FSC[®] - Forest Management Digital Audit Report Supplement

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources – County Forest Program

SCS-FM/COC-00083G

| Certificate Holder Address | Wisconsin DNR - Forestry Division |
|----------------------------|---|
| | 101 S Webster Street PO Box 7921 |
| | Madison, WI 53703 |
| Certificate Holder Contact | Jake Walcisak |
| | jacob.walcisak@wisconsin.gov |
| Certificate Holder Website | https://dnr.wisconsin.gov/topic/CountyForests |

| CERTIFIED | | |
|-------------------|--|--|
| December 22, 2024 | | |

EXPIRATION

December 21, 2029

DATE OF FIELD EVALUATION

05-09 August 2024

DATE OF REPORT FINALIZATION

October 22, 2024

| TYPE OF EVALUATION | | |
|--|-----------------------|--|
| | □ 1st Surveillance | |
| □ Main Evaluation ⊠ Re-Evaluation | 2nd Surveillance | |
| | □ 3rd Surveillance | |
| Expansion of Scope | □ 4th Surveillance | |
| | Other Surveillance: # | |

This document contains the conformity tables and certificate tracking information that together with the Digital Audit Report constitute a complete FSC Forest Management Audit Report.

Table of Contents

| Appendix 1 – Staff and Stakeholders Consulted | 3 |
|---|----|
| Appendix 2 – Additional Evaluation Techniques Employed | 3 |
| Appendix 3 – Required Tracking | 10 |
| Appendix 4 – Forest Management Conformance Table | 11 |
| Appendix 5 – Chain of Custody Indicators for FMEs Conformance Table | 66 |
| Appendix 6 – Trademark Standard Conformance Table | 71 |
| Appendix 7 – Group Management Program | 74 |
| Appendix 8 – Additional Checklists | 74 |

Appendix 1 – Staff and Stakeholders Consulted

List of FME Staff Consulted

To protect privacy, only FME staff who have expressly provided written permission are listed. **These** records are retained by SCS and subject to FSC or ASI examination.

County Forests Certification - Opening Meeting

| Name | Role |
|----------------------------|---|
| Walcisak, Jacob S - DNR | DNR Forest Certification Coordinator |
| Coady, Joshua J - DNR | DNR Public Forestry Specialist |
| Blaylock, Matthew D - DNR | DNR Area Forestry Leader - Park Falls |
| Dave Kafura (Unverified) | WCFA - Technical and Resource Advisor |
| Gillen, Jean-Michel - DNR | DNR Forestry Team Leader - Rhinelander |
| Jake Truitt (Unverified) | County Forester - Oneida |
| Tanya (Unverified) | County Forest Office Coordinator - Oneida |
| Zahasky,Jim | County Forest Administrator - Jackson |
| Broquard, Katarina L - DNR | DNR Forester - Mercer |
| Warren, James K - DNR | DNR Bureau Chief - Forestry Field Operations |
| Allen, Timothy C - DNR | DNR Forester - Medford |
| Didier, Cody C - DNR | DNR Forest Tax Law Compliance Coordinator |
| Lambert, Kristin E - DNR | DNR Forestry Section Chief - Public/Private Lands |
| Onchuck, Thomas A - DNR | DNR Forestry Team Leader - Park Falls |
| Koch, Amanda A - DNR | DNR Forestry Policy Specialist |
| Morales, Amy L - DNR | DNR Forestry District Leader - Northwest |
| Heimstead, Paul F - DNR | DNR Forester - Balsam Lake |
| Tom Harlan | SCS Auditor |
| Johnson, Kyle M - DNR | DNR Forester Tech - Augusta |
| Severson, Ryan J - DNR | DNR Forestry Area Leader |
| Curtiss Lindner (External) | County Forest Administrator - Clark |
| Wysocki, Adam D - DNR | DNR Forester - Friendship |

County Forest Certification - Closing Meeting

Name

Role

| Itallie | hole |
|----------------------------|--|
| Walcisak, Jacob S - DNR | DNR Forest Certification Coordinator |
| Coady, Joshua J - DNR | DNR Public Forestry Specialist |
| fiene.pl@charter.net | Oneida County Forest (retired) |
| Dane Gravesen | County Forest Assistant Administrator - Rusk |
| Tom Lovlien (External) | County Forest Administrator - Marathon |
| Curtiss Lindner (External) | County Forest Administrator - Clark |
| Brown, Ryan T - DNR | DNR Forestry Technician - Eagle River |
| Gillen, Jean-Michel - DNR | DNR Forestry Team Leader - Rhinelander |
| | |

| Onchuck, Thomas A - DNR | DNR Forestry Team Leader - Park Falls |
|------------------------------|---|
| Jason Bodine | County Forest Administrator - Bayfield |
| Kriehn, Jacob D - DNR | DNR Forester - Wausaukee |
| Jake Truitt (Unverified) | County Forester - Oneida |
| Blake, Samuel W - DNR | DNR Forester - Crandon |
| Tanya Tischendorf | |
| (Unverified) | County Forest Office Coordinator - Oneida |
| Warren, James K - DNR | DNR Bureau Chief - Forestry Field Operations |
| Dean Bowe | County Forest Administrator - Lincoln |
| Lambert, Kristin E - DNR | DNR Forestry Section Chief - Public/Private Lands |
| Ryan Bourassa (Unverified) | County Forest Administrator - Marinette |
| Prichard, Teague - DNR | DNR State Forest Specialist |
| Schmidt, Kyle J - DNR | DNR Forester - Prentice |
| Josh Pedersen | County Forest Administrator - Eau Claire |
| Didier, Cody C - DNR | DNR Forest Tax Law Compliance Coordinator |
| Berklund, Heather A - DNR | DNR Chief State Forester |
| Marcus Isaacson (Unverified) | County Forester - Marinette |
| Mike Peterson (Unverified) | County Forest Administrator - Washburn |
| Blaylock, Matthew D - DNR | DNR Area Forestry Leader - Park Falls |
| Peterson, Eric F - DNR | DNR Forester - Webster |
| Hardin, Carmen R - DNR | DNR Bureau Director - Applied Forestry |
| | |

| Name | Role |
|----------------------------|---|
| Walcisak, Jacob S - DNR | DNR Forest Certification Coordinator |
| Brown, Doug - DNR | County Forest & Public Lands Specialist |
| Coady, Joshua J - DNR | DNR Public Forestry Specialist |
| Dane Gravesen | County Forest Assistant Administrator - Rusk |
| Tom Lovlien (External) | County Forest Administrator - Marathon |
| Curtiss Lindner (External) | County Forest Administrator - Clark |
| Brown, Ryan T - DNR | DNR Forestry Technician - Eagle River |
| Gillen, Jean-Michel - DNR | DNR Forestry Team Leader - Rhinelander |
| Onchuck, Thomas A - DNR | DNR Forestry Team Leader - Park Falls |
| Jason Bodine | County Forest Administrator - Bayfield |
| Kriehn, Jacob D - DNR | DNR Forester - Wausaukee |
| Jake Truitt | County Forester - Oneida |
| Blake, Samuel W - DNR | DNR Forester - Crandon |
| Tanya Tischendorf | County Forest Office Coordinator - Oneida |
| Warren, James K - DNR | DNR Bureau Chief - Forestry Field Operations |
| Dean Bowe | County Forest Administrator - Lincoln |
| Lambert, Kristin E - DNR | DNR Forestry Section Chief - Public/Private Lands |
| Ryan Bourassa | County Forest Administrator - Marinette |
| Prichard, Teague - DNR | DNR State Forest Specialist |

List of other FME Staff Consulted

| Schmidt, Kyle J - DNR | DNR Forester - Prentice |
|---------------------------|---|
| Josh Pedersen | County Forest Administrator - Eau Claire |
| Didier, Cody C - DNR | DNR Forest Tax Law Compliance Coordinator |
| Berklund, Heather A - DNR | DNR Chief State Forester |
| Marcus Isaacson | County Forester - Marinette |
| Mike Peterson | County Forest Administrator - Washburn |
| Blaylock, Matthew D - DNR | DNR Area Forestry Leader - Park Falls |
| Peterson, Eric F - DNR | DNR Forester - Webster |
| Hardin, Carmen R - DNR | DNR Bureau Director - Applied Forestry |

List of other Stakeholders Consulted*

Vilas County Forestry Department - Park & Rec Supervisor Landover Saddle Club Member St. Germain Snowmobile Club Member Sno-Eagles Snowmobile Club Member Bo-Boen Snowmobile Club Member Great Headwaters Trail (Bike Trails) Member Landover Dual Sports Off-Road Motorcycle Club Member

To protect privacy, only stakeholders who have expressly provided written permission are listed. **These** records are retained by SCS and subject to FSC or ASI examination.

* Note: SCS may maintain additional records of stakeholder consultation activities (e.g., email notifications) in its recordkeeping system. Anonymous stakeholders may have provided comments as a part of stakeholder outreach activities, such communications are retained by SCS subject to FSC and ASI examination.

Appendix 2 – Additional Evaluation Techniques Employed

Site Notes:

08/06/2024

| Site | Location | Notes: |
|----------------|---|--|
| SG/KM/TH- 1 | Vilas County – Eagle River Office | County Opening Meeting: Introductions, client update, review audit scope, review audit plan, confidentiality, conformance evaluation methods and tools, emergency and security procedures for audit team, and final site selection adjustments. Review any ongoing issues and/or stakeholder concerns. |
| | | Reviewed Training records for Jerome Wotachekthat included first aid, chain saw, BMP, climate adaption and NHI trainings. Reviewed Pesticide book and interviewed Jerome Wotachek Jerome |
| | | is a licensed pesticide applicator which was confirmed by reviewing his certificate, reviewed prescription for application that used Roundup PowerMax and Oust XP. Jerome stated that he refers to the |

| | | label for application rates and normally uses less than the label rate. The Natural Heritage Inventory is reviewed prior to spraying any chemicals. Jerome is working with a bike trail riders group to spray the county forest portion of the trail to control invasives. Reviewed Pesticide storage cabinet that is located in the truck bay that is locked when no one is at the office. There is a sign out sheet that is used when any spray application is going on. There is also a spill kit and an eye wash material that taken to the field while spraying in case of any issues. The SDS sheets are located in the office. Reviewed the file for the first stop of the day, logger was TSI Logging Inc, the SFI training for TSI was confirmed and a copy of the form is in the file, The training is saved in FISTA. Reviewed the timber sale checklist and the presale checklist that is reviewed with the contractor, maps of the sale area were in the file, scale slips and load tags were noted in the file and income from each scale slip was also noted. |
|----------------|--------------------------|---|
| SG/KM/TH- 2 | Sale #1062 Tract 8-23 | Approved 2022. Cut 2023. 80 acres. Aspen coppice. Red pine thinning. White pine shelter wood. Keep oak and white pine as climate adaptation for species diversity. Aspen and red pine might not do as well under climate scenario. Maintain species diversity for climate and wildlife. Also keep black spruce. Sale boundary verification. Green tree retention zone to avoid small RMZ and have screen trees along highly recreationalriver. |
| | | Viewed pre-sale checklist and 2460. Pine cut tree mark. Use 10 BAF and Forest Metrics for volume cruise. NHI hits present. WI River buffered by 100' RMZ. 2-5 year regen survey done for aspen. Viewed hardwood understory in planted pine stands. |
| SG/KM/TH- 3 | Torch Lake Campground | County owned and maintained campground 41 sites. Interview campground host. 5-month seasonal employee host. Sites cost \$45- 50 night with full services. Large campsites. Well maintained restrooms and facilities. |
| SG/KM/TH- 4 | Sale #1047 Tract 3-22 | Approved 2022. Cut 2022. Red pine thinning. 1st and 4th thinning. 50 acres. ATV trails. Widened county roads for fire resiliency. Wood turtle and spruce grouse. Kirtland's Warbler monitoring. |
| | | 66-year-old stand. Reduced BA from 170 to 120. NHI mitigation no- cut 4/1 – 10/1. Discussed public access policy (off-road vehicles prohibited, permits required for x-mass trees, etc.) |

| SG/KM/TH- 5 | Sale #1053 Tract 12-22 | Approved 2022. Aspen coppice (55 ac) , 1st and 2nd red pine thinnings. Spruce/jack pine seed tree. 113 acres. Sale boundary verification. Black spruce regeneration. Ground scaling done for small residual piles, must be hauled by contractor prior to performance bond being returned. White pine |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| | | marked for retention. RMZ buffer along Tamarack Creek. |
| SG/KM/TH- 6 | Tamarack Springs Campground | Stakeholder lunch with ATV, equestrian, off-road motorcycle, and trail bike clubs. Campground renovated in 2018 by ORM club and three trails constructed totaling 22 miles. County built new restrooms. Grant was used to build new pavilion. Equestrian club has 30 miles of dedicated trails for hiking and riding. One multi-use trail on-site. Clubs report very good cooperation and no conflicts among the user groups. |
| SG/KM/TH- 7 | Sale #1031 Tract 20-20 | Approved 2021. Langley Salvage. 107 acres. Windstorm damage. 50% of aspen stand blew over. Leave undamaged oak or pine. Recreation trails closed and relocated. Filter strips left around ephemeral and permanent ponds.Ssmall area left for green tree retention. Cut spring 2021 and spring 2022. |
| | | Discussed BMP monitoring program. 5 year reporting cycle. 30-40 sites of 700 total harvests per year. Results inform BMP training courses for WI County Forest Association meetings and FISTA courses. Results publicly available on the website. |
| SG/KM/TH- 8 | Sale #1041 Tract 7-21 | Approved 2021. JP regeneration. Summer 2022, Fall 2022 used anchor chain to scarify. Regen survey in 2024 or 2025. May do inter- planting to meet stocking of 500-600 Tpa. Would like to have 1,000 Tpa. Boundary Verification. |
| | | Discussed stakeholder notification for timber sales. Notice posted in local newspaper twice. Letters sent to adjacent landowners. Sawhorse sale cancelled in 2019 due to stakeholder concerns with pesticide applications. |
| SG/KM/TH- 9 | Active Timber Sale | Equipment and landing inspection. No crew present. Ponsse harvester and forwarder. 1058 sale. 5 gallon minimum reportable spill. Any size spill must be cleaned Landing COC discussion. Load tickets purchased and kept on-site by logging contractor. |
| SG/KM/TH- 10 | Sale #1055 Tract 14-23 | Clear 2.5 miles of existing road to day light road and repair damage to road. Direct sale due to low cut volume. NHI review. Capital Improvement project. March 1 to May 1 harvest to avoid NHI damage. Sale closed in WISFRS. Final BMPs installed by county staff. |
| SG/KM/TH- 11 | Sale #1064 Tract 12-23 | Approved 2023. 54 acres. RP 1st thinning, white birch seed tree, white pine seed tree. Sold 2023. Harvesting started in 2024. |

| Greentree retention along lakes and for aesthetics in WP seed tree. Property boundary verification. Sale set-up by DNR for county using allocated time standard hours. |
|---|
| Discussed how Natural Heritage Inventory (NHI) is populated. NHC does systematic statewide survey for RTE species. New occurrence can be documents by DNR staff if something is found or through notification of the general public after being confirmed by DNR biologist. |

08/07/2024

| Site | Location | Notes: |
|--------------|---------------------------|--|
| SG/TH - 1 | Price County Office | 92,000 + acres in CF program, working on 40 year rotation for aspen, annual allowable harvest is 2,000 acres per year, DNR allocates 1,360 hours per year for Price Co. work. Training Records Reviewed: Fred Freeman – Assistant Forest Administrator - Pesticide Applicators License Cert. expires 6/2029, first aid/CPR/AED, BMP, chainsaw, more certificates from other years. Luke Bogdanovic – Forester – been on job almost 2 years – Pesticide Applicators License expires 2/2029, Chainsaw safety, FISTA Basic Core II class. Timber Sale folder reviewed – included Timber Sale Completion Checklist that shows what has been done at the end of logging (performance bond returned, WisFRIS update, etc), scale slips, scale slip reconciliation spreadsheet, logger's insurance policy, harvest inspection report, logger training check, and contract. Timber contract has clauses that cover Forest Certification, BMP requirements, Soil Disturbance guidelines, OSHA requirements, Map and signature page. FISTA training certification check on Mike Blomquist for logging job. Tickets in Price County are issued by the forester and not sold, coffee can is put on site for tickets to be deposited into during logging. Pesticide Storage – in locked building and locked storage cabinet, SDS information binder beside cabinet, some mixing is done in the garage, spill kit consists of "kitty litter", no special PPE or First aid equipment noted on site. |
| SG/TH - 2 | Tract 13- 21 | Boundaries only marked where needed, if timber type change is evident, then the line is not marked. Forester works with loggers to make sure they can use the Avenza app, explains harvest area to logger. Discussed sale prep process: Price Co. has two bid sales for the yearly harvest allowable cut - spring and fall; after fall bids they run a query in WisFRIS for tracts that meet age requirements, the list is checked for accuracy, the selected areas are reconned to make sure they will work, the sale area is marked and cruised, the cruise data is entered into WisFRIS (this data has to be no more than 12 months old for the process to work), enter data into the 2460 form, make map and narrative for 2460. Kyle Schmidt, County Forest Liaison with DNR checks NHI database, historical data and archaeological data for sale area, then the sale goes to the committee for approval, once approved the sale is put out for bids and advertised in the local paper. |

| it was not required. Forester noted that there was plenty of timber and they did not have to go after every stick. Discussed inventory method for sale volume – use 10 BAF prism, take DBH and some total heights, use tables for determining volume, use Cubic Cruise software to calculate, number of plots needed is determined by stand characteristics.SG/TH - 4Tract 18- 21Discussed rutting specs with Jake, no issues on tract, tract was selectively harvested removing the Ash due to EAB issue, there was an old well on site that was mapped and marked out for the loggers safety and site protection, a wind storm happened during logging and the logger was asked to cut the damaged timber – this was noted in the harvest inspection but nowhere else.SG/TH - 5Tract 17- 20Discussed boundary marking along woods road – marked with red paint, discussed single tree selection process and noted orange stump mark on harvested tree, discussed regen check timing.SG/TH - 6Tract 17- 23Inspected GAP process and marking in the selective harvest area, GAP areas ar marked with Purple paint and everything within the area is clearcut, these areas are cut to enhance some oak regeneration, the size and location of the GAP's are set in the office and mapped on an Avenza map that is used to find and mark the sites, silvicultural handbook calls for 10% of stand to be in GAP, by setting them up in the office it insures that this target is met, there are 16 | | Discussed green tree retention – policy is 3-15% of stand is retained, if possible, noted that rutting policy is in the contract, and discussed reforestation check – Northern hdwd check in 5 years, aspen check in 3 years, plantation check at age 1 and 3, all other check in 1-3 years. |
|---|---|---|
| - 421harvested removing the Ash due to EAB issue, there was an old well on site that was mapped and marked out for the loggers safety and site protection, a wind storm happened during logging and the logger was asked to cut the damaged timber – this was noted in the harvest inspection but nowhere else.SG/THTract 17- 20Discussed boundary marking along woods road – marked with red paint, discussed single tree selection process and noted orange stump mark on harvested tree, discussed regen check timing.SG/THTract 17- 23Inspected GAP process and marking in the selective harvest area, GAP areas ar marked with Purple paint and everything within the area is clearcut, these areas are cut to enhance some oak regeneration, the size and location of the GAP's are set in the office and mapped on an Avenza map that is used to find and mark the sites, silvicultural handbook calls for 10% of stand to be in GAP, by setting them up in the office it insures that this target is met, there are 16 | - | Aspen was over 3 foot tall next to the sold clearcut harvest. Good Practice – marked a RMZ along a cross drainage to protect the site where it was not required. Forester noted that there was plenty of timber and they did not have to go after every stick. Discussed inventory method for sale volume – use 10 BAF prism, take DBH and some total heights, use tables for determining volume, use Cubic Cruise software to calculate, number of plots needed is determined by stand |
| - 520discussed single tree selection process and noted orange stump mark on harvested tree, discussed regen check timing.SG/TH - 6Tract 17- 23Inspected GAP process and marking in the selective harvest area, GAP areas ar marked with Purple paint and everything within the area is clearcut, these areas are cut to enhance some oak regeneration, the size and location of the GAP's are set in the office and mapped on an Avenza map that is used to find and mark the sites, silvicultural handbook calls for 10% of stand to be in GAP, by setting them up in the office it insures that this target is met, there are 16 | - | harvested removing the Ash due to EAB issue, there was an old well on site that was mapped and marked out for the loggers safety and site protection, a wind storm happened during logging and the logger was asked to cut the damaged |
| - 6 23 marked with Purple paint and everything within the area is clearcut, these areas are cut to enhance some oak regeneration, the size and location of the GAP's are set in the office and mapped on an Avenza map that is used to find and mark the sites, silvicultural handbook calls for 10% of stand to be in GAP, by setting them up in the office it insures that this target is met, there are 16 | - | discussed single tree selection process and noted orange stump mark on |
| | - | areas are cut to enhance some oak regeneration, the size and location of the GAP's are set in the office and mapped on an Avenza map that is used to find and mark the sites, silvicultural handbook calls for 10% of stand to be in GAP, by setting them up in the office it insures that this target is met, there are 16 GAP areas on this sale and they range from 0.2 acres – 0.9 acres in size. Good Practice – setting up GAP areas in office to minimize forester bias and to |

