

DJ

Owner: Dennis Hummitzsch

MCSFC Timber Sales Internal Audit Form

Date of Audit: 10/8/15 Inspector(s) name(s) MOORE
 Timber sale appraiser's name DJ
 Permittee KEVIN THOMAS Permit # 214029

1. Water quality concerns and general site conditions

A. Riparian management zone on the sale area? Yes No (if No, skip to #1c)

Describe delineation of the RMZ

- Zone is accurately and clearly marked
- Zone is clearly marked, but does not follow FRC guidelines
- Zone is not clearly marked and does not follow FRC guidelines
- Zone was not considered at all within the sale design

B. RMZ harvest

- Harvesting has or will occur within the RMZ and meets FRC guidelines
- Harvesting has/will occur within the RMZ and does not meet FRC guidelines
- No harvesting occurred within the RMZ

C. Erosion/Runoff mitigation

- Are water diversion structures needed on skid trails and access roads? Yes No
- If needed, were these structures appropriately placed? Yes No

D. Rutting

Percent of general sale area rutted: 10% or less 10-30% 30-60% +60%

E. Hazardous materials [fuels/lubricants]: Absent , Present , if Present-spill response taken Yes , No .

Comments _____

2. Sale boundaries

- Sale boundary is clearly and accurately delineated in paint
 - Sale boundary is accurate, but not clearly marked in paint
 - Sale boundary does not correspond to timber appraisal map
 - Sale boundary is not clearly marked and does not correspond to timber appraisal map
- Comments _____

3. Condition and placement of access roads and landings

The size and location of roads and landings are appropriate for the sale size Yes No
Comments _____

Rate the current condition of the access roads and landings

- Excellent (little or no rutting, no waste or excess debris on the landings)
- Good (minimal rutting, little waste or excess debris left on the landings)
- Fair (Some noticeable rutting, debris left on landings)
- Poor (considerable amount of rutting, much waste/debris left on landing)

Comments [Show calc. & % new rds & lndgs of sale area] < 3%

4. Leave trees and reserve areas

Estimate the percent of sale designated as reserved 35% or estimate the number of leave trees per acre _____.

If an RMZ is present, are the leave trees in clumps adjacent to the RMZ? Yes No

Comments _____

CONTROLLED DOCUMENT
ANY PRINTED COPY OF THIS DOCUMENT IS NOT CONTROLLED
CHECK ORIGINAL PROCEDURE ON THE INTRANET TO ENSURE THIS COPY IS CURRENT

Owner: Dennis Hummitsch

5. Slash management

Were the regulations appropriate to the site, and for the regeneration plans Yes No

How well were slash regulations followed during the harvesting:

Regulations were fully implemented across the entire sale

Regulations were mostly implemented across most of the sale

Regulations were partially implemented over some of the sale

Regulations were not followed

Comments _____

6. Utilization

Rate how well the utilization standards specified on the sale were followed:

Utilization was good: little or no merchantable wood was left on the sale

Utilization was fair: some merchantable wood (less than 4 cds) left on the sale

Utilization was poor, (more than 4 cds of merchantable wood) left on sale

If utilization was fair/poor, was logger charged for wood left on site? Yes No

Comments _____

7. Forest development plans

Forest development plans are well considered and appropriate for the site

Forest development plans were provided, but may not be fully appropriate for site

Forest development plans were not provided, or are inconsistent with site/conditions

Comments _____

8. Scaling

How is the scaling being done: SOAV Consumer Scale Stick

If an alternate landing is used:

Are piles at alternate landing clearly marked? Yes No

Are tickets being used to account for wood moved to alternate landing? Yes No

Are loads clearly marked? Yes No None seen

Comments _____

9. Sale documentation

Is record of sale supervision complete and accurate? Yes No

How many times was this sale visited while it was being harvested? 712

Comments _____

10. Visual quality

Does the timber sale design incorporate FRC visual quality guidelines? Yes No

If provided, were the guidelines followed? Yes No

Comments _____

11. Natural Heritage/Arch./Cultural Resources incorporated? Yes No . If so, HOW _____

12. Overall timber sale rating

Excellent (the sale was well designed, and well implemented)

Good (generally sale was well designed and implemented, some areas for improvement)

Average (sale design and implementation was OK, but some key areas for improvement)

Poor (sale design and implementation were well below expectation)

Inspector suggestions for improvements _____

CONTROLLED DOCUMENT
ANY PRINTED COPY OF THIS DOCUMENT IS NOT CONTROLLED
CHECK ORIGINAL PROCEDURE ON THE INTRANET TO ENSURE THIS COPY IS CURRENT

