

2000 Powell Street, Ste. 600 Emeryville, CA 94608 USA +1.510.452.8000 main +1.510.452.8001 fax

SCS FOREST MANAGEMENT CERTIFICATION SERVICES

Corrective Action Request (CAR) / Observation (Obs) Form

Certificate Holder/Applicant	Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources	
CAR/OBS identified by (SCS representative)	Brendan Grady	
Date of Issuance	April 22, 2021	
Applicable Standard(s)		
Forest Stewardship Standard(s), inclu	ding version: FSC-US Forest Management Standard V 1-0	
☐ SCS COC indicators for FMEs, V8-0		
\square FSC Trademark Standard (FSC-STD-50	-001 V2-0)	
\square FSC standard for group entities in for	est management groups (FSC-STD-30-005), V1-1	
\square Other(s):		
Audit Year	2021	
	☐ Re/Evaluation	
A 10 =	Surveillance: ☐ 1 st ☐ 2 nd ☐ 3 rd ☐ 4 th	
Audit Type	Other: ☐ CVA; ☐ Scope Expansion; ☒ Special (describe):	
	Complaint Investigation	
	Finding Number: 2021.1	
Finding and Deadline		
☐ Major CAR : Pre-condition to certifica	tion/recertification	
☐ Major CAR : 3 months from Issuance of	of Final Report	
	rly scheduled audit, whichever comes first (surveillance or re-	
evaluation)		
☐ Observation – response is optional		
	r CAR is issued, but evidence of conformance must be provided	
prior to resumption of the relevant timber harvest, or at the next scheduled audit, whichever is sooner.		
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):		
	nagement Standard, Indicator 6.5.b	
Indicator		
Subsquent to the 2020 field audit, a complaint was submitted to SCS regarding the Hodge Podge 11-19		
timber sale, adjacent to Whitney Lake. On the basis of information provided by the complainants as well		
as interviews with pertinent DNR staff, review of pertinent elements of the Wisconsin Best Management		
Practices for Water Quality Manual and the Northern Highlands/American Legion Master Plan, it was		
determined that DNR's planned (and partially executed) timber harvest plan/sale ("Hodge Podge" 11-19		

adjacent to Whitney Lake), is found to be in conflict with FSC-US Forest Management Standard.

The planned harvest in tract 11-19 is primarily intended as an "overstory removal" type of commercial harvest that, in large part, is designed to provide sufficient light to the forest floor to foster establishment and development of a new cohort of seedlings/saplings, primarily oak. Overstory removal harvest prescriptions are generally more intensive (in terms of volume removed per acre) than single tree selection prescriptions. Likewise, so are the visual impacts.

Another pertinent aspect of the planned harvest is that the intensity of planned removal of harvest trees (and, conversely, the spatial pattern of leave trees) varies across the harvest unit. The basal area retention of retained trees will be as low 35 square feet per acre in some areas and above 60 square feet per acre in other areas of the harvest unit. As well, the widths of riparian management zones (RMZ's) adjacent to or within the harvest boundaries are not universally 100 feet or greater.

Chapter 7 of the Wisconsin BMP Field Manual specifies requirements for establishing RMZ's (riparian management zones) in association with lakes and streams. For lakes and for streams wider than 3 feet, RMZ's are to be at least 100 feet (per each side for streams), starting at the ordinary high-water mark. On page 91 of Chapter 7, tree retention requirements within RMZ's are stipulated: "at least 60 square feet of basal area per acre in trees greater than 5" DBH, evenly distributed" (emphasis added).

On page 87, variations from the 100' per side RMZ width requirement are addressed:

RMZ widths greater than 100' per side "may be needed on sites that exhibit <u>one or more</u> (emphasis added) of the following site conditions:

- steep slopes
- long, continuous slopes
- highly erodible soils
- no ground cover or duff layer
- intensive soil disturbance near the RMZ
- Unique or sensitive waters"

RMZ widths less than 100' per side "may be suitable on sites that exhibit the following site conditions:

- flat terrain
- short slopes
- stable or undisturbed soil
- dense groundcover vegetation
- soils with high filtration rates"

Of significant note, the trigger for increasing the widths of RMZs is "one or more" of the stipulated conditions. In contrast, "one or more" does not apply to narrowing RMZs below 100' per side. That is, text on page 87 rather clearly establishes that all 5 stipulated site conditions must be present to warrant narrower RMZs.