| Site | Location | Notes: |
|----------------|--|--|
| SG/KM/TH- 1 | Oneida County Courthouse – Forestry office | Overview of FMU at county office. Review of staff training records, logger qualifications (e.g., FISTA), harvest contracts, and COC records. |
| SG/KM/TH- 2 | Forestry shop | Chemical cabinet inspection and review of application and SDS records. Arsenal and round-up currently in stock. Chemical pesticides are stored separately from other chemicals (e.g., cleaning) and well away from flammable liquids such as oil and gas, which have a separate cabinet in another location in the shop. |
| SG/KM/TH- 3 | Tract 22-20 | 41 ac. of aspen coppice with reserves (green tree retention blocks). Stands 1 and 26; roughly 20 ac a piece. 6 acres total of green tree |

| | | retention. With stand retention of conifers and oaks. Installed water bars after harvest. Harvest June 2023 and closed Sept. 2023. Green tree block of mixed oak/ aspen for wildlife and protect small wetland for amphibian dispersal. Verification of sale boundaries. Recreation trail maintained in partnership with local trail user organization. Berm between rec trail and logging trail. All trails seeded with clover. No issues with BMPs or NHI. |
|----------------|-------------|---|
| SG/KM/TH- 4 | Tract 06-20 | 62 ac. total with 4 ac. of green tree retention. Aspen coppice with some oak and mixed HW. Retention of conifer and green - marked trees. Sold in 2020. Biomass chipping harvest for local box plant. Harvest 2023 and 2024, frozen conditions required. Sale contract extended. NHI review, no affected species within 0.25 miles. Inspection of chipping site. Logger does all work, including chipping. White pine and oak retention trees within unit. Green paint. Sale boundary marked with red paint. Green tree retention block will be retained when adjacent stand is harvested. |
| SG/KM/TH- 5 | Tract 04-24 | 28 ac. Aspen coppice with removal of most balsam fir. Harvest low ground black ash in swale areas. Retain oak, cedar, yellow birch, white spruce, hemlock, and white pine. No RMZ necessary. NHI areas 1 mile outside of sale area so these are not directly affected. Sale sold June 2024. Active site. Kleinschmidt Logging is the contractor. Contract 1829. Adjacent to private property. Green tree retention representative of original stand left within sale unit. Swamp left outside of sale. Pulp wood and bolt sorts. Logger suggested relocating the primary skid trail to higher ground to avoid wetland impacts. Verification of blue-lined private property boundary. Landowner notified of timber sale and boundary. Monuments are located well outside of timber sate area. Not surveyed, just a harvest line. Staff trained on working with private and public boundary identification. Can use old field identifiers to designate sale boundaries. |
| | | Road repair after spring 2022 that led to wash out. Double-culvert replacement after hydrological study to occur in 2025-26. The new size will be 8'x 6' for each culvert due to slope and 100-year flood event model restrictions. Sediment plug will be removed to help culvert last longer (remove scour pressure). |
| SG/KM/TH- 6 | Tract 04-20 | 45 ac. pine clearcut. Harvest completed November 2021. Replant spring 2024 with red pine and white pine (10%) at 1,000 TPA. The harvest is mostly red and white pine, and some aspen and hardwood. Two no-harvest hardwood areas. NHI hits over 1 mile from sale area. No impacted streams or wetlands. Two historic homesteads protected with buffers. No adjacent private lands. Survival check scheduled for 2025. County staff had to do root pruning of bare root stock. |
| SG/KM/TH- 7 | Tract 14-21 | 89 ac, Aspen coppice. Sold 2021. Partially harvested. Must be frozen conditions. Retain birch, elm, cherry. Archaeological site buffered out. Consultation with stakeholders on protection. The contractor |

| | | could lose bond if damage to archeological site. NHI hit over 1 mile from sale. No adjacent landowners. One lowland ephemeral draw that has no minimum RMZ under frozen or dry conditions, 15' otherwise. |
|-----------------|---------------|--|
| SG/KM/TH- 8 | Tract 17-23 | 83 ac. Aspen coppice. Sold November 2023. Partially harvested. Some wood is still on the ground. 9 ac green tree retention. Reserve swamp trees around depressions. No NHI and no RMZs. All season harvest allowed under dry or frozen, wildlife opening. |
| SG/KM/TH- 9 | Tract 01-20 | 144 acres, Aspen coppice (40 Ac) and hardwood thinning (104 ac.). Sold in 2020 and harvested in April 2023. Within the coppice all aspen, balsam fir, white birch, red maple, hard maple, and ironwood 1" diameter and larger were to be harvested. All other species such as cedar, tamarack, white spruce, yellow birch, oak, and pine were left as reserves. The management objective for the hardwood thinning area (104 ac.) was to improve stand quality through selective thinning, recruit additional regeneration by establishing canopy gaps and releasing established regeneration. The management goal was to convert this 2-aged hardwood stand to an all-aged stand. The prescription was to thin the stand to ~80 sq. ft. with 2 canopy gaps per acre at 40'-50' wide. Poor quality and high-risk trees were targeted and marked for removal. The prescription in the thinning area was to cut all trees marked with orange paint including all aspen, balsam fir, and ironwood 1" dia. or larger, and to leave all unmarked hardwood, including sapling-sized regeneration. No NHI hits or RMZ necessary. Northern Hardwood to be converted to uneven-aged via single tree and group selection over successive entries. Snowmobile trail cuts through thinning and coppice area. Coppice has conifer retention. Verification of western edge of timber sale boundary. |
| SG/KM/TH- 10 | Forestry shop | Daily summary |

Appendix 3 – Required Tracking

History of Findings for Certificate Period

| FM Principle | Cert/Re-cert Evaluation (2024) | 1 st Annual Evaluation (year) | 2 nd Annual Evaluation (year) | 3 rd Annual Evaluation (year) | 4 th Annual Evaluation (year) |
|--------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| No findings | \boxtimes | | | | |
| P1 | | | | | |
| P2 | | | | | |

| Р3 | | | |
|----------------|--|--|--|
| Р4 | | | |
| Р5 | | | |
| P6 | | | |
| P7 | | | |
| P8 | | | |
| Р9 | | | |
| P10 | | | |
| COC for FM | | | |
| Trademark | | | |
| Group Other | | | |
| Other | | | |

Progressive HCVF Assessments

☑ FME does not use partial or progressive HCVF assessments.*

*Note: In the case the FME is not operating in the entire management unit, it is permissible to only complete an HCVF assessment for the portion of the unit in which they are operating under special conditions. In such cases, the HCVF assessment must be extended if new areas are entered without an existing, appropriate HCVF assessment having been completed. An example includes a large forest concession where harvesting is initially limited to a smaller geographic scope.

Special Instructions or Scoping Notes for Next Regularly Scheduled Annual Audit

| \boxtimes | Not applicable; no significant issues identified that may impact the next audit. |
|-------------|--|
| | |

*Note: information audit team leaders wish to remain confidential may be communicated directly to SCS.

Requirements Reviewed in Annual Evaluation

| Evaluation Year | Requirements Reviewed (FSC P&C Reviewed, FM/COC Indicators, | |
|-----------------|--|--|
| | Trademark Indicators, Group Standard Indicators, etc.) | |
| 2024 | All – Indicators | |
| | FSC-STD Forest Management Standard(s) FSC-US Forest Management | |
| | Standard V1-0, | |
| | FSC-STD-50-001 V2-1 Trademark Standard, | |
| | SCS COC indicators for FMEs V8-0 | |

Appendix 4 – Forest Management Conformance Table

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

| REQUIREMENT | C/NC | COMMENT/CAR |
|-------------|------|-------------|
| | | |

| P1 Forest management shall respect all a | pplicabl | e laws of the country in which they occur, and | | |
|--|----------|---|--|--|
| international treaties and agreements to which the country is a signatory, and comply with all FSC | | | | |
| Principles and Criteria. | | | | |
| C1.1 Forest management shall respect | С | - | | |
| all national and local laws and | | | | |
| administrative requirements. | | | | |
| 1.1.a Forest management plans and operations demonstrate compliance with all applicable federal, state, county, municipal, and tribal laws, and <i>administrative requirements</i> (e.g., regulations). Violations, outstanding complaints or investigations are provided to the <i>Certifying Body</i> (CB) during the annual audit. | C | 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. Forest Management Plans (FMPs) were reviewed for counties sampled during the audit. A description of the role of DNR liaison foresters working with County Forests can be found in the resource titled <i>WDNR Public Forest Lands</i> <i>Handbook 2460.5.</i> Their primary involvement, as required by statute, is assistance in long-term and annual planning, delivery of technical assistance, and county forest timber sale approvals. County Forest Administrators maintain files with documentation of any violations or lawsuits. No counties reported violations of legal requirements or any new or ongoing lawsuits related to their county forestlands since the last annual surveillance audit. | | |
| 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. | С | Contracts reference applicable laws and regulations 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 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. | | |

| C1.2. All applicable and legally | С | _ |
|--|---|--|
| prescribed fees, royalties, taxes and | C | |
| other charges shall be paid. | | |
| 1.2.a The forest owner or manager | С | 10% of stumpage payments are made from County |
| provides written evidence that all | C | Forests (county government) to municipalities |
| applicable and legally prescribed fees, | | (towns) in the form of Severance Tax. These |
| royalties, taxes and other charges are | | payments are verified during periodic (every 5 |
| being paid in a timely manner. If | | years) internal audits of the County Forest program |
| payment is beyond the control of the | | conducted by DNR in each county. The most recent |
| landowner or manager, then there is | | internal audits for each of the counties visited |
| evidence that every attempt at payment | | during the 2024 audit were reviewed and payment |
| was made. | | was confirmed in each of the counties. The |
| was made. | | 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. |
| C1.3. In signatory countries, the | С | - |
| provisions of all binding international | C | |
| agreements such as CITES, ILO | | |
| Conventions, ITTA, and Convention on | | |
| Biological Diversity, shall be respected. | | |
| 1.3.a. Forest management plans and | С | Based on a review of the agreements referenced in |
| operations comply with relevant | | the indicator, the U.S. is not a signatory and/or has |
| provisions of all applicable binding | | not ratified several of the agreements referenced in |
| international agreements. | | 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. |
| C1.4. Conflicts between laws, | С | - |
| 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. | | |
| 1.4.a. Situations in which compliance | С | No conflicts between compliance with laws or |
| with laws or regulations conflicts with | | regulations and FSC Principles, Criteria or Indicators |
| compliance with FSC Principles, Criteria | | have been identified |
| or Indicators are documented and | | |
| referred to the CB. | | |

| C1.5. Forest management areas should | С | - |
|--|---|---|
| be protected from illegal harvesting, | C | |
| settlement and other unauthorized | | |
| activities. | | |
| 1.5.a. The forest owner or manager | С | Timber theft, trespass, and other illegal or |
| supports or implements measures | | unauthorized activities on county forests are dealt |
| intended to prevent illegal and | | with locally and are typically investigated by county |
| unauthorized activities on the <i>Forest</i> | | law enforcement, DNR wardens, or county forest |
| Management Unit (FMU). | | patrol or recreation staff, as confirmed through |
| | | interviews with county staff. The FMUs are regularly |
| | | patrolled by county or DNR employees to detect |
| | | illegal or unauthorized activities. Recreational user |
| | | groups (e.g., ATV clubs, snowmobile clubs, and |
| | | mountain biking clubs) are important mechanisms |
| | | for monitoring the behavior of recreational users. |
| | | Additionally, active timber sales are monitored by |
| | | county foresters several times per week, which |
| | | includes ensuring that illegal or unauthorized |
| | | activities in harvested sites do not occur. County |
| | | sheriffs, DNR wardens, and other law enforcement |
| | | issue citations for ordinance violations (e.g., off-trail |
| | | ATV use, unpermitted firewood cutting, illegal deer |
| | | stands, etc.). |
| | | WCFP takes considerable action to limit illegal and |
| | | unauthorized activities. Audit team observed gates, |
| | | berms, and the implementation of other access |
| | | control techniques including posted signs indicating |
| | | allowed uses. Surveillance techniques may also be |
| | | employed in cases of vandalism, trespass, dumping, |
| | | or other illegal activities. |
| | | Property boundaries are marked on the ground in |
| | | advance of timber sales, as well as on harvest map, |
| | | as verified by the 2024 audit team. |
| 1.5.b. If illegal or unauthorized activities | С | Maintaining a regular presence and good relations |
| occur, the forest owner or manager | | with user groups, as described in 1.5.a., are |
| implements actions designed to curtail | | considered actions designed to curtail illegal or |
| such activities and correct the situation | | unauthorized activities. |
| to the extent possible for meeting all | | |

| land management objectives with | | Wisconsin law allows flovibility in how timber theft |
|--|---|--|
| land management objectives with consideration of available resources. | | Wisconsin law allows flexibility in how timber theft and trespass cases are treated. Fines or payments are set between \$100 and \$10,000, but violators may be subject to criminal prosecution or required to cover additional expenses for the assessment and recovery of stolen timber. No significant instances of timber trespass were reported for the counties sampled in this year's audit. Illegal harvesting of birch poles and conifer boughs occur on occasion. Monitoring with cameras and on- the-ground enforcement patrols are used to detect violators. Some counties, such as Douglas County, offer an |
| | | anonymous violation reporting form on their websites that can be used by citizens to submit violation reports. Many counties have brochures that cover a variety of topics, including rules and regulations governing use of the forest, that are available to the general public as mechanisms for public education. |
| C1.6. Forest managers shall | С | - |
| demonstrate a long-term commitment | | |
| to adhere to the FSC Principles and | | |
| Criteria. | | |
| 1.6.a. The forest owner or manager demonstrates a long-term commitment to adhere to the FSC Principles and Criteria and FSC and FSC-US policies, including the FSC-US Land Sales Policy, and has a publicly available statement of commitment to manage the FMU in conformance with FSC standards and policies. | С | All county forests that 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 participation in the Sustainable Forestry Initiative® (SFI®) and the Forest Stewardship Council® (FSC®) |

| | [| forest cortification systems and management of the |
|--|----------|---|
| | | forest certification systems and management of the |
| | <u> </u> | Vilas County Forest." |
| 1.6.b. If the certificate holder does not | С | Each county with forests under the Wisconsin |
| certify their entire holdings, then they | | County Forest Program has the option to be |
| document, in brief, the reasons for | | certified to either or both of the FSC or SFI standard. |
| seeking partial certification referencing | | Of the 30 counties, 21 have attained FSC |
| FSC-POL-20-002 (or subsequent policy | | certification. |
| revisions), the location of other | | Certified county forests may have limited amount of |
| managed forest units, the natural | | forestlands they hold outside of the FSC certificate, |
| resources found on the holdings being | | which are documented in the CLUP. In general, |
| excluded from certification, and the | | excluded forestlands are unsuitable for timber |
| management activities planned for the | | management due to species composition (e.g., low |
| holdings being excluded from | | timber value), difficulty in regeneration, and other |
| certification. | | reasons as stated in each county's CLUP. |
| P2 Long-term tenure and use rights to the | e land a | nd forest resources shall be clearly defined, |
| documented and legally established. | | |
| C2.1. Clear evidence of long-term forest | С | - |
| use rights to the land (e.g., land title, | | |
| customary rights, or lease agreements) | | |
| shall be demonstrated. | | |
| 2.1.a The forest owner or manager | С | County Land Information Department and Register |
| provides clear evidence of <i>long-term</i> | | of Deeds maintain all documentation related to |
| rights to use and manage the FMU for | | ownership and use rights for all counties. Each |
| the purposes described in the | | county's CLUP includes an explanation of ownership |
| management plan. | | and use rights and the authority to manage the |
| | | FMU. |
| 2.1.b The forest owner or manager | С | Register of Deeds maintains any recorded |
| identifies and documents legally | | agreements held with other parties, as verified |
| established use and access rights | | through a sample of records for counties visited. |
| associated with the FMU that are held | | See County Forest CLUP– Ch 500 for policies specific |
| by other parties. | | to public use/access, including any schedule of |
| | | public use fees. Stakeholders interviewed recognize |
| | | the use and access rights of multiple user groups. |
| 2.1.c Boundaries of land ownership and | С | Maps included in timber sale prospectuses for each |
| use rights are clearly identified on the | | county visited in 2024 included property boundaries |
| ground and on maps prior to | | where they existed. Timber sale boundaries were |
| commencing management activities in | | clearly marked with paint in the field and some were |
| the vicinity of the boundaries. | | set back from any property boundaries, which was |
| , | | confirmed in maps and interviews with staff. |
| C2.2. Local communities with legal or | С | - |
| 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. | | |
| Angliaghility Natas Fantha glassing and | | |
| Applicability Note: For the planning and | | |
| management of publicly owned forests, | | |
| the local community is defined as all | | |
| residents and property owners of the | | |
| relevant jurisdiction. | | |
| 2.2.a The forest owner or manager | С | Evidence of compliance to public access includes |
| allows the exercise of <i>tenure</i> and <i>use</i> | | field observation of road and trail traffic, deer |
| <i>rights</i> allowable by law or regulation. | | stands, and other infrastructure for recreation. |
| | | Interviews with staff indicate a high level of |
| | | awareness of public access rights and restrictions, |
| | | rights-of-way, and other use rights. |
| | | Stakeholders interviewed indicate that counties |
| | | work collaboratively with different user groups to |
| | | ensure that these rights are respected while |
| | | protecting sensitive natural resources. |
| 2.2.b In FMUs where tenure or use | С | Counties hold public meetings on planned |
| rights held by others exist, the forest | C | management activities, for which records are |
| owner or manager consults with groups | | maintained and publicly available. Many counties |
| that hold such rights so that | | also have a Citizen Advisory Committee that |
| management activities do not | | includes representatives of different interests, |
| significantly impact the uses or benefits | | including recreational user groups and other use |
| of such rights. | | rights holders. Where tribal resources or rights exist, |
| | | each county holds consultations with tribes during |
| | | the management planning process. |
| | | the management planning process. |
| | | Interviews with stakeholders confirmed that the |
| | | counties regularly meet with these groups to ensure |
| | | that forest management activities are compatible |
| | | with recreation and other rights. |
| C2.3. Appropriate mechanisms shall be | С | - |
| 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. | | |
| | 6 | |
| 2.3.a. If <i>disputes</i> arise regarding tenure | С | No significant disputes regarding tenure claims or |
| claims or use rights then the forest | | use rights have occurred in the last year. However, |
| owner or manager initially attempts to | | the FME has mechanisms in place to seek the input |
| resolve them through open | | of stakeholders and any disputes through open |
| communication, negotiation, and/or | | communication, negotiation, and/or mediation. |
| mediation. If these good-faith efforts | | |
| fail, then federal, state, and/or local | | |
| laws are employed to resolve such | | |
| disputes. | | |
| 2.3.b. The forest owner or manager | С | The DNR and counties maintain written |
| documents any significant disputes over | | documentation of any significant disputes over |
| tenure and use rights. | | tenure and use rights. |
| P3 The legal and customary rights of indi | genous p | peoples to own, use and manage their lands, |
| territories, and resources shall be recogn | ized and | respected. |
| C3.1. Indigenous peoples shall control | NA | FME does not manage any tribally-owned FMUs. |
| forest management on their lands and | | |
| territories unless they delegate control | | |
| with free and informed consent to | | |
| other agencies. | | |
| C3.2. Forest management shall not | С | - |
| threaten or diminish, either directly or | | |
| indirectly, the resources or tenure | | |
| rights of indigenous peoples. | | |
| 3.2.a. During management planning, the | С | Indian treaty rights, and specifically Lake Superior |
| forest owner or manager consults with | | Bands of Chippewa, were granted reserved rights to |
| American Indian groups that have legal | | hunt, fish, and gather on all ceded lands in eastern |
| | | |
| rights or other binding agreements to | | I MINNESOLA AND NOTCHERN WISCONSIN AS DATE OF THE |
| rights or other binding agreements to the FMU to avoid harming their | | Minnesota and northern Wisconsin as part of the treaties of 1837 and 1842. County board meetings |
| the FMU to avoid harming their | | treaties of 1837 and 1842. County board meetings |
| | | treaties of 1837 and 1842. County board meetings and forestry committee meetings in which policies |
| the FMU to avoid harming their | | treaties of 1837 and 1842. County board meetings and forestry committee meetings in which policies for resource management are set, provide |
| the FMU to avoid harming their | | treaties of 1837 and 1842. County board meetings and forestry committee meetings in which policies for resource management are set, provide opportunities for public input, including |
| the FMU to avoid harming their | | treaties of 1837 and 1842. County board meetings and forestry committee meetings in which policies for resource management are set, provide opportunities for public input, including representatives of American Indian groups. The |
| the FMU to avoid harming their | | treaties of 1837 and 1842. County board meetings and forestry committee meetings in which policies for resource management are set, provide opportunities for public input, including |