DT

Owner: Dennis Hummitzsch

MCSFC Timber Sales Internal Audit Form

Date of Audit: 1/7/16 Inspector(s) name(s) MOORE, HEIBEL, SCHAFER
 Timber sale appraiser's name DT
 Permittee EGBERT - LONE OAK Permit # 215008

1. Water quality concerns and general site conditions

A. Riparian management zone on the sale area? Yes No (if No, skip to #1c)

Describe delineation of the RMZ

Zone is accurately and clearly marked

Zone is clearly marked, but does not follow FRC guidelines

Zone is not clearly marked and does not follow FRC guidelines

Zone was not considered at all within the sale design

B. RMZ harvest

Harvesting has or will occur within the RMZ and meets FRC guidelines

Harvesting has/will occur within the RMZ and does not meet FRC guidelines

No harvesting occurred within the RMZ

C. Erosion/Runoff mitigation

Are water diversion structures needed on skid trails and access roads? Yes No

If needed, were these structures appropriately placed? Yes No

D. Rutting

Percent of general sale area rutted: 10% or less 10-30% 30-60% +60%

E. Hazardous materials [fuels/lubricants]: Absent , Present , if Present-spill response taken Yes , No .

Comments _____

CONTROLLED DOCUMENT
ANY PRINTED COPY OF THIS DOCUMENT IS NOT CONTROLLED
CHECK ORIGINAL PROCEDURE ON THE INTRANET TO ENSURE THIS COPY IS CURRENT

2. Sale boundaries

Sale boundary is clearly and accurately delineated in paint

Sale boundary is accurate, but not clearly marked in paint

Sale boundary does not correspond to timber appraisal map

Sale boundary is not clearly marked and does not correspond to timber appraisal map

Comments _____

3. Condition and placement of access roads and landings

The size and location of roads and landings are appropriate for the sale size Yes No

Comments _____

Rate the current condition of the access roads and landings

Excellent (little or no rutting, no waste or excess debris on the landings)

Good (minimal rutting, little waste or excess debris left on the landings)

Fair (Some noticeable rutting, debris left on landings)

Poor (considerable amount of rutting, much waste/debris left on landing)

Comments [Show calc. & % new rds & lndgs of sale area] < 3%

4. Leave trees and reserve areas

Estimate the percent of sale designated as reserved _____ or estimate the number of leave trees per acre 6.

If an RMZ is present, are the leave trees in clumps adjacent to the RMZ? Yes No

Comments _____

Owner: Dennis Hummitzsch

5. Slash management

Were the regulations appropriate to the site, and for the regeneration plans Yes No

How well were slash regulations followed during the harvesting:

Regulations were fully implemented across the entire sale

Regulations were mostly implemented across most of the sale

Regulations were partially implemented over some of the sale

Regulations were not followed

Comments _____

6. Utilization

Rate how well the utilization standards specified on the sale were followed:

Utilization was good: little or no merchantable wood was left on the sale

Utilization was fair: some merchantable wood (less than 4 cds) left on the sale

Utilization was poor, (more than 4 cds of merchantable wood) left on sale

If utilization was fair/poor, was logger charged for wood left on site? Yes No

Comments _____

7. Forest development plans

Forest development plans are well considered and appropriate for the site

Forest development plans were provided, but may not be fully appropriate for site

Forest development plans were not provided, or are inconsistent with site/conditions

Comments _____

8. Scaling

How is the scaling being done: SOAV Consumer Scale Stick

If an alternate landing is used:

Are piles at alternate landing clearly marked? Yes No

Are tickets being used to account for wood moved to alternate landing? Yes No

Are loads clearly marked? Yes No None seen

Comments _____

9. Sale documentation

Is record of sale supervision complete and accurate? Yes No

How many times was this sale visited while it was being harvested? 22 ±

Comments _____

10. Visual quality

Does the timber sale design incorporate FRC visual quality guidelines? Yes No

If provided, were the guidelines followed? Yes No

Comments _____

11. Natural Heritage/Arch./Cultural Resources incorporated? Yes No . If so, HOW _____

12. Overall timber sale rating

Excellent (the sale was well designed, and well implemented)

Good (generally sale was well designed and implemented, some areas for improvement)

Average (sale design and implementation was OK, but some key areas for improvement)

Poor (sale design and implementation were well below expectation)

Inspector suggestions for improvements _____

Very good sale overall.

