SHORT CASE STUDIES

✓ Introduction
✓ MFL Application Review Checklist
✓ CASE STUDY ONE
CASE STUDY ONE - Addition

ORIGINAL MAP

ADDITION MAP
CASE STUDY ONE-RESULTS

III a. Each parcel at least 20 contiguous acres
III b. Each parcel 80% productive.
III c. Land meets width requirement.
III d. Land mapped in proper legal descriptions.
III e. Closed area identified, within acreage limits & follow closed acre rules.
III f. One section per map.
CASE STUDY ONE-RESULTS

III g. Buildings and excluded areas identified
Not allowed to add acreage that contains a building
What are the potential solutions to this?

III h. For irregular sections….ensure correct corners are identified.

III i. ½ inch top margin and ¼ inch all other margins
Margins are not conforming

III j. Proper scale of map (8 inches = 1 mile) & page size = 8 ½ X 11
Question on Scale – especially if margins are questioned
CASE STUDY ONE-RESULTS

III k. Entry outlined with proper highlighter
   Highlighting is not correct

III l. Open lands filled with yellow highlighter

III m. Open/Closed legend boxes in header highlighted properly

III n. Adjoining lands identified
   Not all adjacent land is identified

III o. Legend included—”accurate”-
   Not all elements are identified

III p. Preparer name & date
CASE STUDY ONE - RESULTS

III q. Addition: Is it contiguous to the original entry?

III r. Addition: New and addition acres clearly shown

- No need to write 2019 addition on map-
- Acres in ‘open acres’ box is not identified. Map should show all acreage, not just addition

III s. Access to open lands obvious or shown by indicating the route or the location of the sign that are closest to the access point from a public road or other land open to public access ---

Access point-YES and it seems far away without knowing adjacent ownership.
CASE STUDY TWO

2019 entry map

What is needed to make this map approvable?
CASE STUDY TWO-RESULTS

III a. Each parcel at least 20 contiguous acres
III b. Each parcel 80% productive.
III c. Land meets width requirement.
III d. Land mapped in proper legal descriptions.
   Note: Correction section—hard to discern
III e. Closed area identified, within acreage limits & follow closed acre rules.
III f. One section per map.
III g. Buildings and excluded areas identified

III h. For irregular sections..., ensure correct # corners are identified.

Refer to checklist for required notation on section and quarter corners

III i. ½ inch top margin and ¼ inch all other margins

Margins are not conforming

III j. Proper scale of map (8 inches = 1 mile) & page size = 8½ X 11

Question on Scale – especially if margins are questioned
CASE STUDY TWO-RESULTS

**III k.** Entry outlined with proper highlighter

**III l.** Open lands filled with yellow highlighter
   
   **Note:** Odd striping – make sure nice solid yellow-Recorded Legal Document

**III m.** Open/Closed legend boxes in header highlighted properly

**III n.** Adjoining lands identified
   
   *Not all* adjacent land is identified

**III o.** Legend included—”accurate”-
   
   *Not all* elements are identified

**III p.** Preparer name & date
CASE STUDY TWO-RESULTS

III q. Addition: Is it contiguous to the original entry

III r. Addition: New and addition acres clearly shown

III s. Access to open lands obvious or shown by indicating the route or the location of the sign that are closest to the access point from a public road or other land open to public access ---

Description of access —or- sign location that provides the access location for the SW quarter quarter.

III. GENERAL COMMENT-reminder-MAPS are recorded documents and if open to public on the public portal-keep them professional, neat —preferably no scratch outs, etc. EG in the header
CASE STUDIES-ONE & TWO

ANY QUESTIONS??
CASE STUDY-
Application Review
CASE STUDY- Application Review

- GOAL: Approvable applications are submitted on the first submission.
- Chance for discussion and highlights of items that cause a returned application
- Emphasis on utilizing the review checklist
CASE STUDY-Application Review PROCESS

- REVIEW TOOLS:
  - Tax Law Handbook
  - Silviculture Handbook

- 25 minutes of INDIVIDUAL WORKING TIME—quiet please
- 15 minutes of SMALL GROUP discussion (4-6 people)
- 40 minutes entire group debrief
Materials in “Application Packet”

1. Landowner profile
2. Remittance form with “check attached”
3. Application form
4. Proof of ownership
5. Overview comments and tax bill notes
6. Land exam
7. MFL map
8. MFL plan
9. MFL application review checklist (2/2018)
REVIEW- I. Proof of Ownership

THE PROOF OF OWNERSHIP PROVIDED IS NOT VALID-ACCEPTABLE PROOF, THEREFORE IT IS DIFFICULT TO KNOW ALL OF THE BELOW.