| | r | |
|--|---|---|
| | | counties maintain relationships with local tribes and |
| | | solicit input as needed. |
| 3.2.b. Demonstrable actions are taken | С | County and DNR staff are cognizant of the need to |
| so that forest management does not | | ensure that forest management activities do not |
| adversely affect tribal resources. When | | adversely affect tribal resources. For example, on |
| applicable, evidence of, and measures | | public lands within the ceded territory, which |
| for, protecting tribal resources are | | include county forests, a free permit process is used |
| incorporated in the management plan. | | to provide for tribal gathering of firewood, boughs, |
| | | tree bark, lodge poles, marsh hay, and maple syrup. |
| | | A tribal member must provide his/her tribal ID card |
| | | for this access, which is recorded by the county in |
| | | which the collection occurs. |
| | | Additionally, staff are aware of procedures for |
| | | identifying known archaeological sites and |
| | | implementing measures to protect them. Maps are |
| | | protected and not for public use in order to secure |
| | | locations from artifact hunters and looters. Forest |
| | | management activities are coordinated with the |
| | | state archaeologist and Native American tribes. |
| | | Buffer lines on the ground and on management |
| | | maps identify the boundary for activity prohibited |
| | | within the area. |
| C3.3. Sites of special cultural, | С | - |
| ecological, economic or religious | | |
| significance to indigenous peoples shall | | |
| be clearly identified in cooperation | | |
| with such peoples, and recognized and | | |
| protected by forest managers. | | |
| 3.3.a. The forest owner or manager | С | The <i>Timber Sale Handbook</i> requires a check of the |
| invites consultation with tribal | | cultural database be included for all county forest |
| representatives in identifying sites of | | timber sales and that such information be included |
| current or traditional cultural, | | on the timber sale narrative. If special sites have |
| archeological, ecological, economic or | | been identified on a specific county, then unit-level |
| religious significance. | | descriptions often mention that sites have been |
| | | found or not. FME staff consult with tribes on the |
| | | location of known archeological sites, as confirmed |
| | | in interviews with county staff. The Chippewa and |
| | | Potawatomi Tribes have rights to hunting and |
| | | gathering on public lands within the ceded territory. |
| | | Several of these rights are described in treaties and |
| | | Several of these rights are described in treaties and |

| | | in decisions made during court trials over these rights. The tribes are invited for consultation during |
|--|----------|---|
| | | management plan writing. The DNR conducts |
| | | consultations with tribes at broad levels over |
| | | concerns on certain resources, such as birch bark. |
| 3.3.b In consultation with tribal | C | In consultation with tribes, the counties have |
| representatives, the forest owner or | | demonstrated protecting special sites during timber |
| manager develops measures to protect | | harvests. |
| or enhance areas of special significance | | |
| (see also Criterion 9.1). | | |
| C3.4. Indigenous peoples shall be | NA | No traditional knowledge is used in the |
| compensated for the application of | | management of the FMUs. |
| 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. | | |
| | maintain | or enhance the long-term social and economic well- |
| being of forest workers and local commu | | |
| C4.1. The communities within, or | С | - |
| adjacent to, the forest management | | |
| area should be given opportunities for | | |
| employment, training, and other | | |
| services. | | |
| 4.1.a. Employee compensation and | С | Employment opportunities at DNR and county |
| hiring practices meet or exceed the | | forests are non-discriminatory. At counties visited in |
| prevailing <i>local</i> norms within the | | 2024, state and federal postings were visible at |
| forestry industry. | | county offices. State hiring processes adhere to |
| | | strict policies for compliance to equal opportunity, |
| | | including selecting interview candidates and other |
| | | measures to ensure fair hiring practices. During |
| | | interviews, county and DNR staff noted that benefit |
| | | packages are especially good and include health |
| 4.1 b Earact work is offered in weight | | insurance and pensions. |
| 4.1.b. Forest work is offered in ways that create high quality job | C | There is a long average tenure of DNR and county forest staff, which suggests that the quality of work |
| opportunities for employees. | | life (compensation, work hours, job security, |
| | | intangibles, etc.) is desirable. County employees |
| | | interviewed during the 2024 audit expressed high |
| | 1 | interviewed during the 2024 dudit expressed light |

| | | job satisfaction and ample opportunities for training, including DNR-sponsored programs. A sample of training records in personnel files was reviewed, covering a wide variety of topics including invasive species, Natural Heritage Inventory, chainsaw safety, WisFIRS, pesticide application, archeological site identification, among other subjects. |
|--|---|---|
| 4.1.c. Forest workers are provided with fair wages. | С | County and DNR jobs are quality positions with competitive compensation packages. County employees interviewed stated that wages are comparable to what could be earned in similar positions in private industry. Benefit packages were viewed as being good. Interviewed operators indicated that bid rates accepted by the counties for purchased wood is comparable to current rates in the wood market. |
| 4.1.d. Hiring practices and conditions of employment are non-discriminatory and follow applicable federal, state and local regulations. | С | County and DNR employment practices adhere to federal and state laws for exempt and non-exempt employees. As observed in county offices, OSHA and anti-discrimination posters are posted in publicly- visible places. Timber contracts reviewed include stipulations to adhere to federal and state laws, including equal opportunity and non-discrimination. |
| 4.1.e. The forest owner or manager provides work opportunities to qualified local applicants and seeks opportunities for purchasing local goods and services of equal price and quality. | С | FME distributes bid prospectuses to a comprehensive list of potential bidders, including local operators. The size of timber sales is varied to allow access to a range of local companies. Direct sales are provided where value is less than \$10,000 and 500 cords which allow small operators to bid on harvest contracts. |
| 4.1.f. Commensurate with the size and scale of operation, the forest owner or manager provides and/or supports learning opportunities to improve public understanding of forests and forest management. | С | DNR liaisons and county forest staff support a large number and wide range of environmental education activities. For example, DNR staff attend public meetings related to the management of county forests and also provide educational opportunities to the public, such as tours. |

| | | Educating the public about Wisconsin's county forests and the public benefits associated with sustainable forest management is a high priority for Wisconsin County Forests Association (WCFA). The quasi-governmental organization represents the forestry interests of the 30 counties in Wisconsin with lands enrolled under Wisconsin's County Forest certificate. |
|---|---|--|
| 4.1.g. The forest owner or manager participates in local economic development and/or civic activities, based on scale of operation and where such opportunities are available. | C | FME supports local economic activity by providing access to employment opportunities for local community members, offering timber for bid, and offering other in-woods forestry contract work. Additionally, county forest and DNR employees reside in small, mid-sized, and large communities throughout Wisconsin and are engaged in civic activities throughout both as private citizens in off hours and as county and DNR representatives during work hours. |
| C4.2. Forest management should meet or exceed all applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of employees and their families. | С | - |
| 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). | С | No serious injuries or fatalities were reported in the last year. Likewise, operators interviewed indicated that no injuries had occurred. Counties reported that there have been no changes in the occupational health and safety regulatory framework in the last year. Accident records for staff are maintained in personnel files, and a sample was reviewed. |
| 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. | С | All employees and contractors were observed using proper PPE during the audit. Contracts reviewed for timber harvests contain safety requirements. Timber contracts reviewed include stipulations to adhere to federal and state laws, including those pertaining to health and safety. |
| 4.2.c. The forest owner or manager hires well-qualified service providers to safely implement the management plan. | С | All loggers have FISTA training or also Wisconsin Master Logger certified. Records of contractors' FISTA training were viewed in county files and confirmed in the FISTA database. |

| C4.3 The rights of workers to organize | С | _ |
|--|---|---|
| and voluntarily negotiate with their | | |
| employers shall be guaranteed as | | |
| outlined in Conventions 87 and 98 of | | |
| the International Labor Organization | | |
| (ILO). | | |
| 4.3.a Forest workers are free to | С | Freedom of association is unambiguously |
| associate with other workers for the | | guaranteed for all DNR and county employees. Right |
| purpose of advocating for their own | | to organize is guaranteed by US and State of |
| employment interests. | | Wisconsin Law. For all employees of contractors, the |
| employment interests. | | standard contract requires the contractor to comply |
| | | with all applicable labor laws; as such, freedom of |
| | | association is ensured. |
| C4.4. Management planning and | С | - |
| 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. | | |
| 4.4.a. The forest owner or manager | С | County forest and DNR staff that were interviewed |
| understands the likely social impacts of | C | are aware of likely social impacts of forest |
| management activities, and | | management activities. Examples of incorporating |
| incorporates this understanding into | | the public social impacts into management planning |
| management planning and operations. | | and operations include: Buffers are placed around |
| Social impacts include effects on: | | the historic Native American sites in order to protect |
| Archeological sites and sites of | | artifacts and structures. Any management near such |
| cultural, historical and | | sites is coordinated with the state archaeologist and |
| community significance (on and | | Native American tribes. |
| off the FMU; | | County forests allow camping, hunting, and |
| Public resources, including air, | | fishing. Firewood cutting is allowed with a |
| water and food (hunting, | | permit. Implementation of Wisconsin BMPs help |
| fishing, collecting); | | to protect water quality. |
| Aesthetics; | | Aesthetic considerations in setting up harvests |
| Community goals for forest and | | are common, including aesthetic buffers harvest |
| natural resource use and | | units. |
| protection such as employment, | | • Among the community goals that county forests |
| subsistence, recreation and | | provide, recreational opportunities remain |
| health; | | important. County forests work closely with |
| Community economic | | recreational user groups such as ATV/UTV, |
| opportunities; | | snowmobile, mountain bike, horse riding, and |
| opportunities; | | snowmobile, mountain bike, horse riding, and |

| | 1 | |
|---|---|--|
| • Other people who may be | | cross-country ski clubs to ensure that ample |
| affected by management | | opportunities for recreation are created while |
| operations. | | protecting natural resources. |
| A summary is available to the CB. | | County forests support local economic |
| | | opportunities by providing employment for local |
| | | community members, offering timber for bid, |
| | | and offering other in-woods forestry contract |
| | | work. |
| | | • The county forest program considers people |
| | | who may be affected by management |
| | | operations. For example, neighboring |
| | | landowners are alerted to harvests, tribes are |
| | | invited to provide input on management |
| | | planning, and county board meetings are open |
| | | to the public and invite comments. |
| | | |
| | | The comprehensive land use plan for each county |
| | | includes a description of the likely social impacts of |
| | | management activities and how this understanding |
| | | is incorporated into management planning and |
| | | operations. |
| | | |
| 4.4.b. The forest owner or manager | С | County board meetings and forestry committee |
| 4.4.b. The forest owner or manager seeks and considers input in | С | |
| - | С | County board meetings and forestry committee |
| seeks and considers input in | С | County board meetings and forestry committee meetings in which policies for resource |
| seeks and considers input in management planning from people who | С | County board meetings and forestry committee meetings in which policies for resource management and work plans are set allow for public |
| seeks and considers input in management planning from people who would likely be affected by management | С | County board meetings and forestry committee meetings in which policies for resource management and work plans are set allow for public input. Those meetings are typically held monthly. |
| seeks and considers input in management planning from people who would likely be affected by management | С | County board meetings and forestry committee meetings in which policies for resource management and work plans are set allow for public input. Those meetings are typically held monthly. County forest administrators are available for the public to provide feedback, and in this way they are |
| seeks and considers input in management planning from people who would likely be affected by management | С | County board meetings and forestry committee meetings in which policies for resource management and work plans are set allow for public input. Those meetings are typically held monthly. County forest administrators are available for the public to provide feedback, and in this way they are constantly evaluating social impacts and |
| seeks and considers input in management planning from people who would likely be affected by management | С | County board meetings and forestry committee meetings in which policies for resource management and work plans are set allow for public input. Those meetings are typically held monthly. County forest administrators are available for the public to provide feedback, and in this way they are constantly evaluating social impacts and incorporating them into management. The |
| seeks and considers input in management planning from people who would likely be affected by management | С | County board meetings and forestry committee meetings in which policies for resource management and work plans are set allow for public input. Those meetings are typically held monthly. County forest administrators are available for the public to provide feedback, and in this way they are constantly evaluating social impacts and |
| seeks and considers input in management planning from people who would likely be affected by management | С | County board meetings and forestry committee meetings in which policies for resource management and work plans are set allow for public input. Those meetings are typically held monthly. County forest administrators are available for the public to provide feedback, and in this way they are constantly evaluating social impacts and incorporating them into management. The Wisconsin Council on Forestry, through the |
| seeks and considers input in management planning from people who would likely be affected by management | С | County board meetings and forestry committee meetings in which policies for resource management and work plans are set allow for public input. Those meetings are typically held monthly. County forest administrators are available for the public to provide feedback, and in this way they are constantly evaluating social impacts and incorporating them into management. The Wisconsin Council on Forestry, through the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, |
| seeks and considers input in management planning from people who would likely be affected by management | С | County board meetings and forestry committee meetings in which policies for resource management and work plans are set allow for public input. Those meetings are typically held monthly. County forest administrators are available for the public to provide feedback, and in this way they are constantly evaluating social impacts and incorporating them into management. The Wisconsin Council on Forestry, through the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, received a legislative grant for a study of |
| seeks and considers input in management planning from people who would likely be affected by management | С | County board meetings and forestry committee meetings in which policies for resource management and work plans are set allow for public input. Those meetings are typically held monthly. County forest administrators are available for the public to provide feedback, and in this way they are constantly evaluating social impacts and incorporating them into management. The Wisconsin Council on Forestry, through the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, received a legislative grant for a study of Wisconsin's forestry practices, including social |
| seeks and considers input in management planning from people who would likely be affected by management | С | County board meetings and forestry committee meetings in which policies for resource management and work plans are set allow for public input. Those meetings are typically held monthly. County forest administrators are available for the public to provide feedback, and in this way they are constantly evaluating social impacts and incorporating them into management. The Wisconsin Council on Forestry, through the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, received a legislative grant for a study of Wisconsin's forestry practices, including social impacts. The Great Lakes Timber Professionals Association (GLTPA) and WCFA were named joint grant recipients and charged |
| seeks and considers input in management planning from people who would likely be affected by management activities. | | County board meetings and forestry committee meetings in which policies for resource management and work plans are set allow for public input. Those meetings are typically held monthly. County forest administrators are available for the public to provide feedback, and in this way they are constantly evaluating social impacts and incorporating them into management. The Wisconsin Council on Forestry, through the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, received a legislative grant for a study of Wisconsin's forestry practices, including social impacts. The Great Lakes Timber Professionals Association (GLTPA) and WCFA were named joint grant recipients and charged with oversight of the study process and finances |
| seeks and considers input in management planning from people who would likely be affected by management activities. 4.4.c. People who are subject to direct | C | County board meetings and forestry committee meetings in which policies for resource management and work plans are set allow for public input. Those meetings are typically held monthly. County forest administrators are available for the public to provide feedback, and in this way they are constantly evaluating social impacts and incorporating them into management. The Wisconsin Council on Forestry, through the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, received a legislative grant for a study of Wisconsin's forestry practices, including social impacts. The Great Lakes Timber Professionals Association (GLTPA) and WCFA were named joint grant recipients and charged with oversight of the study process and finances County board meetings and forestry committee |
| seeks and considers input in management planning from people who would likely be affected by management activities. 4.4.c. People who are subject to direct adverse effects of management | | County board meetings and forestry committee meetings in which policies for resource management and work plans are set allow for public input. Those meetings are typically held monthly. County forest administrators are available for the public to provide feedback, and in this way they are constantly evaluating social impacts and incorporating them into management. The Wisconsin Council on Forestry, through the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, received a legislative grant for a study of Wisconsin's forestry practices, including social impacts. The Great Lakes Timber Professionals Association (GLTPA) and WCFA were named joint grant recipients and charged with oversight of the study process and finances County board meetings and forestry committee meetings in which policies for resource |
| seeks and considers input in management planning from people who would likely be affected by management activities. 4.4.c. People who are subject to direct adverse effects of management operations are apprised of relevant | | County board meetings and forestry committee meetings in which policies for resource management and work plans are set allow for public input. Those meetings are typically held monthly. County forest administrators are available for the public to provide feedback, and in this way they are constantly evaluating social impacts and incorporating them into management. The Wisconsin Council on Forestry, through the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, received a legislative grant for a study of Wisconsin's forestry practices, including social impacts. The Great Lakes Timber Professionals Association (GLTPA) and WCFA were named joint grant recipients and charged with oversight of the study process and finances County board meetings and forestry committee meetings in which policies for resource management and work plans are established allow |
| seeks and considers input in management planning from people who would likely be affected by management activities. 4.4.c. People who are subject to direct adverse effects of management | | County board meetings and forestry committee meetings in which policies for resource management and work plans are set allow for public input. Those meetings are typically held monthly. County forest administrators are available for the public to provide feedback, and in this way they are constantly evaluating social impacts and incorporating them into management. The Wisconsin Council on Forestry, through the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, received a legislative grant for a study of Wisconsin's forestry practices, including social impacts. The Great Lakes Timber Professionals Association (GLTPA) and WCFA were named joint grant recipients and charged with oversight of the study process and finances County board meetings and forestry committee meetings in which policies for resource |

| | | I |
|--|---|--|
| | | property boundaries or otherwise may affect use |
| | | rights. County forest administrators are available to |
| | | the public for people to provide feedback, and in |
| | | this way they are constantly evaluating social |
| | | impacts and incorporating them into management. |
| 4.4.d. For <i>public forests,</i> consultation | С | The publicly-open county board and forestry |
| shall include the following components: | | committee meetings fulfill this requirement, as well |
| 1. Clearly defined and accessible | | as the administrators being available to the public. |
| methods for public participation | | |
| are provided in both long and | | The County Forest Law establishes mechanisms for |
| short-term planning processes, | | public participation in all planning processes. Annual |
| including harvest plans and | | work plans are open for public comment as |
| operational plans; | | advertised in local newspapers and on each county's |
| 2. Public notification is sufficient | | website before management activities take place. |
| to allow interested stakeholders | | |
| the chance to learn of upcoming | | Appeals are handled prior to plans becoming |
| opportunities for public review | | finalized to avoid conflicts; however, the public may |
| and/or comment on the | | contact their elected county representative or |
| proposed management; | | present information during monthly public meetings |
| 3. An accessible and affordable | | to appeal decisions. Draft and final plans are made |
| appeals process to planning | | available in county offices and on each county's |
| decisions is available. | | website. |
| 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. | | |
| C4.5. Appropriate mechanisms shall be | С | - |
| 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. | | |
| 4.5.a The forest owner or manager does | С | Through implementation of measures to protect |
| not engage in negligent activities that | | property boundaries and ensure compliance to |
| cause damage to other people. | | health and safety laws, the FME avoids negligent |
| | | actions. Any such cases would be handled through |
| | | legal staff. |
| | | |

| | 1 | |
|--|-----------|---|
| 4.5.b The forest owner or manager | C | FME must provide mechanisms for public input on |
| provides a known and accessible means | | forest management activities per the law that |
| for interested stakeholders to voice | | established the program. WCFP maintains |
| grievances and have them resolved. If | | communications with the local public and tribes |
| significant disputes arise related to | | regarding resources of others that may be impacted |
| resolving grievances and/or providing | | during management. |
| fair compensation, the forest owner or | | |
| manager follows appropriate dispute | | |
| resolution procedures. At a minimum, | | |
| the forest owner or manager maintains | | |
| open communications, responds to | | |
| grievances in a timely manner, | | |
| demonstrates ongoing good faith efforts | | |
| to resolve the grievances, and maintains | | |
| records of legal suites and claims. | | |
| 4.5.c Fair compensation or reasonable | C | Through interviews with staff, the audit team |
| mitigation is provided to local people, | | confirmed that there have been no recent cases of |
| communities or adjacent landowners for | | substantiated damage to adjacent lands or |
| substantiated damage or loss of income | | permitted use rights. |
| caused by the landowner or manager. | | |
| P5 Forest management operations shall | encoura | ge the efficient use of the forest's multiple products |
| and services to ensure economic viabilit | y and a w | vide range of environmental and social benefits. |
| C5.1. Forest management should strive | С | - |
| 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. | | |
| 5.1.a. The forest owner or manager is | С | On-the-ground observations and interviews with |
| financially able to implement core | | staff demonstrate that the FME is able to implement |
| management activities, including all | | its core management activities. |
| those environmental, social and | | |
| operating casts, required to most this | 1 | |
| operating costs, required to meet this | | |
| Standard, and investment and | | |
| | | |
| Standard, and investment and | C | While staff levels have fluctuated over time, |
| Standard, and investment and reinvestment in forest management. | С | While staff levels have fluctuated over time, including a slight reduction now as part of the DNR |
| Standard, and investment andreinvestment in forest management.5.1.b. Responses to short-term financial | C | |
| Standard, and investment and reinvestment in forest management. 5.1.b. Responses to short-term financial factors are limited to levels that are | С | including a slight reduction now as part of the DNR |