CONTROLLED DOCUMENT
ANY PRINTED COPY OF THIS DOCUMENT IS NOT CONTROLLED
CHECK ORIGINAL PROCEDURE ON THE INTRANET TO ENSURE THIS COPY IS CURRENT

Owner: Dennis Hummitzsch

MCSFC Timber Sales Internal Audit Form

Date of Audit: 1/7/16 Inspector(s) name(s) MOORE, HEIBEL, SCHAFER
 Timber sale appraiser's name KELLY BROWN
 Permittee GERBRACHT Permit # 214002

CONTROLLED DOCUMENT
 ANY PRINTED COPY OF THIS DOCUMENT IS NOT CONTROLLED
 CHECK ORIGINAL PROCEDURE ON THE INTRANET TO ENSURE THIS COPY IS CURRENT

1. Water quality concerns and general site conditions

A. Riparian management zone on the sale area? Yes No (if No, skip to #1c)

Describe delineation of the RMZ

- Zone is accurately and clearly marked
- Zone is clearly marked, but does not follow FRC guidelines
- Zone is not clearly marked and does not follow FRC guidelines
- Zone was not considered at all within the sale design

B. RMZ harvest

- Harvesting has or will occur within the RMZ and meets FRC guidelines
- Harvesting has/will occur within the RMZ and does not meet FRC guidelines
- No harvesting occurred within the RMZ

C. Erosion/Runoff mitigation

- Are water diversion structures needed on skid trails and access roads? Yes No
- If needed, were these structures appropriately placed? Yes No

D. Rutting

Percent of general sale area rutted: 10% or less 10-30% 30-60% +60%

E. Hazardous materials [fuels/lubricants]: Absent , Present , if Present-spill response taken Yes , No .

Comments _____

2. Sale boundaries

- Sale boundary is clearly and accurately delineated in paint
 - Sale boundary is accurate, but not clearly marked in paint
 - Sale boundary does not correspond to timber appraisal map
 - Sale boundary is not clearly marked and does not correspond to timber appraisal map
- Comments _____

3. Condition and placement of access roads and landings

The size and location of roads and landings are appropriate for the sale size Yes No

Comments _____

Rate the current condition of the access roads and landings

- Excellent (little or no rutting, no waste or excess debris on the landings)
- Good (minimal rutting, little waste or excess debris left on the landings)
- Fair (Some noticeable rutting, debris left on landings)
- Poor (considerable amount of rutting, much waste/debris left on landing)

Comments[Show calc. & % new rds & lngs of sale area] < 3%

4. Leave trees and reserve areas

Estimate the percent of sale designated as reserved 30% or estimate the number of leave trees per acre _____.

If an RMZ is present, are the leave trees in clumps adjacent to the RMZ? Yes No

Comments _____

Owner: Dennis Hummitzsch

5. Slash management

Were the regulations appropriate to the site, and for the regeneration plans Yes No

How well were slash regulations followed during the harvesting:

Regulations were fully implemented across the entire sale

Regulations were mostly implemented across most of the sale

Regulations were partially implemented over some of the sale

Regulations were not followed

Comments _____

6. Utilization

Rate how well the utilization standards specified on the sale were followed:

Utilization was good: little or no merchantable wood was left on the sale

Utilization was fair: some merchantable wood (less than 4 cds) left on the sale

Utilization was poor, (more than 4 cds of merchantable wood) left on sale

If utilization was fair/poor, was logger charged for wood left on site? Yes No

Comments _____

7. Forest development plans

Forest development plans are well considered and appropriate for the site

Forest development plans were provided, but may not be fully appropriate for site

Forest development plans were not provided, or are inconsistent with site/conditions

Comments _____

8. Scaling

How is the scaling being done: SOAV Consumer Scale Stick

If an alternate landing is used:

Are piles at alternate landing clearly marked? Yes No

Are tickets being used to account for wood moved to alternate landing? Yes No

Are loads clearly marked? Yes No None seen

Comments _____

9. Sale documentation

Is record of sale supervision complete and accurate? Yes No

How many times was this sale visited while it was being harvested? 3

Comments _____

10. Visual quality

Does the timber sale design incorporate FRC visual quality guidelines? Yes No

If provided, were the guidelines followed? Yes No

Comments _____

11. Natural Heritage/Arch./Cultural Resources incorporated? Yes No . If so, HOW _____

12. Overall timber sale rating

Excellent (the sale was well designed, and well implemented)

Good (generally sale was well designed and implemented, some areas for improvement)

Average (sale design and implementation was OK, but some key areas for improvement)

Poor (sale design and implementation were well below expectation)

Inspector suggestions for improvements _____

Sale well done.