×a. DEED(S) REPRESENTS ALL ACREAGE BEING ENTERED
×b. DEED(S) REPRESENTS 100% OWNERSHIP
×c. DEED(S) SHOWS ALL LAND UNDER SAME OWNERSHIP
×d. LAND NOT PART OF RECORDED PLAT
×e. NO TIMBER CUTTING RESTRICTIONS ON DEED or APPROPRIATE STEPS TAKEN
# REMINDER
PROOF OF OWNERSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCEPTABLE- MOST COMMON</th>
<th>UNACCEPTABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>deeds</td>
<td>Insurance policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land contracts</td>
<td>Abstracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>probate documents and judgements</td>
<td>Real estate transfer returns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfaction of mortgage or tax receipts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REVIEW- II. Application Form

- a. SIGNATURES
  MISSING JOHNNY J CARTER’s SIGNATURE
  (PHONE AND EMAIL SUPER IMPORTANT)

- b. CORRECT LEGAL DESC & PARCEL ID #'s LISTED-
  Depends if the real proof is provided
  (Tip: cross reference COUNTY PARCEL LAYERS)

- c. CERTIFIED SURVEY MAP  (NA as far as we know)

- d. FOR EACH LEGAL-WHOLE ACRES....

- e. CERTIFICATION STATEMENT-
  NOT INDICATED
REVIEW- III. MAP

✔ a. EACH PARCEL AT LEAST 20 CONTIGUOUS ACRES

✘ b. EACH PARCEL 80% PRODUCTIVE
   Question about stand 3

✘ c. LAND MEETS WIDTH REQUIREMENT
   SWNW is 132 feet =OK; strip in SENW not OK.

✔ d. LAND MAPPED in PROPER DESCRIPTIONS-
   matches application

✘ e. CLOSED AREA IDENTIFIED and within rules
   DOES NOT MATCH APPLICATION
REVIEW- III. MAP

✓ f. ONE SECTION PER MAP

✗ g. BUILDINGS & EXCLUDED AREAS IDENTIFIED
   NWSE has building

✓ h. IRREGULAR SECTIONS

✗ i. ½ inch top & ¼ inch all other margins

✗ j. PROPER SCALE OF MAP 8 inches : 1 mile

✓ k. OUTLINED WITH PROPER HIGHLIGHTING

✗ l. OPEN LANDS FILLED WITH YELLOW HIGHLIGHTER
   Doesn’t match application acreage
REVIEW- III. MAP

✓ m. OPEN/CLOSED LEGEND-HIGHLIGHTED

✗ n. ADJOINING LANDS IDENTIFIED

✗ o. LEGEND INCLUDED-ACCURATE not complete

✓ p. Preparer name and date

q & r. NA-not an addition

✓ s. ACCESS TO OPEN LANDS CLEAR

✗ GENERAL: Stand lines-not definitive –e.g. Stand 3-stream and stands 1 & 2 near the buildings-left out area
IV. MANAGEMENT PLAN

- a. SUITABLE HABITAT FOR NHI HITS EVALUATED
- b. ARCHAEOLOGICAL & HISTORIC SITES EVALUATED & LISTED
- c. TIMBER TYPE DESCRIPTION CORRECT
  
  Stand 1: Question about age difference-another stand??
- d. SOILS INFORMATION CORRECT
- e. SILVICULTURAL SYSTEM CORRECT & CONSISTENT WITH DNR SILVICULTURE and guidelines
  
  Stand 2: system congruent with practice prescribed (GAP)?
REVIEW-
IV. MANAGEMENT PLAN

• f. MANDATORY AND NON-MANDATORY PRACTICES APPROPRIATE
  - Stand 3: ? EAB- immediate threat –discussion on practice timing
  - Consider more planting and specific NON-MANDATORY PRACTICES

• g. STAND CONDITIONS AND SPECIAL FEATURES ADDRESSED
  - REQUEST—please provide info to help the landowner understand AND to make it clear for the DNR Reviewer. EG history, practice amendments or adjustments etc
V. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

√ a. PRODUCTIVITY BY MFL PARCEL LISTED IN COMMENTS on OVERVIEW PAGE
   
   NOTE: much better if just put parcel, do not list it by entry
   
   PREFERRED LANGUAGE: This parcel is ______% non-productive.

√ b. OTHER NON-STAND SPECIFIC INFO
   
   NOTE: Out areas, building issues, access issues, acreage differences

× c. if changes made ALL LANDOWNERS need to initial and date
   
   NOTE: with these changes in this plan the expectation is that landowners understand the adjustments
CASE STUDY-
APPLICATION REVIEW

QUESTIONS?
or
COMMENTS