| | | Evidence suggests that responses to these short- term financial factors are limited to levels that are |
|---|---|---|
| | | consistent with fulfillment of the standard. |
| C5.2. Forest management and | С | - |
| marketing operations should | | |
| encourage the optimal use and local | | |
| processing of the forest's diversity of | | |
| products. | | |
| 5.2.a. Where forest products are | С | Through an examination of harvest contracts, |
| harvested or sold, opportunities for | | interviews with county and DNR employees, and |
| forest product sales and services are | | interviews with operators, all loggers and mills were |
| given to local harvesters, value-added | | verified as being local. Most harvested material is |
| processing and manufacturing facilities, | | manufactured into lumber or pulp/paper products |
| guiding services, and other operations | | locally. |
| that are able to offer services at | | |
| competitive rates and levels of service. | | |
| 5.2.b. The forest owner or manager | С | Wisconsin has mills capable of using various grades |
| takes measures to optimize the use of | | of timber. Silvicultural prescriptions on the observed |
| harvested forest products and explores | | WCFP harvest sites promoted the development of |
| product diversification where | | high-quality stands of hardwood through TSI and |
| appropriate and consistent with | | shelterwood harvests. Pulp and paper, firewood, |
| management objectives. | | and biomass are options for most county lands on |
| | | other sites. Examples of optimization were observed |
| | | in pine thinnings through the use of processors so |
| | | that varying grades of lumber could be obtained |
| | | through better utilization. |
| 5.2.c. On public lands where forest | С | A wide range of harvest sizes and minimum bid |
| products are harvested and sold, some | | amounts are offered for sale to allow for both small |
| sales of forest products or contracts are | | and large businesses to purchase county wood. A |
| scaled or structured to allow small | | review of bid lists verified this practice. |
| business to bid competitively. | | |
| C5.3. Forest management should | С | - |
| minimize waste associated with | | |
| harvesting and on-site processing | | |
| operations and avoid damage to other | | |
| forest resources. | | |
| 5.3.a. Management practices are | С | On all harvest sites visited, there was good |
| employed to minimize the loss and/or | | utilization of harvested forest products. On pine |
| waste of harvested forest products. | | thinnings and aspen regeneration harvests, the use |
| | | of processors allow for a high level of utilization |

| | | while spreading slash evenly over the harvest site to retain nutrients onsite. |
|--|--------|---|
| 5.3.b. Harvest practices are managed to protect residual trees and other forest resources, including: soil compaction, <i>rutting</i> and erosion are minimized; residual trees are not significantly damaged to the extent that health, growth, or values are noticeably affected; damage to NTFPs is minimized during management activities; and techniques and equipment that minimize impacts to vegetation, soil, and water are used whenever feasible. | C | Loggers have FISTA training, which includes training on measures to implement this indicator. No significant damage to the resource was observed. Examples of measures to avoid damage to soil and water resources includes winter logging in wetlands so that compaction is avoided, using timber mats to cross trails and other sensitive areas, minimizing the number of stream crossings, and flagging no- equipment buffers in green tree retention areas and riparian buffers. Damage to residual stands was minimal. |
| C5.4. Forest management should strive | С | - |
| to strengthen and diversify the local | | |
| economy, avoiding dependence on a | | |
| single forest product. | | |
| 5.4.a. The forest owner or manager demonstrates knowledge of their operation's effect on the local economy as it relates to existing and potential markets for a wide variety of timber and non-timber forest products and services. | С | As confirmed through interviews, county forest and DNR staff have a high level of knowledge of local uses for forest products and recreation. The DNR has conducted economic analyses of entire counties which may contain County Forests. Additionally, the DNR has made each of these economic impact reports publicly available https://dnr.wisconsin.gov/topic/forestbusinesses/fa ctsheets#:~:text=The%20forest%20products%20ind ustry%20in,the%20state%20gross%20domestic%20 products. |
| 5.4.b The forest owner or manager strives to diversify the economic use of the forest according to Indicator 5.4.a. C5.5. Forest management operations | C C | Wisconsin's Forest Practices Study (WFPS) was used to identify areas where WCFP has opportunities to enhance to diversify its products or services offerings, among other activities to advance forestry and forest practices in the state. |
| shall recognize, maintain, and, where | | |
| appropriate, enhance the value of | | |

| forest services and resources such as | | |
|---|---|---|
| watersheds and fisheries. | | |
| 5.5.a In developing and implementing | С | WCFP's mission includes opportunities for hunting, |
| activities on the FMU, the forest owner | Ū | fishing, and other forms of recreation developed in |
| or manager identifies, defines and | | cooperation with other public agencies and |
| implements appropriate measures for | | stakeholders. These are mentioned in each county's |
| maintaining and/or enhancing forest | | Comprehensive Land Use Plan. |
| services and resources that serve public | | |
| values, including municipal watersheds, | | |
| fisheries, carbon storage and | | |
| sequestration, recreation and tourism. | | |
| 5.5.b The forest owner or manager uses | С | Evidence observed in the field includes ATV, |
| the information from Indicator 5.5.a to | C | snowmobile, skiing, mountain biking, and hiking |
| implement appropriate measures for | | trails. Money from recreation permits is used to |
| maintaining and/or enhancing these | | manage these resources. |
| services and resources. | | |
| C5.6. The rate of harvest of forest | С | - |
| products shall not exceed levels which | C | |
| can be permanently sustained. | | |
| 5.6.a. In FMUs where products are | С | Reconnaissance (recon) of land is a tool utilized in all |
| being harvested, the landowner or | - | the county forestry programs in the assessment of |
| manager calculates the sustained yield | | geographical, structural, and compositional |
| harvest level for each sustained yield | | attributes of existing resources. This field |
| planning unit, and provides clear | | information is stored in the Wisconsin Forest |
| rationale for determining the size and | | Inventory & Reporting System (WisFIRS) |
| layout of the planning unit. The | | management application. The database is used to |
| sustained yield harvest level calculation | | analyze existing resources, evaluate management |
| , | | |
| | | |
| The sustained yield harvest level | | tool used to assess forest resource information at |
| calculation for each planning unit is | | the property level. All annual forest management |
| based on: | | activities that are carried out by any program (fish, |
| documented growth rates for | | wildlife, parks, endangered resources, etc.) that |
| particular sites, and/or acreage | | alter vegetation in any way (e.g., invasive species |
| of forest types, age-classes and | | treatments, timber stand improvement, site |
| species distributions; | | preparation, tree planting, timber sales, and wildlife |
| mortality and decay and other | | habitat management) is identified by compartment |
| factors that affect net growth; | | and stand within the WisFIRS database. Needs listed |
| areas reserved from harvest or | | in the database, in addition to other multi- |
| subject to harvest restrictions to | | disciplinary input, is used in determining property |
| meet other management goals; | | budgets and annual work plans. |
| calculation for each planning unit is based on: documented growth rates for particular sites, and/or acreage of forest types, age-classes and species distributions; mortality and decay and other factors that affect net growth; areas reserved from harvest or subject to harvest restrictions to | | the property level. All annual forest management activities that are carried out by any program (fish, wildlife, parks, endangered resources, etc.) that alter vegetation in any way (e.g., invasive species treatments, timber stand improvement, site preparation, tree planting, timber sales, and wildlife habitat management) is identified by compartment and stand within the WisFIRS database. Needs listed in the database, in addition to other multi- disciplinary input, is used in determining property |

| silvicultural practices that will | | |
|---|---|--|
| be employed on the FMU; | | Minor changes to annual harvest rates occur each |
| management objectives and | | year when planning is conducted for each county |
| desired future conditions. | | forest. During planning, if harvest intervals or early |
| The calculation is made by considering | | or late constraints are changed, the calculated |
| | | - |
| the effects of repeated prescribed | | annual allowable harvest changes accordingly. If |
| harvests on the product/species and its | | harvest dates are updated on a large amount of the |
| ecosystem, as well as planned | | property, then the AAC can also be impacted. |
| management treatments and | | |
| projections of subsequent regrowth | | Harvest rates are established using area control |
| beyond single rotation and multiple re- | | methods and the data from WisFIRS. County forestry |
| entries. | | committees and county boards develop budgets |
| | | annually, during which AAC acres are considered. |
| | | There have not been anymajor adjustments in the |
| | | FME's annual allowable harvest rate. Minor changes |
| | | to AAC occur each year when planning is conducted |
| | | for each county forest. During planning, if harvest |
| | | intervals or operating season constraints are |
| | | changed, then the calculated AAC will change |
| | | accordingly. Additionally, if harvest dates are |
| | | updated on a large portion of any one county forest, |
| | | then the AAC can also be impacted. |
| 5.6.b. Average annual harvest levels, | С | WCFP measures AAH in acres, and that figure varied |
| over rolling periods of no more than 10 | | from county to county. |
| years, do not exceed the calculated | | |
| sustained yield harvest level. | | 15-year average harvest (AAH) for the FSC-certified |
| | | counties is 34,226 acres. Goal is +/- of 5% of AAH. |
| | | 28,517 acres put up last year. |
| 5.6.c. Rates and methods of timber | С | WCFP uses standard harvest scheduling established |
| harvest lead to achieving desired | | in WisFIRS for each stand type. Future entries are |
| conditions, and improve or maintain | | based on ecological goals for the site, species |
| health and quality across the FMU. | | composition, stocking, and past management. A |
| Overstocked stands and stands that | | combination of moving harvests forward and |
| have been depleted or rendered to be | | delaying harvest is used to ensure a balanced age |
| below productive potential due to | | class distribution over time across the landscape. |
| 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. | | |

| 5.6.d. For NTFPs, calculation of | С | The only significant commercial operations of NTEPs |
|---|----------|---|
| quantitative sustained yield harvest | C | The only significant commercial operations of NTFPs |
| | | occur on counties with sphagnum moss and |
| levels is required only in cases where | | resources. Harvest areas and intervals are |
| products are harvested in significant | | established based on data from past years that show |
| commercial operations or where | | how quickly the resource can recover. |
| traditional or customary use rights may | | |
| be impacted by such harvests. In other | | Other NTFPs are small scale and are controlled and |
| situations, the forest owner or manager | | harvest volumes monitored through issuing permits |
| utilizes available information, and new | | (e.g., Christmas trees, conifer boughs, firewood). |
| information that can be reasonably | | Permits are also issued to tribal members for |
| gathered, to set harvesting levels that | | gathering of boughs, tree bark, lodge poles, marsh |
| will not result in a depletion of the non- | | hay, jack pine stumps, and maple syrup. |
| timber growing stocks or other adverse | | |
| effects to the forest ecosystem. | | None of the NTFPs are sold as FSC-certified. |
| | • | diversity and its associated values, water resources, |
| | and land | Iscapes, and, by so doing, maintain the ecological |
| functions and the integrity of the forest. | | |
| C6.1. Assessments of environmental | C | - |
| 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. | | |
| 6.1.a. Using the results of <i>credible</i> | С | These topics are covered in each county's |
| scientific analysis, best available | | management plan. Forest community types and |
| information (including relevant | | natural disturbance regimes in Wisconsin are |
| databases), and local knowledge and | | described the Silvicultural Guidance. The WisFIRS |
| experience, an assessment of conditions | | database has these resources mapped. Counties |
| on the FMU is completed and includes: | | also use supplemental information such as soil |
| | | maps, LiDAR data for wetland locations, wildlife |
| 1) Forest community types and | | action plans, and DNR manuals. An inquiry to the |
| development, size class and/or | | Natural Heritage Inventory (NHI) database is |
| successional stages, and associated | | included for each project planned on the county |
| natural disturbance regimes; | | forests. These inquiries and the results were |

| 2) Baro Throatonad and Endangered | | confirmed on the Timber Sele Natice and Cutting |
|--|---|---|
| 2) Rare, Threatened and Endangered | | confirmed on the Timber Sale Notice and Cutting |
| (RTE) species and rare ecological | | Reports reviewed during site visits. |
| communities (including plant | | |
| communities); | | |
| 3) Other habitats and species of | | |
| management concern; | | |
| 4) Water resources and associated | | |
| riparian habitats and hydrologic | | |
| functions; | | |
| 5) <i>Soil resources</i> ; and | | |
| 6) <i>Historic conditions</i> 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. | | |
| 6.1.b. Prior to commencing site- | С | Impacts to these resources are evaluated when |
| disturbing activities, the forest owner or | | completing a Timber Sale Notice and Cutting Report |
| manager assesses and documents the | | for each harvest. The forms include the results of |
| potential short and long-term impacts of | | evaluations of these resources. Each county's |
| planned management activities on | | comprehensive land use plan also contains general |
| elements 1-5 listed in Criterion 6.1.a. | | information on impacts. |
| | | |
| The assessment must incorporate the | | Items included in the ecological considerations |
| best available information, drawing | | portion of the Timber Sale Notice (form 2460) and |
| from scientific literature and experts. | | Cutting Report include management history, green |
| The impact assessment will at minimum | | tree retention, post-harvest regeneration plan, |
| include identifying resources that may | | invasive species evaluation, insect/disease concerns, |
| be impacted by management (e.g., | | skidding/seasonal restrictions, landscape |
| streams, habitats of management | | considerations, wildlife action plan/species of |
| concern, soil nutrients). Additional | | greatest conservation need, results of NHI review, |
| detail (i.e., detailed description or | | and forest chemical use. Also included on Timber |
| quantification of impacts) will vary | | Sale Notice and Cutting Reports are sections on |
| depending on the uniqueness of the | | water quality considerations, aesthetic |
| resource, potential risks, and steps that | | considerations, wildlife considerations, recreation |
| will be taken to avoid and minimize | | considerations, and resources of special concern |
| risks. | | (archeological/historical review). |
| 6.1.c. Using the findings of the impact | С | Timber Sale Notice and Cutting Reports document |
| assessment (Indicator 6.1.b), | | the harvest or management prescriptions and |
| management approaches and field | | ecological considerations. |
| prescriptions are developed and | | |
| | 1 | |

| | 1 | |
|---|---|--|
| implemented that: 1) avoid or minimize | | When setting up and implementing harvest units, |
| negative short-term and long-term | | WCFP uses manuals developed by the Wisconsin |
| impacts; and, 2) maintain and/or | | DNR: Wisconsin's Forestry Best Management |
| enhance the long-term ecological | | Practices for Water Quality (PUB FR-093-2010), |
| viability of the forest. | | Timber Sale Handbook (No. 2461), Public Forest |
| | | Lands Handbook, Ecological Landscapes Handbook |
| | | (No. 2460.5), and Silvicultural Guidance. These |
| | | manuals help the county forests avoid negative |
| | | impacts and meet ecological objectives of |
| | | management. The Kotar Habitat Classification |
| | | System is used to assist in making ecological-based |
| | | harvest plans. |
| 6.1.d. On public lands, assessments | С | Each timber sale is posted in a local newspaper and |
| developed in Indicator 6.1.a and | | many are posted on county websites prior to the |
| management approaches developed in | | sale (typically at least 30 days). Confidential portions |
| Indicator 6.1.c are made available to the | | of the timber sale planning documents, including |
| public in draft form for review and | | information on RTE species, sensitive habitats, and |
| comment prior to finalization. Final | | archaeological sites, is maintained in a confidential |
| assessments are also made available. | | portion of the file and is not available to the general |
| | | public. |
| | | |
| | | Management plans that include broad overviews of |
| | | 6.1.a are available online and by request. Public |
| | | input is sought on these drafts. Annual work plans |
| | | are made available to the public prior to finalization, |
| | | and any relevant comments received are responded |
| | | to during public meetings. |
| | | |
| | | All final management planning documents are |
| | | available to the public in county offices, upon |
| | | request, and many are also posted on county |
| | | websites. |
| C 6.2. Safeguards shall exist which | С | - |
| 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. | | |
| 6.2.a. If there is a likely presence of RTE | С | The Wisconsin NHI database is consulted prior to all |
| species as identified in Indicator 6.1.a | | forest management activities, and the results are |
| then either a field survey to verify the | | documented in the Timber Sale Notice and Cutting |
| species' presence or absence is | | Reports. Foresters work in consultation with DNR |
| conducted prior to site-disturbing | | Wildlife and NHC staff to address any occurrences in |
| management activities, or management | | order to ensure protection. Additional site surveys |
| occurs with the assumption that | | for species are often conducted if the NHI database |
| potential RTE species are present. | | indicates the need. Sites visited during the audit |
| | | included protection measures in place for RTE |
| Surveys are conducted by biologists with | | species to avoid the risk of impacts of forest |
| the appropriate expertise in the species | | management activities. |
| 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. | | |
| 6.2.b. When RTE species are present or | С | |
| 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 <i>protected areas</i> 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. | | |
| 6.2.c. For medium and large public | С | The US Fish and Wildlife Service has developed |
| forests (e.g. state forests), forest | | statewide Habitat Conservation Plans for several |
| management plans and operations are | | species (e.g., Karner Blue Butterfly). Funding is |
| designed to meet species' recovery | | provided to county forests by the DNR to perform |
| goals, as well as landscape level | | habitat improvement work, which can be used for |
| biodiversity conservation goals. | | game or non-game species. |

| | 1 | |
|---|---|---|
| 6.2.d. Within the capacity of the forest | C | Activities that may impact RTE species may be |
| owner or manager, hunting, fishing, | | conducted under the authority of a broad or site- |
| trapping, collecting and other activities | | specific incidental take permit as approved by the |
| are controlled to avoid the risk of | | DNR. Sites visited included protection measures in |
| impacts to vulnerable species and | | place for RTE species to avoid the risk of impacts of |
| communities (See Criterion 1.5). | | forest management activities. |
| C6.3. Ecological functions and values | С | - |
| 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. | | |
| C6.3.a. Landscape-scale indicators | | |
| 6.3.a.1. The forest owner or manager | С | Assessments of under-represented, naturally- |
| maintains, enhances, and/or restores | | occurring successional stages occur during |
| under-represented <i>successional</i> stages | | comprehensive land use planning processes and |
| in the FMU that would naturally occur | | annual reconnaissance surveys. Specific FMU goals |
| on the types of sites found on the FMU. | | for management of these areas are described in |
| Where old growth of different | | each county's comprehensive land use plan and/or |
| community types that would naturally | | in annual work plans. Some of these areas are |
| occur on the forest are under- | | considered as HCV. |
| represented in the landscape relative to | | |
| natural conditions, a portion of the | | |
| forest is managed to enhance and/or | | |
| restore old growth characteristics. | | |
| 6.3.a.2. When a <i>rare ecological</i> | С | Some of the counties and sites visited during the |
| community is present, modifications are | | 2024 audit include ecosystems which not only are |
| made in both the management plan and | | rare but also support RTE species. Common |
| its implementation in order to maintain, | | modifications included no-entry buffer strips and |
| restore or enhance the viability of the | | green tree retention areas. |
| community. Based on the vulnerability | | |
| of the existing community, <i>conservation</i> | | |
| <i>zones</i> and/or <i>protected areas</i> are | | |
| established where warranted. | | |
| 6.3.a.3. When they are present, | С | Relict old growth stands (Type 1) are typed as |
| management maintains the area, | | reserved; there is no active management except for |
| structure, composition, and processes of | | protection from invasive species. In managed old |
| all Type 1 and Type 2 old growth . Type | | growth stands, any forest management is |
| 1 and 2 old growth are also protected | | conducted primarily to maintain or enhance old |
| | • | |