CONTROLLED DOCUMENT
ANY PRINTED COPY OF THIS DOCUMENT IS NOT CONTROLLED
CHECK ORIGINAL PROCEDURE ON THE INTRANET TO ENSURE THIS COPY IS CURRENT

Owner: Dennis Hummitzsch

MCSFC Timber Sales Internal Audit Form

Date of Audit: 1/7/16 Inspector(s) name(s) MOORE, HEIBEL, SCHAFER
 Timber sale appraiser's name CHAD JACOBSON
 Permittee DUKE Permit # 215032

1. Water quality concerns and general site conditions

A. Riparian management zone on the sale area? Yes No (if No, skip to #1c)

Describe delineation of the RMZ

- Zone is accurately and clearly marked
- Zone is clearly marked, but does not follow FRC guidelines
- Zone is not clearly marked and does not follow FRC guidelines
- Zone was not considered at all within the sale design

B. RMZ harvest

- Harvesting has or will occur within the RMZ and meets FRC guidelines
- Harvesting has/will occur within the RMZ and does not meet FRC guidelines
- No harvesting occurred within the RMZ

C. Erosion/Runoff mitigation

- Are water diversion structures needed on skid trails and access roads? Yes No
- If needed, were these structures appropriately placed? Yes No slash water bar

D. Rutting

Percent of general sale area rutted: 10% or less 10-30% 30-60% +60%

E. Hazardous materials [fuels/lubricants]: Absent , Present , if Present-spill response taken Yes , No .

Comments _____

2. Sale boundaries

- Sale boundary is clearly and accurately delineated in paint
 - Sale boundary is accurate, but not clearly marked in paint
 - Sale boundary does not correspond to timber appraisal map
 - Sale boundary is not clearly marked and does not correspond to timber appraisal map
- Comments _____

3. Condition and placement of access roads and landings

The size and location of roads and landings are appropriate for the sale size Yes No
Comments _____

Rate the current condition of the access roads and landings

- Excellent (little or no rutting, no waste or excess debris on the landings)
- Good (minimal rutting, little waste or excess debris left on the landings)
- Fair (Some noticeable rutting, debris left on landings)
- Poor (considerable amount of rutting, much waste/debris left on landing)

Comments[Show calc. & % new rds & lndgs of sale area] < 3%

4. Leave trees and reserve areas

Estimate the percent of sale designated as reserved _____ or estimate the number of leave trees per acre 6-10.

If an RMZ is present, are the leave trees in clumps adjacent to the RMZ? Yes No
Comments _____

CONTROLLED DOCUMENT
ANY PRINTED COPY OF THIS DOCUMENT IS NOT CONTROLLED
CHECK ORIGINAL PROCEDURE ON THE INTRANET TO ENSURE THIS COPY IS CURRENT

Owner: Dennis Hummitzsch

5. Slash management

Were the regulations appropriate to the site, and for the regeneration plans Yes No

How well were slash regulations followed during the harvesting:

Regulations were fully implemented across the entire sale

Regulations were mostly implemented across most of the sale

Regulations were partially implemented over some of the sale

Regulations were not followed

Comments _____

6. Utilization

Rate how well the utilization standards specified on the sale were followed:

Utilization was good: little or no merchantable wood was left on the sale

Utilization was fair: some merchantable wood (less than 4 cds) left on the sale

Utilization was poor, (more than 4 cds of merchantable wood) left on sale

If utilization was fair/poor, was logger charged for wood left on site? Yes No

Comments _____

7. Forest development plans

Forest development plans are well considered and appropriate for the site

Forest development plans were provided, but may not be fully appropriate for site

Forest development plans were not provided, or are inconsistent with site/conditions

Comments _____

8. Scaling

How is the scaling being done: SOAV Consumer Scale Stick

If an alternate landing is used:

Are piles at alternate landing clearly marked? Yes No

Are tickets being used to account for wood moved to alternate landing? Yes No

Are loads clearly marked? Yes No None seen

Comments _____

9. Sale documentation

Is record of sale supervision complete and accurate? Yes No

How many times was this sale visited while it was being harvested? 12

Comments _____

10. Visual quality

Does the timber sale design incorporate FRC visual quality guidelines? Yes No

If provided, were the guidelines followed? Yes No

Comments _____

11. Natural Heritage/Arch./Cultural Resources incorporated? Yes No . If so, HOW _____

12. Overall timber sale rating

Excellent (the sale was well designed, and well implemented)

Good (generally sale was well designed and implemented, some areas for improvement)

Average (sale design and implementation was OK, but some key areas for improvement)

Poor (sale design and implementation were well below expectation)

Inspector suggestions for improvements _____

CONTROLLED DOCUMENT
ANY PRINTED COPY OF THIS DOCUMENT IS NOT CONTROLLED
CHECK ORIGINAL PROCEDURE ON THE INTRANET TO ENSURE THIS COPY IS CURRENT