In the absence of an argument and supporting evidence that all 5 triggers for narrower RMZ's are met, the RMZs established for the Whitney Lake harvest unit are not in compliance with the Wisconsin Best Management Practices Manual. That is:

• the RMZ's as laid out are not uniformly greater than 100' per side

The residual trees (to be reserved from harvest) are not evenly distributed, and		
comp	rising at least 60 square feet basal area per acre.	
Given that forest operations must meet or exceed BMPs, the current harvest layout constitutes a non-conformity with pertinent elements of the FSC US Forest Management Standard.		
Non-Conformity C Non-Conformity C	Corrective Action Request	
Z Non Comonney C	onective Action Request	
Prior to resumption of timber harvesting in the Hodge Podge 11-19 timber sale, DNR must revise the harvest mark to conform with the RMZ requirements found in the Wisconsin BMP Manual.		
FME response		
(including any		
evidence submitted)		
SCS review		
Status of CAR:	□ Closed	
	☐ Upgraded to Major	
	\square Other decision (refer to description above)	
	Finding Number: 2021.2	
Finding and Deadline		
•	ondition to certification/recertification	
	ths from Issuance of Final Report	
	onths or next regularly scheduled audit, whichever comes first (surveillance or re-	
evaluation)		
Observation – resp		
	e (specify): A Minor CAR is issued, but evidence of conformance must be provided	
	f the relevant timber harvest, or at the next scheduled audit, whichever is sooner.	
	to (when more than one FMU):	
Standard and	FSC-US Forest Management Standard, Indicator 4.4.a	
Indicator		
⋈ Non-Conformity E	vidence Observation Justification and/or Explanation	
See finding 2021.1 for additional background.		
The Whitney Lake con	nplainants, have strongly asserted that the harvest plan, if operated as presently	
planned, will result in a significant adverse aesthetic impact on the viewsheds adjacent to Whitney Lake.		
While the complaint r	eview did not include a site inspection, it is likely that an overstory removal type of	
harvest that involves removing large trees in the near vicinity of the lake shore will generate adverse aesthetic impacts.		
The NHAL Master Plan, contains numerous references and directives regarding the importance of		
aesthetic values in the state forests of northern Wisconsin, particularly with respect to the many lakes		
_	Notable directives regarding aesthetics include:	
•	uality of all shorelines and primary roadways will be maintained and enhanced	
through application of aesthetic management techniques" (page 7)		

- Vision Statement: "The unique, aesthetic character of the NH-AL State Forest and the quality of its waters will be perpetuated." (page 9)
- Property Goal #2: "Maintain and enhance aesthetic qualities of the Northern Highlands— American Legion State Forest."
- Property Goal #8: "Protect and enhance wild resource values such as...the sights and sounds of a natural environment."
- Big Tree Silviculture: "A...Governor appointed committee...recommended that...recreational and aesthetic values of old growth and big trees be recognized." (page 11)
- "All undeveloped lake and stream shoreline will be managed to protect water quality, maintain
 wildlife and fisheries habitat, and enhance aesthetics. Shoreline management shall include
 vegetative zones. They will be maintained by following Best Management Practices for Water
 Quality when performing all forest management activities." (page 156)

Based upon review of pertinent written information and telephone interviews with the complainants and DNR personnel, the harvest plan for tract 11-19, adjacent to Whitney Lake, is likely in conflict with the above excerpts from the NHAL Master Plan. The evidence suggests that the harvest prescription does not adequately incorporate "aesthetic management techniques" nor adequately balance aesthetic objectives against silvicultural and production objectives.

against silvicultural and production objectives.		
Prior to resumption of timber harvesting in the Hodge Podge 11-19 timber sale, DNR must revise the harvest mark to conform with the lakeshore aesthetic management objectives articulated in the NHAL Master Plan.		
FME response		
(including any		
evidence submitted)		
SCS review		
Status of CAR:	□ Closed	
	☐ Upgraded to Major	
	☐ Other decision (refer to description above)	

	Finding Number: 2021.3	
Finding and Deadline		
☐ Major CAR : Pre-co	ondition to certification/recertification	
☐ Major CAR : 3 mor	nths from Issuance of Final Report	
☐ Minor CAR: 12 months or next regularly scheduled audit, whichever comes first (surveillance or re-		
evaluation)		
☐ Observation – response is optional		
☑ Other and deadline (specify): A minor CAR is issued, but evidence of conformance must be provided		
prior to resumption of the relevant timber harvest, or at the next scheduled audit, whichever is sooner.		
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):		
Standard and	FSC-US Forest Management Standard, Indicator 1.1.a	

Indicator		
☑ Non-Conformity Evidence ☐ Observation Justification and/or Explanation		
As detailed in finding 2021.1, the harvest plan for the the Hodge Podge 11-19 timber sale, is not in conformance with Wisconsin Best Management Practices for Water Quality Manual. The BMPs, while voluntary to some private landowners in Wisconsin, are mandatory for use on public lands, including		
state forests. This is explicitly detailed on page 13 of the Wisconsin BMP Manual.		
Thus, to the extent that the issues identified in 2021.1 represent a violation of state administrative requirements, a separate non-conformance is raised under the Principle 1 of the FSC standard, requiring compliance with all applicable laws.		
☑ Non-Conformity Corrective Action Request ☐ Observation; no Corrective Action is required		
Forest management plans and operations must demonstrate compliance with all applicable federal,		
state, county, municipal, and tribal laws, and administrative requirements.		
FME response		
(including any		
evidence submitted)		
SCS review		
Status of CAR:	□ Closed	
	☐ Upgraded to Major	
	\square Other decision (refer to description above)	