| and buffered as necessary with | growth characteristics. Only one of these stands has |
|---|--|
| conservation zones, unless an | a planned treatment and that is not until 2099. |
| alternative plan is developed that | |
| provides greater overall protection of | |
| old growth values. | |
| | |
| 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). | |
| | |
| 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). | |
| | |
| 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). | |
| 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: | | |
| Old growth forests comprise a significant portion of the tribal ownership. | | |
| A history of forest stewardship by the tribe exists. | | |
| High Conservation Value Forest attributes are maintained. | | |
| Old-growth structures are maintained. | | |
| Conservation zones representative of old growth | | |
| stands are established. 6. Landscape level considerations are addressed. | | |
| 7. Rare species are protected. | | |
| 6.3.b. To the extent feasible within the | С | DNR wildlife biologists work with liaison foresters |
| size of the ownership, particularly on | | and county forest administrators to plan and carry |
| larger ownerships (generally tens of | | out projects for wildlife habitat improvement. |
| thousands or more acres), management | | |
| maintains, enhances, or restores habitat | | Some past examples of efforts to benefit wildlife |
| conditions suitable for well-distributed | | include the Young Forest Initiative, barrens |
| populations of animal species that are | | restoration and management, grouse/woodcock |
| characteristic of forest ecosystems | | habitat enhancement, and turkey habitat |
| within the landscape. | | enhancement. Projects are often conducted in |
| | | partnership with other groups including Ruffed |
| | | Grouse Society, National Wild Turkey Federation, and US Fish and Wildlife Service. |
| 6.3.c. Management maintains, enhances | С | Forest management activities regularly occur near |
| and/or restores the plant and wildlife | | riparian and other wetland areas. Wisconsin's |
| habitat of Riparian Management Zones | | Forestry Best Management Practices for Water |
| (RMZs) to provide: | | Quality are followed when conducting management |
| a) habitat for aquatic species that | | near these areas. BMP, soil disturbance, and |
| breed in surrounding uplands; | | ephemeral pond monitoring projects are conducted |
| b) habitat for predominantly | | on county forest lands by the DNR forest |
| terrestrial species that breed in | | hydrologist. |
| 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. | | |
|---|---|---|
| Stand-scale Indicators 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. | С | The harvests observed in 2024 are consistent the natural disturbance regimes that would maintain conditions for the species groups found on those sites. For example, aspen regeneration harvests mimic wind and fire events that would naturally keep aspen on the landscape. Oak thinnings and northern hardwood selections harvests are consistent with wind throw and natural mortality events that would promote the growth of healthy trees. |
| 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. <i>Native</i> <i>species</i> suited to the site are normally selected for regeneration. | С | When planting is required, seed sources predominantly come from areas around the state's nurseries. Some counties send local seed sources to out-of-state nurseries to be container grown. In some cases, local seed sources are not available for use; in those cases, the next seed source is utilized. |
| 6.3.f. Management maintains, enhances, or restores habitat components and associated stand structures, in abundance and distribution that could be expected from naturally occurring processes. These components include: a) large live trees, live trees with decay or declining health, <i>snags</i>, and well- distributed coarse down and dead woody material. <i>Legacy trees</i> where present are not harvested; and b) vertical and horizontal complexity. | C | Completed harvests observed contained snags left, as well as some legacy trees such as conifers within aspen regeneration harvests. Also observed were retained den and cavity trees. |

| | 1 | |
|---|---|---|
| Trees selected for <i>retention</i> are | | |
| generally representative of the | | |
| dominant species found on the site. | | |
| 6.3.g.1 In the Southeast, Appalachia, | С | When even-aged harvests are conducted, guidelines |
| Ozark-Ouachita, Mississippi Alluvial | | for green tree retention areas, biomass harvesting, |
| Valley, and Pacific Coast Regions, when | | course woody debris are followed, as confirmed in |
| even-aged systems are employed, and | | field observation. These guidelines are intended to |
| during salvage harvests, live trees and | | represent a proportion and configuration that is |
| other native vegetation are retained | | consistent with the characteristic natural |
| within the harvest unit as described in | | disturbance regime. |
| Appendix C for the applicable region. | | |
| | | |
| 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. | | |
| 6.3.g.2 Under very limited situations, | С | There are no additional restrictions on even-aged |
| the landowner or manager has the | | management for the Lake States-Central Hardwoods |
| option to develop a qualified plan to | | region. |
| allow minor departure from the opening | | |
| size limits described in Indicator 6.3.g.1. | | |
| A qualified plan: | | |
| 1. Is developed by qualified | | |
| experts in ecological and/or | | |
| related fields (wildlife biology, | | |
| hydrology, landscape ecology, | | |
| forestry/silviculture). | | |
| 2. Is based on the totality of the | | |
| best available information | | |
| including peer-reviewed | | |
| science regarding natural | | |

| | disturbance regimes for the | | |
|----|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| 2 | FMU. | | |
| 3. | Is spatially and temporally | | |
| | explicit and includes maps of | | |
| 4 | 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. | | |
| | e forest owner or manager | С | The threat of invasive species varies between |
| | the risk of, prioritizes, and, as | | counties, and each of the counties visited in 2024 |
| | d, develops and implements a | | have active invasive species control programs. |
| | to prevent or control <i>invasive</i> | | |
| • | ncluding: | | In the last year, chemical treatments for invasives |
| 1. | a method to determine the | | have occurred. Mechanical treatment also was |
| | extent of invasive species and | | implemented in these counties. Invasive species |
| | the degree of threat to native | | populations are monitored in follow up visits and re- |
| | species and ecosystems; | | treated when necessary. |
| 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. | | |

| | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
|---|---|
| C | Most prescribed burns in Wisconsin are conducted for wildlife habitat purposes. Counties work with the DNR to complete burn plans and coordinate burns on county forests. Barrens management, red oak regeneration, and suppressing woody vegetation in grasslands are common objectives for prescribed fire. |
| | |
| С | The RSA assessment was completed by Wisconsin DNR, which conducted an ecosystem-wide assessment for the entire state followed by a gap analysis. WDNR identified potential RSA areas via aerial photos and then ground-truthed the sites. |
| | |
| С | WDNR recommended potential RSAs to county |
| | forests. Nearly all recommended RSAs were classified as RSAs; however, the counties refined the on-the-ground analysis by identifying RSA boundaries. RSAs include SNAs and some HCVFs that overlap with RSAs. |
| | C |

| | 1 | |
|---|---|--|
| are conducive to the establishment of | | |
| such areas, designate ecologically viable | | |
| RSAs to serve these purposes. | | |
| | | |
| Large FMUs are generally expected to | | |
| establish RSAs of purpose 2 and 3 within | | |
| the FMU. | | |
| 6.4.c Management activities within RSAs | С | Barrens, such as the Bauer Brockway Barrens in |
| are limited to low impact activities | | Jackson County, are managed through fire and |
| compatible with the protected RSA | | management activities designed to act as a |
| objectives, except under the following | | surrogate for fire when it cannot be used. The SNA |
| circumstances: | | website outlines activities that are permitted or |
| a) harvesting activities only where they | | recommended to maintain them, including timber |
| are necessary to restore or create | | harvests when these are compatible with |
| conditions to meet the objectives of | | management objectives. |
| the protected RSA, or to mitigate | | |
| conditions that interfere with | | |
| achieving the RSA objectives; or | | |
| b) road-building only where it is | | |
| documented that it will contribute to | | |
| minimizing the overall environmental | | |
| impacts within the FMU and will not | | |
| jeopardize the purpose for which the | | |
| RSA was designated. | | |
| 6.4.d The RSA assessment (Indicator | С | NHI data is continually updated with new |
| 6.4.a) shall be periodically reviewed and | | information, which is then used to classify any new |
| if necessary updated (at a minimum | | SNAs as indicated by the size and scope of the new |
| every 10 years) in order to determine if | | finding. |
| the need for RSAs has changed; the | | |
| designation of RSAs (Indicator 6.4.b) is | | |
| revised accordingly. | | |
| 6.4.e Managers of large, contiguous | С | This indicator is met through the establishment of |
| public forests establish and maintain a | | RSAs, HCVs, riparian buffers, and a diversity of seral |
| network of representative protected | | stages across the landscape. |
| areas sufficient in size to maintain | | |
| species dependent on interior core | | |
| habitats. | | |
| C6.5. Written guidelines shall be | С | - |
| prepared and implemented to control | | |
| erosion; minimize forest damage | | |
| during harvesting, road construction, | | |

| and all other mechanical disturbances; | | |
|---|---|---|
| and to protect water resources. | | |
| 6.5.a. The forest owner or manager has written guidelines outlining conformance with the Indicators of this Criterion. | C | WCFP uses BMPs developed by the Wisconsin DNR (<i>Wisconsin's Forestry Best Management Practices</i> for Water Quality, PUB FR-093-2010). Per the DNR <i>Timber Sale Handbook</i> (No. 2461), BMPs are mandatory on those county forests that are certified to the FSC FM Standard. |
| 6.5.b. Forest operations meet or exceed | C | All sites evaluated by the 2024 audit team showed |
| Best Management Practices (BMPs) that address components of the Criterion where the operation takes place. | | the implementation of BMPs, including properly constructed water bars, RMZs, watercourse crossings, and slashed trails. |
| 6.5.c. Management activities including site preparation, harvest prescriptions, techniques, timing, and equipment are selected and used to protect soil and water resources and to avoid erosion, landslides, and significant soil disturbance. Logging and other activities that significantly increase the risk of landslides are excluded in areas where risk of landslides is high. The following actions are addressed: Slash is concentrated only as much as necessary to achieve the goals of site preparation and the reduction of fuels to moderate or low levels of fire hazard. Disturbance of topsoil is limited to the minimum necessary to achieve successful regeneration of species native to the site. Rutting and compaction is minimized. Soil erosion is not accelerated. Burning is only done when consistent with natural disturbance regimes. Natural ground cover disturbance is minimized to the | C | Wisconsin BMPs form the base for conformance to this indicator. The 2024 audit team saw good compliance to BMPs during the audit: slash was evenly distributed on an aspen regen harvest to encourage nutrient retention; there was no sign of equipment or logging slash in vernal pools; disturbance of topsoil was minimal; water bars were installed properly and functioning correctly; and water crossings were appropriately designed. |

| | | 1 |
|--|---|--|
| extent necessary to achieve | | |
| regeneration objectives. | | |
| Whole tree harvesting on any | | |
| site over multiple rotations is | | |
| only done when research | | |
| indicates soil productivity will | | |
| not be harmed. | | |
| Low impact equipment and | | |
| technologies is used where | | |
| appropriate. | | |
| 6.5.d. The transportation system, | С | Counties follow Wisconsin BMPs, which address |
| including design and placement of | | many of these issues. The road systems observed |
| permanent and temporary haul roads, | | were in good condition with permanent roads |
| skid trails, recreational trails, water | | crowned to shed precipitation and rolling dips. |
| crossings and landings, is designed, | | Logging trails had well-constructed waterbars. |
| constructed, maintained, and/or | | Harvest areas were designed to minimize road |
| reconstructed to reduce short and long- | | infrastructure, and crossing of streams was limited. |
| term environmental impacts, habitat | | Crossings that were observed were well constructed |
| fragmentation, soil and water | | with no erosion evident. |
| disturbance and cumulative adverse | | |
| effects, while allowing for customary | | |
| uses and use rights. This includes: | | |
| access to all roads and trails | | |
| (temporary and permanent), | | |
| including recreational trails, and | | |
| off-road travel, is controlled, as | | |
| possible, to minimize ecological | | |
| impacts; | | |
| road density is minimized; | | |
| erosion is minimized; | | |
| sediment discharge to streams | | |
| is minimized; | | |
| • there is free upstream and | | |
| downstream passage for aquatic | | |
| organisms; | | |
| • impacts of transportation | | |
| systems on wildlife habitat and | | |
| migration corridors are | | |
| minimized; | | |
| • area converted to roads, | | |
| landings and skid trails is | | |

| minimized; | | |
|--|---|--|
| habitat fragmentation is | | |
| - | | |
| minimized;unneeded roads are closed and | | |
| unneeded roads are closed and rehabilitated. | | |
| | 6 | |
| 6.5.e.1. In consultation with appropriate | С | Riparian Management Zones (RMZs) are described |
| expertise, the forest owner or manager | | in Wisconsin's BMP manual. The manual includes |
| implements written <i>Streamside</i> | | the application of BMPs in wetland environments, |
| Management Zone (SMZ) buffer | | including recommended vegetative buffer widths. |
| management guidelines that are | | The BMP manual includes examples of RMZ widths |
| adequate for preventing environmental | | for common situations, such as even-aged aspen |
| impact, and include protecting and | | harvests. |
| restoring water quality, hydrologic | | |
| conditions in rivers and stream | | |
| corridors, wetlands, vernal pools, seeps | | |
| and springs, lake and pond shorelines, | | |
| and other hydrologically sensitive areas. | | |
| The guidelines include vegetative buffer | | |
| widths and protection measures that | | |
| are acceptable within those buffers. | | |
| | | |
| In the Appalachia, Ozark-Ouachita, | | |
| Southeast, Mississippi Alluvial Valley, | | |
| Southwest, Rocky Mountain, and Pacific | | |
| Coast regions, there are requirements | | |
| for minimum SMZ widths and explicit | | |
| limitations on the activities that can | | |
| occur within those SMZs. These are | | |
| outlined as requirements in Appendix E. | | |
| 6.5.e.2. Minor variations from the stated | С | All RMZ buffer widths observed during the 2024 |
| minimum SMZ widths and layout for | | audit were consistent with those recommended by |
| specific stream segments, wetlands and | | , Wisconsin's BMP manual. |
| other water bodies are permitted in | | |
| limited circumstances, provided the | | |
| forest owner or manager demonstrates | | |
| that the alternative configuration | | |
| maintains the overall extent of the | | |
| buffers and provides equivalent or | | |
| greater environmental protection than | | |
| FSC-US regional requirements for those | | |
| stream segments, water quality, and | | |
| stream segments, water quanty, and | | |

| aquatic species, based on site-specific | | |
|---|---|---|
| conditions and the best available | | |
| information. The forest owner or | | |
| manager develops a written set of | | |
| supporting information including a | | |
| description of the riparian habitats and | | |
| species addressed in the alternative | | |
| configuration. The CB must verify that | | |
| the variations meet these requirements, | | |
| based on the input of an independent | | |
| expert in aquatic ecology or closely | | |
| related field. | | |
| 6.5.f. Stream and wetland crossings are | С | Wisconsin's BMP manual covers stream crossings |
| avoided when possible. Unavoidable | | with specific examples. The recommended |
| crossings are located and constructed to | | specifications described in the manual are in line |
| minimize impacts on water quality, | | with this indicator. Field sites visited in 2024 showed |
| hydrology, and fragmentation of | | adherence with BMPs. No impediments to aquatic |
| aquatic habitat. Crossings do not | | organisms were observed. Timber mats and/or |
| impede the movement of aquatic | | woody debris are typically used to cross sensitive |
| species. Temporary crossings are | | areas, and examples of both were observed. |
| restored to original hydrological | | |
| conditions when operations are | | |
| finished. | | |
| 6.5.g. Recreation use on the FMU is | С | BMPs are designed with compatible multiple uses in |
| managed to avoid negative impacts to | | mind. Recreation trails such as ATV/UTV and |
| soils, water, plants, wildlife and wildlife | | mountain bike trails are constructed to minimize |
| habitats. | | negative impacts to soils, water, plants, wildlife, and |
| | | wildlife habitats. |
| 6.5.h. Grazing by domesticated animals | С | No grazing with domesticated animals is permitted |
| is controlled to protect in-stream | | on county forests. |
| habitats and water quality, the species | | |
| composition and viability of the riparian | | |
| vegetation, and the banks of the stream | | |
| channel from erosion. | | |
| C6.6. Management systems shall | С | - |
| 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 ship should be deeped and | | |
|--|---|--|
| 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. | | |
| 6.6.d. Whenever chemicals are used, a | С | Review of chemical application plans and pesticide |
| written prescription is prepared that | | applicator license records demonstrate compliance |
| describes the site-specific hazards and | | with this indicator. |
| 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. | | |
| C6.7. Chemicals, containers, liquid and | С | - |
| solid non-organic wastes including fuel | | |
| and oil shall be disposed of in an | | |
| environmentally appropriate manner | | |
| at off-site locations. | | |
| 6.7.a The forest owner or manager, and | С | Loggers, County staff, and WIDNR staff interviewed |
| employees and contractors, have the | | stated that FISTA training includes procedures for |
| equipment and training necessary to | | using spill kits. Spill kits were located onsite at an |
| respond to hazardous spills. | | active operation. |
| 6.7.b In the event of a hazardous | С | No spills were reported on any of the county |
| material spill, the forest owner or | | properties visited in 2024. Logging equipment |
| manager immediately contains the | | observed was in working conditions and with no |
| material and engages qualified | | evidence of persistent leaks. |
| personnel to perform the appropriate | | |

| removal and remodiation as required | | |
|---|----------|---|
| removal and remediation, as required | | |
| by applicable law and regulations. | <u> </u> | Produced attraction and the second |
| 6.7.c. Hazardous materials and fuels are | С | Fuels and other hazardous materials are stored in |
| stored in leak-proof containers in | | landing areas observed on active logging sites, which |
| designated storage areas, that are | | are well away from sensitive areas. No leaks were |
| outside of riparian management zones | | observed on any of the equipment onsite during the |
| and away from other ecological | | field audit. |
| 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. | | |
| C6.8. Use of biological control agents | С | - |
| 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. | | |
| 6.8.a Use of biological control agents | С | Although biological control agents may occasionally |
| are used only as part of a pest | | be recommended for use in the control of invasive |
| management strategy for the control of | | plants and insects per State and federal regulations, |
| invasive plants, pathogens , insects, or | | county staff do not have the authority to release |
| other animals when other pest control | | them. |
| 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. | | |
| 6.8.b If biological control agents are | С | Only WDNR or other state employees that have |
| used, they are applied by trained | | been trained in application methods release them |
| workers using proper equipment. | | (primarily insects or aerial bacterial sprays). |
| | | Counties are not authorized to release biological |
| | | control agents. |
| 6.8.c If biological control agents are | С | The use of biocontrol agents, such as the beetles |
| used, their use shall be documented, | | used for knapweed control on Bayfield County |
| monitored and strictly controlled in | | Forest, are documented and monitored in |
| accordance with state and national laws | | accordance with state and federal law. |
| and internationally accepted scientific | | |
| , , | L | |

| protocols. A written plan will be | | |
|--|---|---|
| developed and implemented justifying | | |
| such use, describing the risks, specifying | | |
| the precautions workers will employ to | | |
| avoid or minimize such risks, and | | |
| describing how potential impacts will be | | |
| monitored. | | |
| 6.8.d Genetically Modified Organisms | С | No use of GMOs was reported by County staff. All |
| (GMOs) are not used for any purpose | | seed sources from nurseries are documented and |
| | | traceable to the provenance or collection area. |
| C6.9. The use of exotic species shall be | C | - |
| carefully controlled and actively | | |
| monitored to avoid adverse ecological | | |
| impacts. | | |
| 6.9.a. The use of exotic species is | С | With the exception of limited biocontrol agents, |
| contingent on the availability of credible | | exotic species are generally not used on the FMUs |
| scientific data indicating that any such | | for commercial or management purposes. Wisconsin |
| species is non-invasive and its | | Forestry Best Management Practices for Water |
| application does not pose a risk to | | Quality (Appendix D) lists non-native species |
| native biodiversity. | | suitable for cover crops for short term erosion |
| 6.9.b. If exotic species are used, their | С | control. Wisconsin's Forestry Best Management |
| provenance and the location of their use | | Practices for Invasive Species Field Manual lists |
| are documented, and their ecological | | species recommended for revegetation. Wisconsin |
| effects are actively monitored. | | DNR analyzed the risk of using non-native species |
| 6.9.c The forest owner or manager shall | С | listed in these BMP manuals. County staff follow the |
| take timely action to curtail or | | guidelines from this evaluation, which indicated low |
| significantly reduce any adverse impacts | | risk of invasiveness and low risk of establishment of |
| resulting from their use of exotic species | | a seed bank. |
| C6.10. Forest conversion to plantations | С | - |
| 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. | | |
| 6.10.a Forest conversion to non-forest | С | Documentation of any forests to non-forest use is |
| land uses does not occur, except in | | maintained by county forest administrators. WCFP |
| | | |

| circumstances where conversion entails | | consists of natural forests (including planted natural |
|---|----|--|
| a very limited portion of the forest | | forests) and no FSC plantations. Counties have not |
| management unit (note that Indicators | | conducted any conversion of forestland to non- |
| 6.10.a, b, and c are related and all need | | forest use. |
| to be conformed with for conversion to | | |
| be allowed). | | |
| 6.10.b Forest <i>conversion</i> to non-forest | С | No new conversion has taken place. |
| land uses does not occur on high | | No new conversion has taken place. |
| conservation value forest areas (note | | |
| · · | | |
| that Indicators 6.10.a, b, and c are | | |
| related and all need to be conformed | | |
| with for conversion to be allowed). | - | |
| 6.10.c Forest <i>conversion</i> to non-forest | C | No new conversion has taken place. |
| land uses does not occur, except in | | |
| circumstances where conversion will | | |
| enable clear, substantial, additional, | | |
| secure, long term conservation benefits | | |
| across the forest management unit | | |
| (note that Indicators 6.10.a, b, and c are | | |
| related and all need to be conformed | | |
| with for conversion to be allowed). | | |
| 6.10.d Natural or semi-natural stands | С | No conversion of natural/semi-natural stands to |
| are not converted to plantations. | | non-forest use was not reported or observed during |
| Degraded, semi-natural stands may be | | the 2024 assessment. |
| converted to restoration plantations. | | |
| 6.10.e Justification for land-use and | С | The development of some areas of later |
| stand-type conversions is fully described | | successional stands through passive management, |
| in the long-term management plan, and | | management of oak-hickory, and riparian lowland |
| meets the biodiversity conservation | | hardwood forests with harvests is compatible with |
| requirements of Criterion 6.3 (see also | | achieving landscape biodiversity. |
| Criterion 7.1.l) | | |
| 6.10.f Areas converted to non-forest use | NA | No oil, gas or mineral (OGM) rights are reported to |
| for facilities associated with subsurface | | be in exercise currently. Counties usually seek to |
| mineral and gas rights transferred by | | acquire subsurface rights when acquiring new lands. |
| prior owners, or other conversion | | OGM rights may expire in many areas when the |
| outside the control of the certificate | | rights holder does not exercise the rights within 20 |
| holder, are identified on maps. The | | years. |
| notael, are factured of mapor the | | |
| forest owner or manager consults with | | |
| - | | |
| forest owner or manager consults with | | |

| these transferred rights, the forest | |
|---|--|
| owner or manager exercises control | |
| over the location of surface | |
| disturbances in a manner that minimizes | |
| adverse environmental and social | |
| impacts. If the certificate holder at one | |
| point held these rights, and then sold | |
| them, then subsequent conversion of | |
| forest to non-forest use would be | |
| subject to Indicator 6.10.a-d. | |