Owner: Dennis Hummitzsch

MCSFC Timber Sales Internal Audit Form

Date of Audit: 1/7/16 Inspector(s) name(s) MOORE, HEIBEL, SCHAFER
 Timber sale appraiser's name CHAD JACOBSON
 Permittee PAULSON Permit # 213004

1. Water quality concerns and general site conditions

A. Riparian management zone on the sale area? Yes No (if No, skip to #1c)

Describe delineation of the RMZ

- Zone is accurately and clearly marked
- Zone is clearly marked, but does not follow FRC guidelines
- Zone is not clearly marked and does not follow FRC guidelines
- Zone was not considered at all within the sale design

B. RMZ harvest

- Harvesting has or will occur within the RMZ and meets FRC guidelines
- Harvesting has/will occur within the RMZ and does not meet FRC guidelines
- No harvesting occurred within the RMZ

C. Erosion/Runoff mitigation

- Are water diversion structures needed on skid trails and access roads? Yes No
- If needed, were these structures appropriately placed? Yes No

D. Rutting

Percent of general sale area rutted: 10% or less 10-30% 30-60% +60%

E. Hazardous materials [fuels/lubricants]: Absent , Present , if Present-spill response taken Yes , No .

Comments _____

2. Sale boundaries

- Sale boundary is clearly and accurately delineated in paint
 - Sale boundary is accurate, but not clearly marked in paint
 - Sale boundary does not correspond to timber appraisal map
 - Sale boundary is not clearly marked and does not correspond to timber appraisal map
- Comments _____

3. Condition and placement of access roads and landings

The size and location of roads and landings are appropriate for the sale size Yes No

Comments _____

Rate the current condition of the access roads and landings

- Excellent (little or no rutting, no waste or excess debris on the landings)
- Good (minimal rutting, little waste or excess debris left on the landings)
- Fair (Some noticeable rutting, debris left on landings)
- Poor (considerable amount of rutting, much waste/debris left on landing)

Comments[Show calc. & % new rds & lndgs of sale area] < 3%

4. Leave trees and reserve areas

Estimate the percent of sale designated as reserved 25% or estimate the number of leave trees per acre _____.

If an RMZ is present, are the leave trees in clumps adjacent to the RMZ? Yes No

Comments _____

CONTROLLED DOCUMENT
ANY PRINTED COPY OF THIS DOCUMENT IS NOT CONTROLLED
CHECK ORIGINAL PROCEDURE ON THE INTRANET TO ENSURE THIS COPY IS CURRENT

Owner: Dennis Hummitzsch

5. Slash management

Were the regulations appropriate to the site, and for the regeneration plans Yes No

How well were slash regulations followed during the harvesting:

Regulations were fully implemented across the entire sale

Regulations were mostly implemented across most of the sale

Regulations were partially implemented over some of the sale

Regulations were not followed

Comments _____

6. Utilization

Rate how well the utilization standards specified on the sale were followed:

Utilization was good: little or no merchantable wood was left on the sale

Utilization was fair: some merchantable wood (less than 4 cds) left on the sale

Utilization was poor, (more than 4 cds of merchantable wood) left on sale

If utilization was fair/poor, was logger charged for wood left on site? Yes No

Comments _____

7. Forest development plans

Forest development plans are well considered and appropriate for the site

Forest development plans were provided, but may not be fully appropriate for site

Forest development plans were not provided, or are inconsistent with site/conditions

Comments _____

8. Scaling

How is the scaling being done: SOAV Consumer Scale Stick

If an alternate landing is used:

Are piles at alternate landing clearly marked? Yes No

Are tickets being used to account for wood moved to alternate landing? Yes No

Are loads clearly marked? Yes No None seen

Comments _____

9. Sale documentation

Is record of sale supervision complete and accurate? Yes No

How many times was this sale visited while it was being harvested? 22

Comments _____

10. Visual quality

Does the timber sale design incorporate FRC visual quality guidelines? Yes No

If provided, were the guidelines followed? Yes No

Comments _____

11. Natural Heritage/Arch./Cultural Resources incorporated? Yes No . If so, HOW _____

12. Overall timber sale rating

Excellent (the sale was well designed, and well implemented)

Good (generally sale was well designed and implemented, some areas for improvement)

Average (sale design and implementation was OK, but some key areas for improvement)

Poor (sale design and implementation were well below expectation)

Inspector suggestions for improvements _____

CONTROLLED DOCUMENT
ANY PRINTED COPY OF THIS DOCUMENT IS NOT CONTROLLED
CHECK ORIGINAL PROCEDURE ON THE INTRANET TO ENSURE THIS COPY IS CURRENT

mg

Owner: Dennis Hummitzsch

MCSFC Timber Sales Internal Audit Form

Date of Audit: 1/7/16 Inspector(s) name(s) MOORE, HEIBEL, SCHAFER
 Timber sale appraiser's name MARSHALL GRAMM
 Permittee DAN AFFIELD Permit # 215022

