 7" W	Jon Harris	jharris@dougl ascountywi.or g	264,426.6 3	15,639. 64	280,066.27
Eau Claire	FSC/S FI	44° 45' 9" N	-91° 2' 7" W	Joshua Pedersen	Josh.Pederse n@co.eau-cla ire.wi.us	51,642.23	1,168.8 8	52,811.11
Florence	FSC/S FI	45° 46' 53" N	-88° 15' 4" W	Patrick Smith	psmith@co.flo rence.wi.us	36,331.65	63.15	36,394.80
Forest	FSC/S FI	45° 31' 52" N	-88° 52' 26" W	Vacant		14,095.73	0	14,095.73
Iron	FSC/S FI	46° 17' 45" N	-90° 13' 48" W	Eric Peterson	icfadmin@iron countyforest.o rg	174,144.8 0	1,048.0 2	175,192.82
Jackson	FSC/S FI	44° 20' 57" N	-90° 32' 6" W	Jim Zahasky	jim.zahasky@ centurytel.net	119,404.7 6	2,685.4 0	122,090.16
Juneau	FSC/S FI	44° 1' 2" N	-90° 8' 14" W	Brian Lloyd	pfadm@co.jun eau.wi.us	15,931.07	1,867.7 2	17,798.79

Langlade	SFI	45° 20' 1"	-89° 4' 14" W	Erik Rantala	erantala@co.l anglade.wi.us	128,117.0 6	1,885.2 4	130,002.30
Lincoln	FSC/S FI	45° 22' 57"	-89° 50' 45" W	Kevin Kleinsc hmidt	kkleinschmidt @co.lincoln.wi .us	100,421.3 0	421.75	100,843.05
Marathon	SFI	44° 52' 11"	-89° 41' 33" W	Tom Lovlien	tglovlien@mail .co.marathon. wi.us	29,384.47	572.32	29,956.79
Marquette	SFI	45° 27' 39"	-88° 10' 59" W	Pete Villas	pvillas@marin ettecounty.co m	226,409.6 0	3,528.9 1	229,938.51
Monroe	Not Certified	44° 6' 50"	-90° 44' 54" W	Chad Ziegler	ctieglers@co. monroe.wi.us	6,848.69	432.3	7,280.99
Oconto	FSC/S FI	45° 2' 24"	-88° 16' 40" W	Monty Brink	Monty.brink@ co.oconto.wi.u s	43,546.40	159.43	43,705.83
Oneida	FSC/S FI	45° 35' 24"	-89° 37' 1" W	John Bilogan	jbilogan@co.o neida.wi.us	82,219.95	179.2	82,399.15
Polk	SFI	45° 36' 21"	-92° 43' 11" W	Jeremy Koslow ski	jeremy.koslow ski@co.polk.w i.us	16,445.71	720.39	17,166.10
Price	FSC/S FI	45° 34' 9"	-90° 23' 54" W	Eric Holm		91,507.44	795.01	92,302.45
Rusk	SFI	45° 35' 15"	-91° 4' 19" W	Paul Teska	pteska@ruskc ountywi.us	89,083.57	240	89,323.57
Sawyer	FSC/S FI	45° 42' 43"	-91° 3' 9" W	Greg Peterson	greg.peterson @sawycoun tygov.org	115,196.5 0	0	115,196.50
Taylor	FSC/S FI	45° 19' 15"	-90° 3' 47" W	Jake Walci sak	Jake.Walcisak @co.taylor.wi. us	17,669.06	18.86	17,687.92

Vernon	Not Certified	43° 35' 16" N	-91° 0' 29" W	Andy LaChance	andy.lachance@vernoncounty.org	1,886.91	0	1,886.91
Vilas	FSC/SFI	46° 2' 8" N	-89° 17' 19" W	John Gagnon	jogagn@vilascountywi.gov	41,078.62	61.27	41,139.89
Washburn	FSC/SFI	45° 57' 3" N	-91° 44' 54" W	Mike Peterson	mlpeters@co.washburn.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.wood.wi.us	37,069.75	692.58	37,762.33
Totals :						2,359,125.95	34,619.80	2,393,745.75

Prepared by Division of Forestry, August 5, 2017

WI. Department Of Natural Resources, Report 50A
7/1/2017

Tot Acres	
FSC	<u>2,031.47</u> 8.62
SFI	<u>2,215.41</u> 0.60
Non-certified	<u>9,167.90</u>