P7 A management plan -- appropriate to the scale and intensity of the operations -- shall be written, implemented, and kept up to date. The long-term objectives of management, and the means of achieving them, shall be clearly stated.

| | 1 | |
|--|---|---|
| C7.1. The management plan and | C | - |
| supporting documents shall provide: | | |
| a) Management objectives. b) | | |
| description of the forest resources to | | |
| be managed, environmental | | |
| limitations, land use and ownership | | |
| status, socio-economic conditions, and | | |
| a profile of adjacent lands. | | |
| c) Description of silvicultural and/or | | |
| other management system, based on | | |
| the ecology of the forest in question | | |
| and information gathered through | | |
| resource inventories. d) Rationale for | | |
| rate of annual harvest and species | | |
| selection. e) Provisions for monitoring | | |
| of forest growth and dynamics. f) | | |
| Environmental safeguards based on | | |
| environmental assessments. g) Plans | | |
| for the identification and protection of | | |
| rare, threatened and endangered | | |
| species. | | |
| h) Maps describing the forest resource | | |
| base including protected areas, | | |
| planned management activities and | | |
| land ownership. | | |
| i) Description and justification of | | |
| harvesting techniques and equipment | | |
| to be used. | | |

| | 1 | |
|--|---|--|
| 7.1.a The management plan identifies the ownership and legal status of the FMU and its resources, including rights held by the owner and rights held by others. 7.1.b The management plan describes | C | County-level FMPs include chapters on statutory authority and ownership. County-level FMPs cite Wisconsin Statutes 28.10 and 28.11, the legislation that establishes the authority for establishment of, administration of, and management of county forests. The DNR Public Forest Lands Handbook provides a comprehensive overview of these statutes. Each county's FMU describes the history of the |
| the history of land use and past management, current forest types and associated development, size class and/or successional stages, and natural disturbance regimes that affect the FMU (see Indicator 6.1.a). | | forest in each county, the natural features of the forest, and the relevant biological communities and associated resources. Current forest types and age classes are presented in integrated resource management. |
| 7.1.c The management plan describes: a) current conditions of the timber and non-timber forest resources being managed; b) desired future conditions; c) historical ecological conditions; and d) applicable management objectives and activities to move the FMU toward desired future conditions. | С | FMPs are complemented by the <i>Wisconsin Forest</i> <i>Management Guidelines</i> (WFMG), published by DNR and revised in 2018. This document presents a history of forest conditions and natural disturbance regimes. Objectives are clearly presented in FMPs, and future conditions and activities are presented in WisFIRS models, AWPs, and planning meeting minutes. There is some variation among plans in the presentation of desired future conditions. |
| 7.1.d The management plan includes a description of the landscape within which the FMU is located and describes how landscape-scale habitat elements described in Criterion 6.3 will be addressed. | c | FMPs describe the landscape of each county, and are complemented by a narrative (Form 2460) prepared for all timber sales. To varying degrees, examples of Form 2460 examined had relevant descriptions of the surrounding landscape. FMP also includes reference to landscape management and habitat elements. |
| 7.1.e The management plan includes a description of the following resources and outlines activities to conserve and/or protect: rare, threatened, or endangered species and natural communities (see Criterion 6.2); plant species and community diversity and wildlife habitats (see Criterion 6.3); | С | FMPs include all of the elements listed in this indicator. Form 2460 and revised appendices of the plans also contain lists of RTE species. Each plan reviewed clearly identified HCVFs protected and managed in cooperation with the State Natural Areas Program. |

| | 1 | |
|--|---|--|
| • water resources (see Criterion 6.5); | | |
| • soil resources (see Criterion 6.3); | | |
| Representative Sample Areas (see | | |
| Criterion 6.4); | | |
| High Conservation Value Forests | | |
| (see Principle 9); | | |
| Other special management areas. | | |
| 7.1.f If invasive species are present, the | С | Each county plan includes lists and management |
| management plan describes invasive | | recommendations for invasive species. This is |
| species conditions, applicable | | supplemented by an Invasive Species BMP Manual |
| management objectives, and how they | | prepared by the Wisconsin Council on Forestry. |
| will be controlled (see Indicator 6.3.j). | | Invasive species are also addressed on Form 2460 |
| | | prior to implementation of timber sales. |
| 7.1.g The management plan describes | С | County plans address control of forest pests and |
| insects and diseases, current or | | pathogens. The WDNR Public Forest Lands |
| anticipated outbreaks on forest | | Handbook 2460.5 contains guidance on insects and |
| conditions and management goals, and | | diseases, with particular emphasis on how to use |
| how insects and diseases will be | | WisFIRS to develop management options. |
| managed (see Criteria 6.6 and 6.8). | | |
| 7.1.h If chemicals are used, the plan | С | County forests use chemicals sparingly, especially |
| describes what is being used, | C | for silviculture, and county management plans |
| applications, and how the management | | mostly address applicable laws and regulations on |
| system conforms with Criterion 6.6. | | their use. Each county FMP includes an integrated |
| system contorns with enterior o.o. | | pest management program, and the WFMG |
| | | addresses pesticide use. A specific plan is required |
| | | for each application, approved by the County Forest |
| | | Administrator and detailed in the WisFIRS Pesticide |
| | | Tab. |
| 7.1. If historical controls are used the | C | |
| 7.1.i If biological controls are used, the | C | Similar to chemical use, the Comprehensive Land |
| management plan describes what is | | Use Plan includes general reference to biological |
| being used, applications, and how the | | controls, if any. A specific plan would be approved, |
| management system conforms with | | likely requiring an environmental assessment. |
| Criterion 6.8. | | |
| 7.1.j The management plan incorporates | С | Social impacts are presented mostly in county plans, |
| the results of the evaluation of social | | which include sections on treaty rights, cultural |
| impacts, including: | | features, administration, training, ordinances, etc. |
| traditional cultural resources and | | Additional information is found in appendices. |
| rights of use (see Criterion 2.1); | | WCFA maintains information on socioeconomic |
| • potential conflicts with customary | | impacts of the FME on its website, and was a part of |
| uses and use rights (see Criteria | | the Wisconsin's Forest Practices Study (WFPS) to |
| 2.2, 2.3, 3.2); | | examine the impacts of Wisconsin's forestry |

| | 1 | |
|---|---|---|
| management of ceremonial, | | practices. All of the social impact elements in this |
| archeological, and historic sites | | indicator are included in the documents that |
| (see Criteria 3.3 and 4.5); | | comprise county management plants. |
| management of aesthetic values | | |
| (see Indicator 4.4.a); | | |
| public access to and use of the | | |
| forest, and other recreation issues; | | |
| local and regional socioeconomic | | |
| conditions and economic opportunities, | | |
| including creation and/or maintenance | | |
| of quality jobs (see Indicators 4.1.b and | | |
| 4.4.a), local purchasing opportunities | | |
| (see Indicator 4.1.e), and participation in | | |
| local development opportunities (see | | |
| Indicator 4.1.g). | | |
| 7.1.k The management plan describes | С | County FMPs and AWPs plans address the |
| the general purpose, condition and | | transportation network. BMP manuals provide |
| maintenance needs of the | | descriptions of common methods of maintaining |
| transportation network (see Indicator | | forest roads and trails. |
| 6.5.e). | | |
| 7.1.I The management plan describes | С | General references are contained in county plans. |
| the silvicultural and other management | | The DNR Silviculture Guidance is the primary |
| systems used and how they will sustain, | | reference for this element of the plan. Specific |
| over the long term, forest ecosystems | | silviculture plans are part of Form 2460 and |
| present on the FMU. | | discussed in AWPs. |
| 7.1.m The management plan describes | С | The degree to which harvest rate calculations are |
| how species selection and harvest rate | | presented in county plans varies, but the Public |
| calculations were developed to meet | | Lands Handbook is the primary reference for harvest |
| the requirements of Criterion 5.6. | | rate calculations along with Help menus in WisFIRS |
| | | and reoccurring training. Species selection for |
| | | harvest is a product of annual updates from forest |
| | | recon and the programming of the WisFIRS system. |
| 7.1.n The management plan includes a | С | Most of the required monitoring is part of the forest |
| description of monitoring procedures | | compartment reconnaissance (recon), described in |
| necessary to address the requirements | | detail in the WDNR Public Forest Lands Handbook |
| of Criterion 8.2. | | 2460.5. |
| 7.1.0 The management plan includes | С | All relevant maps are included WCFP plans. Maps |
| maps describing the resource base, the | | are also available through WisFIRS and GIS. |
| characteristics of general management | | |
| zones, special management areas, and | | |
| protected areas at a level of detail to | | |
| | I | |

| achieve management objectives and | | |
|--|---|---|
| protect sensitive sites. | | |
| 7.1.p The management plan describes | С | Although there are general descriptions of |
| and justifies the types and sizes of | | harvesting equipment in WFMG, specific |
| harvesting machinery and techniques | | requirements for machinery or special provisions for |
| | | |
| employed on the FMU to minimize or | | harvesting are included in prescriptions for each harvest and described on Form 2460. Most |
| limit impacts to the resource. | | |
| | | harvesting on WCFP is done with processors and |
| | | forwarders, generally considered to have minimal |
| | | impacts on resources. |
| 7.1.q Plans for harvesting and other | С | All elements of this indicator are addressed |
| significant site-disturbing management | | routinely in the harvest prescription and narrative |
| activities required to carry out the | | completed before advertising timber sales. This is a |
| management plan are prepared prior to | | multi-disciplinary process, usually involving DNR |
| implementation. Plans clearly describe | | personnel with expertise in wildlife, fisheries, water, |
| the activity, the relationship to | | cultural features, etc. See Form 2460 and the AWPs. |
| objectives, outcomes, any necessary | | |
| environmental safeguards, health and | | Timber harvest planning is robust and well- |
| safety measures, and include maps of | | documented, fulfilling the requirements of this and |
| adequate detail. | | related indicators in this standard. As part of the |
| | | harvest planning, approval and recordkeeping |
| | | process a Timber Sale Notice and Cutting Report is |
| | | prepared for all sales. The narrative portion |
| | | includes the following sections: |
| | | a. General Sale Description |
| | | 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 |
| | | c. Water Quality Considerations |
| | | d. Aesthetic Considerations |
| | | e. Wildlife Considerations, including Snag, Den and |
| | | Mast Tree Retention, Game Openings, and |
| | | Comments |
| | | f. Recreation Considerations |
| | | g. Resources of Special Concern Considerations |
| | | (Archeological / Historical Review) |
| | 1 | |

| 7.1.r The management plan describes | С | WCFP plans describes elements of stakeholder |
|--|---|---|
| the stakeholder consultation process. | | consultation, but this is addressed more specifically |
| · | | by the state statutes requiring environmental |
| | | assessments and public oversight of county plans. |
| C7.2. The management plan shall be | С | - |
| 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. | | |
| 7.2.a The management plan is kept up | С | Each county's 15-year plan was updated in 2021. |
| to date. It is reviewed on an ongoing | | County forest managers are directed to develop new |
| basis and is updated whenever | | comprehensive land use plans every 15 years by |
| necessary to incorporate the results of | | Wisconsin Statute 28.11(5)(a), although the plans |
| monitoring or new scientific and | | are living documents and updated frequently. AWPs |
| technical information, as well as to | | follow the entry of new data from forest |
| respond to changing environmental, | | reconnaissance, and annual WisFIRS updates |
| social and economic circumstances. At a | | produce new 15-year harvest projections. The |
| minimum, a full revision occurs every 10 | | planning documents that guide management are |
| years. | | updated on an as needed basis, in many cases at |
| | | least every 10 years. Such documents include the |
| | | Silvicultural Handbook, Public Forest Lands |
| | | Handbook, 2460 Cutting Notices, Ecological |
| | | Landscapes, and Annual Work Plans for each county. |
| | | Assuming that these planning documents continue |
| | | to play important roles in guiding management of |
| | | Wisconsin's County Forests, the 15-year update |
| | | schedule for the County Forest Comprehensive Land |
| | | Use Plans is acceptable. |
| | | Cortain components of management planning |
| | | Certain components of management planning documents, such as the DNR Silviculture Guidance, |
| | | are updated at least annually due to the results of |
| | | scientific and technical information. |
| C7.3. Forest workers shall receive | С | |
| adequate training and supervision to | | |
| ensure proper implementation of the | | |
| management plans. | | |
| 7.3.a. Workers are qualified to properly | С | The operator interviewed in 2024 was FISTA-trained; |
| implement the management plan; All | | Harvest maps were onsite during active operations. |
| forest workers are provided with | | As confirmed in interviews with county and DNR |
| | | As committee in interviews with county and DNR |

| sufficient guidance and supervision to | | staff and operators, pre-work meetings are |
|--|---------|--|
| adequately implement their respective | | conducted immediately prior to harvesting activity; |
| components of the plan. | | a sample of pre-sale checklists was reviewed. |
| | | Additionally, interviews with operators and a review |
| | | of written inspection forms confirmed regular visits |
| | | by county foresters during operations. Operators |
| | | stated that county foresters are accessible if |
| | | questions arise and that there is regular |
| | | communication. |
| C7.4. While respecting the | С | - |
| 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. | | |
| 7.4.a While respecting landowner | С | The County Forest comprehensive land use plans are |
| confidentiality, the management plan or | | posted on most County Forestry Department |
| a management plan summary that | | websites. Plans are also available at publicly |
| outlines the elements of the plan | | available county forest offices. Other components of |
| described in Criterion 7.1 is available to | | the management plan are also available. |
| the public either at no charge or a | | |
| nominal fee. | | |
| 7.4.b Managers of public forests make | С | Both draft and final plans are made available for |
| draft management plans, revisions and | | public input. WCFP management plans, annual work |
| supporting documentation easily | | plans, and annual reports are posted on county |
| accessible for public review and | | website in most counties, and are available in other |
| comment prior to their implementation. | | formats upon request. |
| Managers address public comments and | | |
| modify the plans to ensure compliance | | Monthly meetings with Forestry and Recreation |
| with this Standard. | | Committees in each county are open to the public. |
| | | (Note: all counties have such a committee, but |
| | | committee names vary). |
| P8 Monitoring shall be conducted appr | onriato | to the scale and intensity of forest management to |

P8 Monitoring shall be conducted -- appropriate to the scale and intensity of forest management -- to assess the condition of the forest, yields of forest products, chain of custody, management activities and their social and environmental impacts.

Applicability Note: On small and medium-sized forests (see Glossary), an informal, qualitative assessment may be appropriate. Formal, quantitative monitoring is required on large forests and/or intensively managed forests.

| C8.1. The frequency and intensity of | С | - |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| 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. | _ | |
| 8.1.a Consistent with the scale and | С | Most of the required monitoring is part of the forest |
| intensity of management, the forest | | compartment reconnaissance (recon), described in |
| owner or manager develops and | | detail in the WDNR Public Forest Lands Handbook. |
| consistently implements a regular, | | WisFIRS provides a system for recording monitoring |
| comprehensive, and replicable written | | information per DNR-established protocols. Other |
| monitoring protocol. | | elements of the monitoring system include field |
| | | manuals for forest inventory (reconnaissance), and |
| | | studies commissioned by DNR, the legislature or |
| | | other bodies. Monitoring strategy is described |
| | | WDNR Public Forest Lands Handbook and recorded |
| | | in WisFIRS. |
| 8.2. Forest management should include | С | - |
| 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. | | |
| 8.2.a.1. For all commercially harvested | С | WisFIRS is a comprehensive system for guiding the |
| products, an inventory system is | | reconnaissance and inventory of forest |
| maintained. The inventory system | | compartments as well as for scheduling harvest and |
| includes at a minimum: a) species, b) | | other management options of stands. All of the |
| volumes, c) stocking, d) regeneration, | | elements listed in this indicator are included in the |
| and e) stand and forest composition and | | Wisconsin DNR Public Forest Lands Handbook (No. |
| structure; and f) timber quality. | | 2460.5). |
| 8.2.a.2. Significant, unanticipated | С | No significant, unanticipated removal or loss or |
| removal or loss or increased | | increased vulnerability of forest resources has |
| vulnerability of forest resources is | 1 | occurred in the last year in the counties sampled. If |

| 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. | | such a loss were to occur, data would be gathered by a special reconnaissance inventory and entered into WisFIRS before annual updates of harvest scheduling. |
|---|---|---|
| 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. | С | . Recon will be updated, and the next practice scheduled in WisFIRS before the next annual harvest schedule is ran. Records are kept of permits for the harvest of firewood and other non-certified NTFPs, including members of tribes. Harvest data are manually entered into WisFIRS. This data is from the Timber Sale Notice & Cutting Reports. In this respect, WisFIRS is the central repository and mechanism for monitoring the volume of harvested timber over time. |
| 8.2.c. The forest owner or manager periodically obtains data needed to monitor presence on the FMU of: Rare, threatened and endangered species and/or their <i>habitats;</i> Common and rare plant communities and/or habitat; Location, presence and abundance of invasive species; Condition of protected areas, set-asides and buffer zones; High Conservation Value Forests (see Criterion 9.4). | C | The DNR conducts wildlife surveys on county forests: nesting bird surveys, grouse transects, summer deer observations, winter track surveys, bear surveys, and a variety of other wildlife and plant monitoring. The NHI database is updated based on the results of statewide inventories, data generated by NHI cooperators at universities, nonprofit organizations, federal and state agencies and individuals; and published literature and reports submitted to the DNR. Foresters are trained to assess sites for invasive plants during routine forest reconnaissance. Invasives are on the recon datasheet to allow for retention of this information. Several counties participate in Cooperative Weed Management Associations. Additionally, the DNR also has a system for gathering invasives information (aquatic, wetland, and terrestrial) from the general public. Forest health monitoring, including gypsy moth and EAB surveys, occurs at the state level. During routine forest reconnaissance, foresters are trained to |

| | | assess sites for invasives. Some counties locate incidents of invasive species detections via GPS for use when controlling and monitoring. As part of monitoring active harvest sites, as well as closing out such sites, county foresters ensure that protected areas, set-asides, and buffer zones are implemented according to the prescription. Notes from visits to active sites were reviewed, as were harvest close-out checklists. |
|--|---|---|
| | | HCVs are monitored regularly, which was verified through document review and interviews with county staff. |
| 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. | С | In addition to regular monitoring of active harvests and close-out, BMP monitoring for water quality, soil disturbance monitoring, and vernal pond monitoring occurs. Examples of timber sale inspection reports and checklists for sites visited were reviewed. |
| 8.2.d.2. A monitoring program is in place to assess the condition and environmental impacts of the forest- road system. | С | DNR requires annual work plans for each county. These annual plans routinely include information on the system of forest roads. <i>Wisconsin's Forestry</i> <i>Best Management Practices for Water Quality</i> includes the need for inspection at regular intervals for active roads and inspection of inactive roads. County staff interviewed indicated that their regular presence in the forest is an important mechanism for monitoring road conditions. Any problems noted by staff are promptly reported to the county administrator. |
| 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 | С | With county board meetings being open to the public and most documents available for public review, the county administrators are continually aware of relevant socioeconomic issues. They often receive stakeholder comments and respond to those comments. Individual county comprehensive land use plans, as well as the WCFA website, contain monitoring information. |