1. Water quality concerns and general site conditions

A. Riparian management zone on the sale area? Yes No (if No, skip to #1c)

Describe delineation of the RMZ

Zone is accurately and clearly marked

Zone is clearly marked, but does not follow FRC guidelines

Zone is not clearly marked and does not follow FRC guidelines

Zone was not considered at all within the sale design

B. RMZ harvest

Harvesting has or will occur within the RMZ and meets FRC guidelines 760 ac²

Harvesting has/will occur within the RMZ and does not meet FRC guidelines

No harvesting occurred within the RMZ

C. Erosion/Runoff mitigation

Are water diversion structures needed on skid trails and access roads? Yes No

If needed, were these structures appropriately placed? Yes No

D. Rutting

Percent of general sale area rutted: 10% or less 10-30% 30-60% +60%

E. Hazardous materials [fuels/lubricants]: Absent , Present , if Present-spill response taken Yes , No .

Comments _____

2. Sale boundaries

Sale boundary is clearly and accurately delineated in paint

Sale boundary is accurate, but not clearly marked in paint

Sale boundary does not correspond to timber appraisal map

Sale boundary is not clearly marked and does not correspond to timber appraisal map

Comments _____

3. Condition and placement of access roads and landings

The size and location of roads and landings are appropriate for the sale size Yes No

Comments _____

Rate the current condition of the access roads and landings

Excellent (little or no rutting, no waste or excess debris on the landings)

Good (minimal rutting, little waste or excess debris left on the landings)

Fair (Some noticeable rutting, debris left on landings)

Poor (considerable amount of rutting, much waste/debris left on landing)

Comments[Show calc. & % new rds & lndgs of sale area] < 3%

4. Leave trees and reserve areas

Estimate the percent of sale designated as reserved _____ or estimate the number of leave trees per acre ± 1570.

If an RMZ is present, are the leave trees in clumps adjacent to the RMZ? Yes No

Comments _____

CONTROLLED DOCUMENT
ANY PRINTED COPY OF THIS DOCUMENT IS NOT CONTROLLED
CHECK ORIGINAL PROCEDURE ON THE INTRANET TO ENSURE THIS COPY IS CURRENT

Owner: Dennis Hummitzsch

5. Slash management

Were the regulations appropriate to the site, and for the regeneration plans Yes No

How well were slash regulations followed during the harvesting:

Regulations were fully implemented across the entire sale

Regulations were mostly implemented across most of the sale

Regulations were partially implemented over some of the sale

Regulations were not followed

Comments _____

6. Utilization

Rate how well the utilization standards specified on the sale were followed:

Utilization was good: little or no merchantable wood was left on the sale

Utilization was fair: some merchantable wood (less than 4 cds) left on the sale

Utilization was poor, (more than 4 cds of merchantable wood) left on sale

If utilization was fair/poor, was logger charged for wood left on site? Yes No

Comments _____

7. Forest development plans

Forest development plans are well considered and appropriate for the site

Forest development plans were provided, but may not be fully appropriate for site

Forest development plans were not provided, or are inconsistent with site/conditions

Comments _____

8. Scaling

How is the scaling being done: SOAV Consumer Scale Stick

If an alternate landing is used:

Are piles at alternate landing clearly marked? Yes No

Are tickets being used to account for wood moved to alternate landing? Yes No

Are loads clearly marked? Yes No None seen

Comments _____

9. Sale documentation

Is record of sale supervision complete and accurate? Yes No

How many times was this sale visited while it was being harvested? 7

Comments _____

10. Visual quality

Does the timber sale design incorporate FRC visual quality guidelines? Yes No

If provided, were the guidelines followed? Yes No

Comments _____

11. Natural Heritage/Arch./Cultural Resources incorporated? Yes No . If so, HOW _____

12. Overall timber sale rating

Excellent (the sale was well designed, and well implemented)

Good (generally sale was well designed and implemented, some areas for improvement)

Average (sale design and implementation was OK, but some key areas for improvement)

Poor (sale design and implementation were well below expectation)

Inspector suggestions for improvements _____

CONTROLLED DOCUMENT
ANY PRINTED COPY OF THIS DOCUMENT IS NOT CONTROLLED
CHECK ORIGINAL PROCEDURE ON THE INTRANET TO ENSURE THIS COPY IS CURRENT

M6

Owner: Dennis Hummitzsch

MCSFC Timber Sales Internal Audit Form

Date of Audit: 1/7/16 Inspector(s) name(s) MOORE, HEIBEL, SCHAFER
 Timber sale appraiser's name KEVIN THOMAS MARSHALL GRAHAM
 Permittee KEVIN THOMAS Permit # 213055

1. Water quality concerns and general site conditions

A. Riparian management zone on the sale area? Yes No (if No, skip to #1c)

Describe delineation of the RMZ

Zone is accurately and clearly marked

Zone is clearly marked, but does not follow FRC guidelines

Zone is not clearly marked and does not follow FRC guidelines

Zone was not considered at all within the sale design

B. RMZ harvest

Harvesting has or will occur within the RMZ and meets FRC guidelines

Harvesting has/will occur within the RMZ and does not meet FRC guidelines

No harvesting occurred within the RMZ

C. Erosion/Runoff mitigation

Are water diversion structures needed on skid trails and access roads? Yes No

If needed, were these structures appropriately placed? Yes No

D. Rutting

Percent of general sale area rutted: 10% or less 10-30% 30-60% +60%

E. Hazardous materials [fuels/lubricants]: Absent , Present , if Present-spill response taken Yes , No .

Comments _____

2. Sale boundaries

Sale boundary is clearly and accurately delineated in paint

Sale boundary is accurate, but not clearly marked in paint

Sale boundary does not correspond to timber appraisal map

Sale boundary is not clearly marked and does not correspond to timber appraisal map

Comments _____

3. Condition and placement of access roads and landings

The size and location of roads and landings are appropriate for the sale size Yes No

Comments _____

Rate the current condition of the access roads and landings

Excellent (little or no rutting, no waste or excess debris on the landings)

Good (minimal rutting, little waste or excess debris left on the landings)

Fair (Some noticeable rutting, debris left on landings)

Poor (considerable amount of rutting, much waste/debris left on landing)

Comments[Show calc. & % new rds & lngs of sale area] < 3%

4. Leave trees and reserve areas

Estimate the percent of sale designated as reserved 2570 or estimate the number of leave trees per acre _____.

If an RMZ is present, are the leave trees in clumps adjacent to the RMZ? Yes No

Comments _____

CONTROLLED DOCUMENT
ANY PRINTED COPY OF THIS DOCUMENT IS NOT CONTROLLED
CHECK ORIGINAL PROCEDURE ON THE INTRANET TO ENSURE THIS COPY IS CURRENT

Owner: Dennis Hummitzsch

5. Slash management

Were the regulations appropriate to the site, and for the regeneration plans Yes No

How well were slash regulations followed during the harvesting:

Regulations were fully implemented across the entire sale

Regulations were mostly implemented across most of the sale

Regulations were partially implemented over some of the sale

Regulations were not followed

Comments _____

6. Utilization

Rate how well the utilization standards specified on the sale were followed:

Utilization was good: little or no merchantable wood was left on the sale

Utilization was fair: some merchantable wood (less than 4 cds) left on the sale

Utilization was poor, (more than 4 cds of merchantable wood) left on sale

If utilization was fair/poor, was logger charged for wood left on site? Yes No

Comments _____

7. Forest development plans

Forest development plans are well considered and appropriate for the site

Forest development plans were provided, but may not be fully appropriate for site

Forest development plans were not provided, or are inconsistent with site/conditions

Comments _____

8. Scaling

How is the scaling being done: SOAV Consumer Scale Stick

If an alternate landing is used:

Are piles at alternate landing clearly marked? Yes No

Are tickets being used to account for wood moved to alternate landing? Yes No

Are loads clearly marked? Yes No None seen

Comments _____

9. Sale documentation

Is record of sale supervision complete and accurate? Yes No

How many times was this sale visited while it was being harvested? 6

Comments _____

10. Visual quality

Does the timber sale design incorporate FRC visual quality guidelines? Yes No

If provided, were the guidelines followed? Yes No

Comments _____

11. Natural Heritage/Arch./Cultural Resources incorporated? Yes No . If so, HOW

12. Overall timber sale rating

Excellent (the sale was well designed, and well implemented)

Good (generally sale was well designed and implemented, some areas for improvement)

Average (sale design and implementation was OK, but some key areas for improvement)

Poor (sale design and implementation were well below expectation)

Inspector suggestions for improvements _____

CONTROLLED DOCUMENT
ANY PRINTED COPY OF THIS DOCUMENT IS NOT CONTROLLED
CHECK ORIGINAL PROCEDURE ON THE INTRANET TO ENSURE THIS COPY IS CURRENT