| local purchasing appartunities (see | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| local purchasing opportunities (see | | | |
| Indicator 4.1.e). | 6 | | |
| 8.2.d.4. Stakeholder responses to | С | Meeting minutes with the public and Citizen | |
| management activities are monitored | | Advisory Councils serve as a record of stakeholder | |
| and recorded as necessary. | | interaction. | |
| 8.2.d.5. Where sites of cultural | С | Communication with tribal representatives is | |
| significance exist, the opportunity to | | ongoing, assuring that any opportunities for joint | |
| jointly monitor sites of cultural | | monitoring of cultural sites are made available to | |
| significance is offered to tribal | | tribes. | |
| representatives (see Principle 3). | | | |
| 8.2.e. The forest owner or manager | С | Quarterly and annual accomplishment reports show | |
| monitors the costs and revenues of | | progress throughout the year for various work goals | |
| management in order to assess | | (timber sale establishment, reforestation, etc.). | |
| productivity and efficiency. | | Timber sale inspections constitute monitoring at | |
| | | harvest sale level. | |
| C8.3. Documentation shall be provided | С | | |
| 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." | | | |
| 8.3.a. When forest products are being | С | County forests use a trip ticket system for tracking | |
| sold as FSC-certified, the forest owner | | FSC-certified products. Tickets have three parts: (1) | |
| an management has a most south of the second | | | |
| or manager has a system that prevents | | when a load leaves the landing, one part is | |
| or manager has a system that prevents mixing of FSC-certified and non-certified | | when a load leaves the landing, one part is deposited in a lockbox on site.; (2) when delivered | |
| | | | |
| mixing of FSC-certified and non-certified | | deposited in a lockbox on site.; (2) when delivered | |
| mixing of FSC-certified and non-certified forest products prior to the point of | | deposited in a lockbox on site.; (2) when delivered to the mill, a second ticket is maintained by the mill; | |
| mixing of FSC-certified and non-certified forest products prior to the point of sale, with accompanying documentation | | deposited in a lockbox on site.; (2) when delivered to the mill, a second ticket is maintained by the mill; and (3) and the third is retained by the contractor, | |
| mixing of FSC-certified and non-certified forest products prior to the point of sale, with accompanying documentation to enable the tracing of the harvested | | deposited in a lockbox on site.; (2) when delivered to the mill, a second ticket is maintained by the mill; and (3) and the third is retained by the contractor, Part (2) is returned to the county from the mill along | |
| mixing of FSC-certified and non-certified forest products prior to the point of sale, with accompanying documentation to enable the tracing of the harvested material from each harvested product | C | deposited in a lockbox on site.; (2) when delivered to the mill, a second ticket is maintained by the mill; and (3) and the third is retained by the contractor, Part (2) is returned to the county from the mill along with mill weight or tally. See COC indicators for | |
| mixing of FSC-certified and non-certified forest products prior to the point of sale, with accompanying documentation to enable the tracing of the harvested material from each harvested product from its origin to the point of sale. | C | deposited in a lockbox on site.; (2) when delivered to the mill, a second ticket is maintained by the mill; and (3) and the third is retained by the contractor, Part (2) is returned to the county from the mill along with mill weight or tally. See COC indicators for FMEs conformance table. | |
| mixing of FSC-certified and non-certified forest products prior to the point of sale, with accompanying documentation to enable the tracing of the harvested material from each harvested product from its origin to the point of sale. 8.3.b The forest owner or manager | C | deposited in a lockbox on site.; (2) when delivered to the mill, a second ticket is maintained by the mill; and (3) and the third is retained by the contractor, Part (2) is returned to the county from the mill along with mill weight or tally. See COC indicators for FMEs conformance table. See Indicator 8.3.a above and COC indicators for | |
| mixing of FSC-certified and non-certified forest products prior to the point of sale, with accompanying documentation to enable the tracing of the harvested material from each harvested product from its origin to the point of sale. 8.3.b The forest owner or manager maintains documentation to enable the | C | deposited in a lockbox on site.; (2) when delivered to the mill, a second ticket is maintained by the mill; and (3) and the third is retained by the contractor, Part (2) is returned to the county from the mill along with mill weight or tally. See COC indicators for FMEs conformance table. See Indicator 8.3.a above and COC indicators for | |
| mixing of FSC-certified and non-certified forest products prior to the point of sale, with accompanying documentation to enable the tracing of the harvested material from each harvested product from its origin to the point of sale. 8.3.b The forest owner or manager maintains documentation to enable the tracing of the harvested material from | C | deposited in a lockbox on site.; (2) when delivered to the mill, a second ticket is maintained by the mill; and (3) and the third is retained by the contractor, Part (2) is returned to the county from the mill along with mill weight or tally. See COC indicators for FMEs conformance table. See Indicator 8.3.a above and COC indicators for | |
| mixing of FSC-certified and non-certified forest products prior to the point of sale, with accompanying documentation to enable the tracing of the harvested material from each harvested product from its origin to the point of sale. 8.3.b The forest owner or manager maintains documentation to enable the tracing of the harvested material from each harvested product from its origin to the point of sale. | C | deposited in a lockbox on site.; (2) when delivered to the mill, a second ticket is maintained by the mill; and (3) and the third is retained by the contractor, Part (2) is returned to the county from the mill along with mill weight or tally. See COC indicators for FMEs conformance table. See Indicator 8.3.a above and COC indicators for | |
| mixing of FSC-certified and non-certified forest products prior to the point of sale, with accompanying documentation to enable the tracing of the harvested material from each harvested product from its origin to the point of sale. 8.3.b The forest owner or manager maintains documentation to enable the tracing of the harvested material from each harvested material from to the point of sale. 8.3.b The forest owner or manager maintains documentation to enable the tracing of the harvested material from each harvested product from its origin to the point of sale. C8.4. The results of monitoring shall be | | deposited in a lockbox on site.; (2) when delivered to the mill, a second ticket is maintained by the mill; and (3) and the third is retained by the contractor, Part (2) is returned to the county from the mill along with mill weight or tally. See COC indicators for FMEs conformance table. See Indicator 8.3.a above and COC indicators for FMEs conformance table. | |
| mixing of FSC-certified and non-certified forest products prior to the point of sale, with accompanying documentation to enable the tracing of the harvested material from each harvested product from its origin to the point of sale. 8.3.b The forest owner or manager maintains documentation to enable the tracing of the harvested material from each harvested product from its origin to the point of sale. C8.4. The results of monitoring shall be incorporated into the implementation | | deposited in a lockbox on site.; (2) when delivered to the mill, a second ticket is maintained by the mill; and (3) and the third is retained by the contractor, Part (2) is returned to the county from the mill along with mill weight or tally. See COC indicators for FMEs conformance table. See Indicator 8.3.a above and COC indicators for FMEs conformance table. | |
| mixing of FSC-certified and non-certified forest products prior to the point of sale, with accompanying documentation to enable the tracing of the harvested material from each harvested product from its origin to the point of sale. 8.3.b The forest owner or manager maintains documentation to enable the tracing of the harvested material from each harvested product from its origin to the point of sale. C8.4. The results of monitoring shall be incorporated into the implementation and revision of the management plan. | | deposited in a lockbox on site.; (2) when delivered to the mill, a second ticket is maintained by the mill; and (3) and the third is retained by the contractor, Part (2) is returned to the county from the mill along with mill weight or tally. See COC indicators for FMEs conformance table. See Indicator 8.3.a above and COC indicators for FMEs conformance table. | |
| mixing of FSC-certified and non-certified forest products prior to the point of sale, with accompanying documentation to enable the tracing of the harvested material from each harvested product from its origin to the point of sale. 8.3.b The forest owner or manager maintains documentation to enable the tracing of the harvested material from each harvested product from its origin to the point of sale. C8.4. The results of monitoring shall be incorporated into the implementation and revision of the management plan. 8.4.a The forest owner or manager | С | deposited in a lockbox on site.; (2) when delivered to the mill, a second ticket is maintained by the mill; and (3) and the third is retained by the contractor, Part (2) is returned to the county from the mill along with mill weight or tally. See COC indicators for FMEs conformance table. See Indicator 8.3.a above and COC indicators for FMEs conformance table. | |
| mixing of FSC-certified and non-certified forest products prior to the point of sale, with accompanying documentation to enable the tracing of the harvested material from each harvested product from its origin to the point of sale. 8.3.b The forest owner or manager maintains documentation to enable the tracing of the harvested material from each harvested product from its origin to the point of sale. C8.4. The results of monitoring shall be incorporated into the implementation and revision of the management plan. | С | deposited in a lockbox on site.; (2) when delivered to the mill, a second ticket is maintained by the mill; and (3) and the third is retained by the contractor, Part (2) is returned to the county from the mill along with mill weight or tally. See COC indicators for FMEs conformance table. See Indicator 8.3.a above and COC indicators for FMEs conformance table. | |

| management plan are being fulfilled, as | | management objectives detailed in the |
|--|---|---|
| well as significant deviations from the | | comprehensive land use plans and field data |
| plan. | | available in WisFIRS for classified stands. Any stands |
| | | that have not been harvested are included as part of |
| | | the next year's annual allowable harvest or delayed |
| | | until the stands are ready for harvest. |
| 8.4.b Where monitoring indicates that | С | In 2024, significant deviations from management |
| management objectives and guidelines, | | plans or guidelines were not reported. Each county's |
| including those necessary for | | comprehensive land use plan references monitoring |
| conformance with this Standard, are not | | and monitoring results. |
| being met or if changing conditions | | |
| indicate that a change in management | | |
| strategy is necessary, the management | | |
| plan, operational plans, and/or other | | |
| plan implementation measures are | | |
| revised to ensure the objectives and | | |
| guidelines will be met. If monitoring | | |
| shows that the management objectives | | |
| and guidelines themselves are not | | |
| sufficient to ensure conformance with | | |
| this Standard, then the objectives and | | |
| guidelines are modified. | | |
| C8.5. While respecting the | С | - |
| confidentiality of information, forest | | |
| managers shall make publicly available | | |
| a summary of the results of monitoring | | |
| indicators, including those listed in | | |
| Criterion 8.2. | | |
| 8.5.a While protecting landowner | С | Annual reports and work plans present summaries |
| confidentiality, either full monitoring | | of monitoring and are usually available on county |
| results or an up-to-date summary of the | | web sites, or by request in offices. The public also is |
| most recent monitoring information is | | welcome to visit each county forest administrator's |
| maintained, covering the Indicators | | office and request monitoring information. |
| listed in Criterion 8.2, and is available to | | Additional monitoring information is available |
| the public, free or at a nominal price, | | through WCFA. |
| upon request. | | |
| DO Management activities in high severe | | alua faraste chall maintain ar anhanca tha attributos |

P9 Management activities in high conservation value forests shall maintain or enhance the attributes which define such forests. Decisions regarding high conservation value forests shall always be considered in the context of a precautionary approach.

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

- a) Forest areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant: concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g., endemism, endangered species, refugia); and/or large landscape level forests, contained within, or containing the management unit, where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance
- b) Forest areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems
- c) Forest areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g., watershed protection, erosion control)
- 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).

Examples of forest areas that *may have* high conservation value attributes include, but are not limited to:

Central Hardwoods:

- Old growth (see Glossary) (a)
- Old forests/mixed age stands that include trees >160 years old (a)
- Municipal watersheds headwaters, reservoirs (c)
- Rare, Threatened, and Endangered (RTE) ecosystems, as defined by GAP analysis, Natural Heritage Inventory, and/or the World Wildlife Fund's Forest Communities of Highest Conservation Concern, and/or Great Lakes Assessment (b)
- Intact forest blocks in an agriculturally dominated landscape (refugia) (a)
- Intact forests >1000 ac (valuable to interior forest species) (a)
- Protected caves (a, b, or d)
- Savannas (a, b, c, or d)
- Glades (a, b, or d)
- Barrens (a, b, or d)
- Prairie remnants (a, b, or d)

North Woods/Lake States:

- Old growth (see Glossary) (a)
- Old forests/mixed age stands that include trees >120 years old (a)
- Blocks of contiguous forest, > 500 ac, which host RTEs (b)
- Oak savannas (b)
- Hemlock-dominated forests (b)
- Pine stands of natural origin (b)
- Contiguous blocks, >500 ac, of late successional species, that are managed to create old growth (a)
- Fens, particularly calcareous fens (c)

- Other non-forest communities, e.g., barrens, prairies, distinctive geological land forms, vernal pools (b or c)
- Other sites as defined by GAP analysis, Natural Heritage Inventory, and/or the World Wildlife Fund's Forest Communities of Highest Conservation Concern (b)

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

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

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

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

| C9.1. Assessment to determine the | С | - |
|--|---|--|
| presence of the attributes consistent | | |
| with High Conservation Value Forests | | |
| will be completed, appropriate to scale | | |
| and intensity of forest management. | | |
| 9.1.a The forest owner or manager | С | FME consults various WDNR sources, such as NHI |
| identifies and maps the presence of | | data and plant community mapping information. |
| High Conservation Value Forests (HCVF) | | FME utilizes the experience and expertise of WDNR |
| within the FMU and, to the extent that | | staff on the presence of RTE species and |
| data are available, adjacent to their | | communities (e.g., State Natural Areas). The WDNR |
| FMU, in a manner consistent with the | | Timber Sale Handbook contains codes that are used |
| assessment process, definitions, data | | to denote community types that qualify as HCVF. In |
| sources, and other guidance described | | cooperation with County administrators, DNR |
| in Appendix F. | | maintain spreadsheets with all HCVs by the six types |
| | | per county. WDNR maintains a crosswalk that |
| Given the relative rarity of old growth | | compares state-level terminology to HCV types. |
| forests in the contiguous United States, | | |
| these areas are normally designated as | | |
| HCVF, and all old growth must be | | |
| managed in conformance with Indicator | | |

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

| | 1 | |
|--|---|---|
| 6.3.a.3 and requirements for legacy | | |
| trees in Indicator 6.3.f. | | |
| 9.1.b In developing the assessment, the | С | The HCVF assessment is conducted in consultation |
| forest owner or manager consults with | | with Wisconsin DNR. In that assessment, many |
| qualified specialists, independent | | experts, community members, and specialists are |
| experts, and local community members | | consulted during the process. Records are included |
| who may have knowledge of areas that | | in management plans, annual work plans, and |
| meet the definition of HCVs. | | county meeting minutes. |
| 9.1.c A summary of the assessment | С | This is available in the comprehensive land use plans |
| results and management strategies (see | | for the counties that were visited. |
| Criterion 9.3) is included in the | | |
| management plan summary that is | | |
| made available to the public. | | |
| C9.2. The consultative portion of the | С | - |
| certification process must place | | |
| emphasis on the identified | | |
| conservation attributes, and options | | |
| for the maintenance thereof. | | |
| 9.2.a The forest owner or manager | С | Wisconsin DNR and external stakeholders are |
| holds consultations with stakeholders | | consulted to determine HCVF locations and their |
| and experts to confirm that proposed | | attributes. Records are included in management |
| HCVF locations and their attributes have | | plans, annual work plans, and county meeting |
| been accurately identified, and that | | minutes. |
| appropriate options for the | | |
| maintenance of their HCV attributes | | |
| have been adopted. | | |
| 9.2.b On public forests, a transparent | С | County forest management planning documents |
| and accessible public review of | | regarding HCVF classification are open to public |
| proposed HCV attributes and HCVF | | review through public meetings, county websites, |
| areas and management is carried out. | | and the Citizen Advisory Committee. Records are |
| Information from stakeholder | | included in management plans, annual work plans, |
| consultations and other public review is | | and county meeting minutes. |
| integrated into HCVF descriptions, | | |
| delineations and management. | | |
| C9.3. The management plan shall | С | - |
| 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 | | |
| measures shall be specifically included | | |

| in the publicly available management | | |
|---|----|---|
| plan summary. | | |
| plan summary. 9.3.a The management plan and relevant operational plans describe the measures necessary to ensure the maintenance and/or enhancement of all high conservation values present in all identified HCVF areas, including the precautions required to avoid risks or impacts to such values (see Principle 7). These measures are implemented. 9.3.b All management activities in HCVFs must maintain or enhance the high conservation values and the extent of the HCVF. | C | Each HCVF is identified in the comprehensive land use plan and a written description along with management objectives is provided. The counties work with Wisconsin DNR to determine and to apply the appropriate management activities that should occur in each HCVF. These include methods to protect species habitat characteristics (e.g., nest sites) or to maintain rare habitats, such as |
| | | by burning, as described in the comprehensive land use plan and annual work plans. |
| 9.3.c If HCVF attributes cross ownership boundaries and where maintenance of the HCV attributes would be improved by coordinated management, then the forest owner or manager attempts to coordinate conservation efforts with adjacent landowners. | NA | No HCVs that cross ownership boundaries were observed or reported in the 2024 audit. |
| C9.4. Annual monitoring shall be conducted to assess the effectiveness of the measures employed to maintain or enhance the applicable conservation attributes. | С | |
| 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. | С | Periodic reconnaissance is conducted updating and targeted monitoring visits to some HCVFs each year as needed. HCV areas mostly undergo passive management. Interviews with staff indicate that these are visited periodically to ensure that there is little to no visible anthropogenic disturbance. For example, Gobbler Lake State Natural Area is annually surveyed for invasive species. HCVs within harvest units are primarily in sensitive areas that are identified during pre-harvest reconnaissance and |

| | | monitored during post-harvest close-out evaluations |
|--|---|---|
| | | to ensure effective protection measures. |
| 9.4.b. When monitoring results indicate | С | According to FME staff and external stakeholders, |
| increasing risk to a specific HCV | | no increasing risks to HCVs have been detected. |
| 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. | | |
| P10 Plantations shall be planned and managed in accordance with Principles and Criteria 1-9, and | | |
| Principle 10 and its Criteria. While plantations can provide an array of social and economic benefits, | | |

Principle 10 and its Criteria. While plantations can provide an array of social and economic benefits, and can contribute to satisfying the world's needs for forest products, they should complement the management of, reduce pressures on, and promote the restoration and conservation of natural forests.

This principle is not applicable for the FME.

Appendix 5 – Chain of Custody Indicators for FMEs Conformance Table

| REQUIREMENT | C/NC/NA | | |
|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| 1. Quality Management | | | |
| 1.1 The FME shall appoint a management representative as having overall | ⊠C | | |
| responsibility and authority for the organization's compliance with all | □ NC | | |
| applicable requirements of this standard. | | | |
| Evidence 1.1: As confirmed through review of COC procedures (e.g., Chapte | r 90 of Timber Sale | | |
| Handbook), interviews with staff, the certificate manager is Chain of Custod | y Administrator with | | |
| responsibility and authority for the FME's conformance with the requirement | nts of this standard. COC | | |
| information is included on the organization's certification webpage: | | | |
| https://dnr.wisconsin.gov/topic/timbersales/certification. | | | |
| 1.2 A system shall be implemented to track and trace all products that are | ⊠C | | |
| sold with an FSC Claim from the <i>forest of origin</i> to the <i>forest gate(s)</i> . | □ NC | | |
| When legally required, and for group and multiple FMU certificates, this | NA, FME does not sell | | |
| system shall also be documented. | any products with an FSC | | |
| The forest of origin should be the smallest reportable manageable unit, such as a tax | claim | | |
| parcel. It shall never be larger than a Forest Management Unit (FMU). The forest gate is defined as the point where the change in ownership of the certified-forest | | | |
| product occurs. | | | |
| Evidence 1.2: Confirmed via review of COC procedures and sales documenta | ation reviewed in 2.3. | | |
| 1.3 The FME shall maintain complete records of all FSC-related COC | ⊠C | | |
| activities, including sales and training, for at least 5 years. | | | |
| Evidence 1.3: This FME's sale records were presented and reviewed. Contracts are the main sales | | | |
| document and all claims are listed on the FME's <u>website</u> . Contracts were reviewed for all timber sales | | | |
| visited. Records of FSC-related CoC activities are kept for at least 5 years, per review of records and | | | |
| interviews with FME staff. Log load tickets were examined. | | | |

| 1.4 The FME shall define its <i>forest gate(s)</i> (check all that apply): | ⊠C | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | |
| ⊠ Stump | | | | |
| <i>Stumpage sale or sales of standing timber; transfer of ownership of certified-forest product occurs <u>upon</u> harvest.</i> | | | | |
| \Box On-site concentration yard | | | | |
| Transfer of ownership of certified-product occurs at concentration yard under control of FME. | | | | |
| Off-site Mill/ Log Yard/ Port | | | | |
| Transfer of ownership occurs when certified-product is unloaded or paid for at purchaser's fac purchaser's control. | cility or a facility under the | | | |
| Auction house/ Brokerage | | | | |
| Transfer of ownership occurs at a government-run or private auction house/ brokerage. | | | | |
| ⊠ Lump-sum sale/ Per Unit/ Pre-Paid Agreement | | | | |
| A timber sale in which the buyer and seller agree on a total price for marked standing trees of before the wood is removed — the timber is usually paid for <u>before</u> harvesting begins. Similar | | | | |
| Log landing | · | | | |
| Transfer of ownership of certified-product occurs at landing/yarding areas. | | | | |
| Other (Please describe): | 1 | | | |
| 1.5 The FME shall have sufficient control over its <i>forest gate(s)</i> to ensure | ⊠C | | | |
| that there is no risk of mixing of FSC-certified forest products covered by | | | | |
| the scope of the FM/COC certificate with forest products from outside of | □ NA, FME does not sell | | | |
| the scope prior to the transfer of ownership. | any products with an FSC | | | |
| Evidence 1.4/1.5 : The legal transfer point is defined within each timber sale | claim | | | |
| sales, specification that logs cannot be transferred prior to scaling is include | | | | |
| Transfer of ownership in those cases occurs either upon scaling or approval | | | | |
| 1.6 The FME and its contractors shall not process FSC-certified material | | | | |
| prior to transfer of ownership at the <i>forest gate(s)</i> without conforming to | | | | |
| applicable chain of custody requirements. | | | | |
| NOTE: This does not apply to log cutting or de-barking units, small portable sawmills, on- | | | | |
| site processing of chips/biomass or primary processing of Non-Timber Forest Products | | | | |
| (NTFPs) under the FME's control (e.g., latex, rattan, maple syrup, etc.) originating from the | | | | |
| | onfirmed via field | | | |
| observation and review of timber sales documentation. | | | | |
| 1.7 The FME has supported transaction verification conducted by SCS and | □c | | | |
| | | | | |
| transaction data as requested by SCS. | 🗵 NA, no verification | | | |
| NOTE: Pricing information is not within the scope of transaction verification data | requested | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | - | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 1.7 The FME has supported transaction verification conducted by SCS and Assurance Services International (ASI) by providing samples of FSC transaction data as requested by SCS. | □ C □ NC ☑ NA, no verification requested □ C □ NC ☑ NA, no verification requested | | | |

| 2.1. Products from the certified forest area shall be identifiable as | ⊠C |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| certified at the <i>forest gate(s)</i> . | |
| | □ NA, FME does not sell |
| | any products with an FSC |
| | claim |
| Evidence 2.1 : A variety of contracts were presented and reviewed for all contracts were presented and reviewed f | unties sampled. These |
| documents include the identification of these products as certified (FSC 100 | • |
| the FME's website with all certificate information (including certificate code | |
| were presented and reviewed for all sites examined during the audit; see Sit | |
| those contracts reviewed. | |
| Most harvested timber is transferred upon severance from the stump (stum | page sales) or prior to |
| harvest (lump-sum sales). Haul tickets may be used in stumpage sales to tra | |
| once they leave the site, but ownership remains with the buyer upon owner | |
| sum sales, the buyer is responsible for any COC requirements. For field-scale | |
| scaled at the landing prior to transport, county and/or DNR staff scale each | |
| This lets the buyer know that the item is approved to transport. | |
| 2.2 Information about all products sold shall be compiled and | ⊠C |
| documented for all FMUs in the scope of certification, including: | |
| Common and scientific species name; | |
| 2) Product name or description; | |
| 3) Volume (or quantity) of product; | |
| 4) Information to trace the material to the source of origin harvest block; | |
| 5) Harvest date; | |
| 6) If basic processing activities take place in the forest, the date and | |
| volume/quantity produced; and | |
| | |
| 7) Whether or not the material was sold with an FSC Claim. Evidence 2.2: County staff tally and track harvest timber volumes. Informati | on is ontored into WisEIPS |
| for comparison of pre-harvest and post-harvest volume information. Scale t | |
| each load. | |
| 2.3. The FME shall ensure that all sales documents issued for outputs sold | ⊠C |
| with FSC claims include the following information: | |
| C C | |
| a) name and contact details of the FME; | □ NA, FME does not sell |
| b) information to identify the customer, such as their name and address; | any products with an FSC claim |
| c) date when the document was issued; | claim |
| d) product name or description, including common and scientific species | |
| name(s); | |
| e) quantity of products sold; f) the ENT's ESC Forest Management (ENA/COC) or ESC Controlled Wood | |
| f) the FME's FSC Forest Management (FM/COC) or FSC Controlled Wood | |
| (CW/FM) code; | |
| g) clear indication of the FSC claim for each product item or the total | |
| products as follows: | |
| i. the claim "FSC 100%" for products from FSC 100% product | |
| groups; or | |
| ii. the claim "FSC Controlled Wood" for products from FSC | |
| Controlled Wood product groups. | |
| 2.4 If the sales documentation issued by the FME is not included with the | ⊠C |
| shipment of the product and this information is relevant for the customer | |
| to identify the product as being FSC certified, the related delivery | |

| | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| documentation has included the same information as required in indicator 2.3 and a reference linking it to the sales documentation. Note: 2.3 and 2.4 are based on FSC-STD-40-004 V3-0 Clauses 5.1 and 5.3 | □ NA, delivery documentation not required or FME is not responsible for issuing delivery documentation | | | | |
| | □ NA, FME does not sell any products with an FSC claim | | | | |
| Evidence 2.3/2.4 : A variety of timber sale contracts, trip tickets, wood settlement sheets and a timber harvest summary spreadsheet were presented and reviewed and include the volume of products | | | | | |
| sold. A variety of timber sale contracts were presented and reviewed for each site described in section 2.1 (see Site Notes). Current county forest timber sale contracts and haul tickets are maintained by county forest administrators. Whenever changes are made relative to forest certification information, the WCFP manager is consulted. Contracts contain the correct certificate code and FSC claim, as well as elements a)-e). Samples of timber sale contracts and load tickets were examined. Load tickets examined have elements a)-g) of 2.3 as stated above. | | | | | |
| 2.5 If the FME is unable to include the FSC claim and/or certificate code in sales or delivery documents, the required information has been provided to the customer through supplementary documentation (e.g. supplementary letters). In this case, the FME has obtained permission from SCS to implement supplementary documentation in accordance with the following criteria: a. there shall exist clear information linking the supplementary documentation to the sales or delivery documents; b. there is no risk that the customer will misinterpret which products are | ☑ C ☑ NC ☑ NA, all information included per 2.3 and/or 2.4 | | | | |
| or are not FSC certified in the supplementary documentation; and where the sales documents contain multiple products with different FSC claims, each product shall be cross-referenced to the associated FSC claim provided in the supplementary documentation. | on its webpage and | | | | |
| Evidence 2.5 : In 2023, the FME decided to include its certificate information on its webpage and include reference to that either in contracts or load tickets. Some counties have updated their templates to be consistent with this new method for communicating claims. For example, Washburn County's contract includes the following text: 10. The area encompassed by this timber sale and forest products from this sale including logs or chips of all species are 3rd party certified. Seller's forest certification information and chain of custody can be found at: https://dnr.wisconsin.gov/topic/timbersales/certification . | | | | | |
| 2.6 The FME may identify products exclusively made of input materials from small or community producers by adding the following claim to sales documents: "From small or community forest producers." This claim can be passed on along the supply chain by certificate holders. A forest management unit (FMU) or group of FMUs that meet(s) the small and low- intensity managed forest eligibility criteria (FSC-STD-1-003a) and addenda. A community FMU must comply with the tenure and management criteria defined in FSC-STD-40-004. | □ C □ NC ☑ NA, not a small or community producer; or does not wish to pass along this claim | | | | |
| Evidence 2.6: FME does not make such claims. | | | | | |
| 3. Labeling and Promotion | | | | | |

| □ NA – FME does not use/ intend to use trademarks and no trademark uses were detected during the audit. | | | | |
|---|------------------------------|--|--|--|
| □ NA – CW/FM certificates are not allowed to use FSC trademarks and no trademark uses were | | | | |
| detected during the audit (Note: it is a Major nonconformity to 3.1 if CW/FN | | | | |
| be using trademarks). | vi certificates are jound to | | | |
| 3.1 The FME shall adhere to relevant trademark use requirements of FSC- | ⊠ C | | | |
| STD-50-001 described in the SCS Trademark Annex for FMEs. | - | | | |
| | | | | |
| Evidence 3.1 : Refer to evidence and findings cited in applicable trademark c | | | | |
| \Box FSC trademark use was detected for a CW/FM certificate as described in N | Major CAR for 3.1, FSC- | | | |
| STD-30-010, Annex 3, 1.2, and FSC-STD-50-001, 2.1e and 11.2: | | | | |
| See Trademark Checklist in this Audit report. | | | | |
| 4. Outsourcing | | | | |
| ☑ NA – FME does not outsource any COC-related activities, as confirmed via | a interviews, sales | | | |
| documentation, and field observation. | | | | |
| □ NA – FME outsources low-risk activities such as transport and harvesting, | as confirmed via | | | |
| interviews, sales documentation, and field observation. | | | | |
| 4.1 The FME shall provide the names and contact details of all outsourced | □C | | | |
| service providers. | □ NC | | | |
| | 🖾 NA | | | |
| 4.2 The FME shall have a control system for the outsourced process and | □c | | | |
| agreement which ensures that: | □ NC | | | |
| a) The material used for the production of FSC-certified material is | 🖾 NA | | | |
| traceable and not mixed with any other material prior to the point of | | | | |
| transfer of legal ownership; | | | | |
| b) The outsourcer keeps records of FSC-certified material covered under | | | | |
| the outsourcing agreement; | | | | |
| c) The FME issues the final invoice for the processed or produced FSC- | | | | |
| certified material following outsourcing; | | | | |
| d) The outsourcer only uses FSC trademarks on products covered by the | | | | |
| scope of the outsourcing agreement and not for promotional use; | | | | |
| e) The outsourcer does not further outsource the material; and | | | | |
| f) The outsourcer accepts the right of the certificate body to audit them. | | | | |
| Evidence 4.1/4.2: Logging and transportation of forest products are conside | red low risk and therefore | | | |
| these indicators are NA. | | | | |
| 5. Training and/or Communication Strategies/ | | | | |
| 5.1 All relevant FME staff and outsourcers shall be trained in the FME's | ⊠C | | | |
| COC control system commensurate with the scale and intensity of | □ NC | | | |
| operations and shall demonstrate competence in implementing the FME's | | | | |
| COC control system. | | | | |
| 5.2 The FME shall maintain up-to-date records of its COC training and/or | ⊠C | | | |
| communications program, such as a list of trained employees, completed | □ NC | | | |
| COC trainings or communications, the intended frequency of COC training | | | | |
| (e.g., training plan), and related program materials (e.g., presentations, | | | | |
| memos, contracts, employee handbooks, etc.). | | | | |
| Evidence 5.1/5.2 : Interviewed County staff demonstrated awareness of when to use haul tickets and | | | | |
| how to assign them to each sale. There is low risk for failure to pass COC claims on to buyers since | | | | |
| information from 2.3 is included in contract templates. Informal training occurs at WCFA meetings to | | | | |

review certification issues, including COC. Operators showed proper understanding of how to use the trip ticket system and the purpose of the COC procedures.

Training on COC procedures occurs for new employees that learn timber sale administration. Since the current COC system is largely automated as information is included in contracts and load tickets by default, training records of training are minimal.

Appendix 6 – Trademark Standard Conformance Table

| 1. General Requirements for Use of the FSC Trademarks | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--------------------|---|--|
| (FSC "checkmark-and-tree" logo, initials "FSC," and/or name "Forest Stewardship Council") | | | | | |
| 1 | Trademark uses reviewed: | | | | |
| | Trademark Application (on-product/promotional) | Case Approval #, or Email (include approver name & date), or other appropriate documentation | trade sch If | ements correct? (e.g., mark symbol, color neme, size, etc.) not, describe in onformities below. | |
| | Website | <u>https://dnr.wisconsin.gov/topic/timbersales/countyfor</u> <u>ests</u> <u>https://forestcountywi.com/forestry</u> | | Y 🛛 N 🗆 | |
| [| \Box All known uses reviewed. | | | | |
| [| oxtimes Sample reviewed. Rationa | le that sample choice is sufficient to confirm requirement | s are met: | Website was | |
| 5 | earched for "FSC" and "For | est Stewardship Council" terms, and the Certificate "land | ing page" | was examined for | |
| e | each county. | | | | |
| □ Trademark uses detected include those grandfathered in under prior FSC trademark rules (e.g., FSC-TMK-50-201). | | | | | |
| Place the initials "GF" by the specific Trademark Applications above. Note: This only applies to printed items or | | | | | |
| physical promotional materials (e.g., hats, load tickets) in stock. New printings, items, and websites must be updated | | | | | |
| per FSC-STD-50-001 requirements. If the organization only has GF uses and no new uses, the rest of this checklist is NA. | | | | | |
| 1.2 Trademark License Agreement and valid certificate | | Maintained on file | | | |
| In order to use these FSC trademarks, the FME shall have a valid FSC trademark license | | | by SCS Main Office | | |
| | agreement and hold a valid c | | | | |
| Note: Consultations for certification Organizations applying for forest management certification or conducting activities related to the implementation of controlled wood requirements, may refer to FSC | | | | | |
| | by name and initials for stakeho | | 10150 | | |
| Evidence 1.2: Maintained on file by SCS Main Office. | | | | | |
| 1 | L.6 Product Group List | · · · · | | ⊠C | |
| The products intended to be labeled or promoted as FSC certified have been included in the | | | | | |
| 0 | organization's certified produ | uct group list. | | □ C w/ OBS | |
| Evidence 1.6 : 🛛 Refer to Product Groups List in Public Summary Report; | | | | | |
| [| □ The following nonconformance(s) were detected in Product Groups: ; or | | | | |
| [| Refer to OBS related to Pro | oduct Groups: | | | |
| 1 | L.3 Trademark License Code | | | ⊠C | |
| _ | | | | | |

| The FSC trademark license code assigned by FSC to the organization accompanies any use of | |
|--|------------------------|
| the FSC trademarks. It is sufficient to show the code once per product or promotional material. | □ C w/ OBS |
| 1.4 Trademark Symbol | ⊠C |
| The FSC logo and the 'Forests For All Forever' marks shall include the trademark symbol [®] in | |
| the upper right corner when used on products or materials to be distributed in a country | □ C w/ OBS |
| where the relevant trademark is registered. | \Box NA, one or more |
| For use in a country where the trademark is not yet registered, use of the symbol ™ is | of noted exceptions |
| recommended. The Trademark Registration List document is available in the FSC trade-mark | applies |
| portal and marketing toolkit. | •• |
| The symbol [®] shall also be added to 'FSC' and 'Forest Steward-ship Council' at the first or most | |
| prominent use in any text; one use per material is sufficient (e.g. website or brochure). | |
| NOTE: The use of the trademark symbol is not required for FSC claims in sales and delivery | |
| documents, or for the disclaimer statement specified in requirement 6.2. | |
| 2.1 Restrictions on using FSC trademarks | $\boxtimes C$ |
| The organization has not used the FSC trademarks in the following ways: | □ NC |
| a) in a way that could cause confusion, misinterpretation, or loss of credibility to the FSC certification scheme; | □ C w/ OBS |
| b) in a way that implies that FSC endorses, participates in, or is responsible for activities performed by | |
| the organization, outside the scope of certification; | |
| c) to promote product quality aspects not covered by FSC certification; | |
| d) in product brand or company names, such as 'FSC Golden Timber' or website domain names; | |
| e) in connection with FSC controlled wood or controlled material – they shall not be used for labelling | |
| products or in any promotion of sales or sourcing of controlled material or FSC controlled wood; the initials FSC shall only be used to pass on FSC controlled wood claims in sales and de-livery | |
| documentation, in conformity with FSC chain of custody requirements. | |
| 2.2 Translations | □ C |
| The name 'Forest Stewardship Council' has not been replaced with a translation. A translation | |
| may be included in brackets after the name, for example: Forest Stewardship Council® | \Box C w/ OBS |
| (translation) | - |
| | NA, no |
| | translations |
| Evidence 1.3, 1.4, 2.1, and 2.2 : Refer to Trademark uses reviewed above; | |
| □ The following nonconformance(s) were detected,□ Refer to OBS: | |
| Sections 8 and 9 Graphic Rules | C |
| The organization has only used FSC logos that conform to the standard requirements | □ NC |
| governing: | 🗆 C w/ OBS |
| • color and font (8.1-8.3); | |
| • format and size (8.4-8.9); | |
| label placement (8.10); and | |
| • 'Forests For All Forever' marks (9.1-9.7). | |
| 1.5 Trademark Use Approval | ⊠C |
| The organization has submitted all intended uses of the FSC trademarks to SCS for approval. | |
| | |
| OR | |
| The organization has an approved trademark use management system in place. (If the | □ NC |
| The organization has an approved trademark use management system in place. (If the organization has a trademark use management system, complete Annex A.) | □ NC □ C w/ OBS |
| The organization has an approved trademark use management system in place. (If the organization has a trademark use management system, complete Annex A.) 4.6 FSC trademarks may be used to identify FSC-certified materials in the chain of custody | □ NC □ C w/ OBS |
| The organization has an approved trademark use management system in place. (If the organization has a trademark use management system, complete Annex A.) 4.6 FSC trademarks may be used to identify FSC-certified materials in the chain of custody before the products are finished. It is not necessary to submit such segregation marks for | □ NC □ C w/ OBS |
| The organization has an approved trademark use management system in place. (If the organization has a trademark use management system, complete Annex A.) 4.6 FSC trademarks may be used to identify FSC-certified materials in the chain of custody | □ NC □ C w/ OBS |

| | NA, trademarks no used for segregation marks |
|---|---|
| Evidence Graphic Rules, 1.5, and 4.6: ⊠ Refer to Trademark uses reviewed above; □ The following nonconformance(s) were detected ; or □ Refer to OBS: | |
| 2. On-Product Use of FSC Trademarks NA, no use of on-product trademarks (<i>on-product checklist may be deleted</i>) | |
| 3. Promotional Use of FSC Trademarks □ NA, no use of promotional trademarks (<i>promotional checklist may be deleted</i>) | |
| 6.1 Catalogues, Brochures, and Websites When the FSC trademarks have been used in catalogues, brochures, or websites, the following requirements apply: It is sufficient to present the promotional elements only once in catalogues, brochures, websites, etc. If both FSC-certified and uncertified products are listed then a text such as "Look for our FSC®-certified products" shall be used next to the promotional elements and the FSC-certified products shall be clearly identified. If some or all of the products are available as FSC certified on request only, this is be clearly stated. 6.2 Sales and Delivery Documents When the FSC trademarks are included on sales or delivery document templates that may be used for both FSC and non-FSC products, the following or a similar statement is included: "Only | □ C □ NC □ C w/ OBS □ NA, not using trademarks in catalogues/ brochures/websites/ □ C □ NC □ C w/ OBS |
| the products that are identified as such on this document are FSC certified". NOTE: Use of the FSC claim and certificate code on the invoices does not qualify as FSC trademark use. | ☑ NA, not using trademarks on templates for FSC & non-FSC products |
| 6.3 Promotional Items All promotional items (e.g., mugs, pens, T-shirts, caps, banners, vehicles, etc.) have displayed, at minimum, the FSC logo and FSC trademark license code. | □ C □ NC □ C w/ OBS ⊠ NA, not labeling promotional items |
| 6.5 Trade Fairs When the FSC trademarks are used for promotion at trade fairs, the organization has: a) clearly marked which products are FSC certified, or b) add a visible disclaimer stating "Ask for our FSC®-certified products" or similar if no FSC-certified products are displayed. NOTE: Use of text to describe the FSC certification of the organization does not require a disclaimer. | □ C □ NC □ C w/ OBS ⊠ NA, not using trademarks at trade fairs |
| Section 6.6 and 6.7 Investment/Financial Claims 6.6 When investment companies or others are making financial claims based on the organization's FSC certified operations, the organization has taken full responsibility for the use of the FSC trademarks. 6.7 Any such claims have been accompanied by the disclaimer, "FSC is not responsible for and does not endorse any financial claims on returns on investments." | □ C □ NC □ C w/ OBS ⊠ NA, not making financial claims about FSC status |

| 7.1 and 7.2 Other Forestry Certification Scheme Logos | ⊠C | | |
|---|-----------------------|--|--|
| The FSC trademarks have not been used together with the marks of other forest certification | □ NC | | |
| schemes in a way which implies equivalence, or in a way which is disadvantageous to the FSC | □ C w/ OBS | | |
| trademarks in terms of size or placement. | □ NA, not using | | |
| | other scheme logos | | |
| 7.3 Business Cards | ⊠c | | |
| The FSC trademarks have not used on business cards to promote the organization's certification. | | | |
| The FSC logo or 'Forests For All Forever' marks are not used on business cards for promotion. | □ C w/ OBS | | |
| A text reference to the organization's FSC certification, with license code, is allowed, for | □ NA, approval | | |
| example "We are FSC [®] certified (FSC [®] C######)" or "We sell FSC [®] -certified products (FSC [®] | granted prior to July | | |
| C######)". | 1, 2011 | | |
| 7.4 Promotion with CB Logo | ⊠C | | |
| FSC certified products have not been promoted using only the SCS Kingfisher and/or SCS | □ NC | | |
| Global Services logo. | □ C w/ OBS | | |
| Evidence 6.1-6.3, 6.5-6.7, 7.1-7.4: 🛛 Refer to Trademark uses reviewed above; | | | |
| □ The following nonconformance(s) were detected ; or | | | |
| Refer to OBS: | | | |
| | | | |

Annex A: Trademark use management system

☑ NA, not using a trademark management system (*Annex A checklist may be deleted*)

Annex B, Additional trademark rules for group FM certificate holders

⊠ NA, not a group FM certificate or group does not use FSC trademarks (*Annex B checklist may be deleted*)

Appendix 7 – Group Management Program

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

Appendix 8 – Additional Checklists

 \boxtimes No additional checklists, so this appendix is not applicable.