Owner: Dennis Hummitzsch

MCSFC Timber Sales Internal Audit Form

Date of Audit: 1/29/2016 Inspector(s) name(s) MOORE
 Timber sale appraiser's name KELLY BROWN
 Permittee STEVE LYSENG Permit # 215020

1. Water quality concerns and general site conditions

A. Riparian management zone on the sale area? Yes No (if No, skip to #1c)

Describe delineation of the RMZ

- Zone is accurately and clearly marked
- Zone is clearly marked, but does not follow FRC guidelines
- Zone is not clearly marked and does not follow FRC guidelines
- Zone was not considered at all within the sale design

B. RMZ harvest

- Harvesting has or will occur within the RMZ and meets FRC guidelines
- Harvesting has/will occur within the RMZ and does not meet FRC guidelines
- No harvesting occurred within the RMZ

C. Erosion/Runoff mitigation

- Are water diversion structures needed on skid trails and access roads? Yes No
- If needed, were these structures appropriately placed? Yes No

D. Rutting

Percent of general sale area rutted: 10% or less 10-30% 30-60% +60%

E. Hazardous materials [fuels/lubricants]: Absent , Present , if Present-spill response taken Yes , No

Comments No rutting or hazardous materials spills.

2. Sale boundaries

- Sale boundary is clearly and accurately delineated in paint
 - Sale boundary is accurate, but not clearly marked in paint
 - Sale boundary does not correspond to timber appraisal map
 - Sale boundary is not clearly marked and does not correspond to timber appraisal map
- Comments _____

3. Condition and placement of access roads and landings

The size and location of roads and landings are appropriate for the sale size Yes No

- Comments _____
- Rate the current condition of the access roads and landings
- Excellent (little or no rutting, no waste or excess debris on the landings)
 - Good (minimal rutting, little waste or excess debris left on the landings)
 - Fair (Some noticeable rutting, debris left on landings)
 - Poor (considerable amount of rutting, much waste/debris left on landing)

Comments[Show calc. & % new rds & lngs of sale area] < 3% landings located along road and main skid trail.

4. Leave trees and reserve areas

Estimate the percent of sale designated as reserved 15% or estimate the number of leave trees per acre _____

If an RMZ is present, are the leave trees in clumps adjacent to the RMZ? Yes No

Comments _____

CONTROLLED DOCUMENT
ANY PRINTED COPY OF THIS DOCUMENT IS NOT CONTROLLED
CHECK ORIGINAL PROCEDURE ON THE INTRANET TO ENSURE THIS COPY IS CURRENT

Owner: Dennis Hummitzsch

5. Slash management

Were the regulations appropriate to the site, and for the regeneration plans Yes No

How well were slash regulations followed during the harvesting:

Regulations were fully implemented across the entire sale

Regulations were mostly implemented across most of the sale

Regulations were partially implemented over some of the sale

Regulations were not followed

Comments _____

6. Utilization

Rate how well the utilization standards specified on the sale were followed:

Utilization was good: little or no merchantable wood was left on the sale

Utilization was fair: some merchantable wood (less than 4 cds) left on the sale

Utilization was poor, (more than 4 cds of merchantable wood) left on sale

If utilization was fair/poor, was logger charged for wood left on site? Yes No

Comments _____

7. Forest development plans

Forest development plans are well considered and appropriate for the site

Forest development plans were provided, but may not be fully appropriate for site

Forest development plans were not provided, or are inconsistent with site/conditions

Comments _____

8. Scaling

How is the scaling being done: SOAV Consumer Scale Stick

If an alternate landing is used:

Are piles at alternate landing clearly marked? Yes No

Are tickets being used to account for wood moved to alternate landing? Yes No

Are loads clearly marked? Yes No None seen

Comments _____

9. Sale documentation

Is record of sale supervision complete and accurate? Yes No

How many times was this sale visited while it was being harvested? 3 to date

Comments Active Sale - many more site visits will occur as Sale progresses.

10. Visual quality

Does the timber sale design incorporate FRC visual quality guidelines? Yes No

If provided, were the guidelines followed? Yes No

Comments Buffer gone along Island Lake

11. Natural Heritage/Arch./Cultural Resources incorporated? Yes No . If so, HOW

12. Overall timber sale rating

Excellent (the sale was well designed, and well implemented)

Good (generally sale was well designed and implemented, some areas for improvement)

Average (sale design and implementation was OK, but some key areas for improvement)

Poor (sale design and implementation were well below expectation)

Inspector suggestions for improvements _____

CONTROLLED DOCUMENT
ANY PRINTED COPY OF THIS DOCUMENT IS NOT CONTROLLED
CHECK ORIGINAL PROCEDURE ON THE INTRANET TO ENSURE THIS COPY IS CURRENT