FSC Certification Report for the
2010 Annual Audit of the:

Wisconsin State Forests Managed by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Certificate Number: SCS-FM/COC-00070N

Under the
SCS Forest Conservation Program
(An FSC-Accredited Certification Program)

Date of Field Audit: August 16-19, 2010
Date of Report: September 20,2010

Scientific Certification Systems
2200 Powell Street, Suite 725
Emeryville, CA 94608

SCS Contact: Dave Wager, Program Director
dwager@scscertified.com

Client Contact: Teague Prichard, teague.prichard@dnr.state.wi.us

Section 2.0 (Surveillance Decision and Public Record) will be made publicly available on the SCS website (www.scscertified.com) no later than 60 days after the report is finalized.

1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1 CONTACT INFORMATION

- Wisconsin DNR, Division of Forestry
- Contact person: Teague Prichard
- Address: 101 S. Webster St., P.O. Box 7921, Madison, WI 53707-7921
- Telephone: (608) 266-1727
- Fax: (608) 266-8576
- E-mail: teague.prichard@dnr.state.we.us
- Certificate Type: single Forest management certificte with Forest gate chain-of-custody
- Certified products: Hardwood and softwood stumpage
- Number of Acres/hectares seeking to be certified: approximately 1.5 million acres. All lands are state managed including 513,000 acres of state forests and 984,157 acres of Land Division properties.
- Nearest Town: Madison, Wisconsin
- Tenure: Public, state owned
- Forest Composition: A mosaic of conifer and hardwood cover types, classified by species dominance; e.g., White Pine, Spruce-Fir, Northern Hardwoods, Central Hardwood, Oak, Red Maple, Aspen, Pine Plantations
- Managed as: Natural Forest

1.2 General Background

This report covers the second annual audit after the 2008/2009 recertification and scope expansion of the Wisconsin DNR State Forests and "Other State Lands" pursuant to the FSC guidelines for annual audits as well as the terms of the forest management certificate, as awarded by Scientific Certification Systems initially on May, 2003 and then again on January 13, 2009 (SCS-FM/COC-00070N). All certificates issued by SCS under the aegis of the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) require annual audits to ascertain ongoing compliance with the requirements and standards of certification. A public summary of the initial evaluation is available on the SCS website www.scscertified.com.

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

- A focused assessment of the status of any outstanding conditions or corrective action requests

- Follow-up inquiry into any issues that may have arisen since the award of certification or prior audit
- As necessary given the breadth of coverage associated with the first two components, an additional focus on selected topics or issues, the selection of which is not known to the certificate holder prior to the audit. The 2010 team completed a focused audit of the Department's conformance to Principle 6 as elaborated by the Lake States Regional Standard.

At the closure of the 2009, as signified by the issuance of the 2009 audit report, , there were four open Corrective Action Requests (CARs) of which three were classified as Major. In late December, WI DNR provided written responses to the four CARS detailing the corrective actions that had been taken to that point in time. The response document also indicated that additional corrective actions were still to be undertaken. On the basis of those initial corrective actions, SCS concluded that provisional closure of the three Major CARs was warranted, subject to evaluation of the additional corrective actions that were scheduled to be taken in the first half of 2010. Shortly prior to the 2010 surveillance audit, WI DNR submitted an updated response document detailing the additional corrective actions completed after the initial set of responses. The WI DNR's response, both initially and then up through the date of the 2010 audit, to these four CAR's was a major focus of the annual audit; see discussion, below, for a listing of those CARs and their disposition as a result of this annual audit.

1.3 Guidelines/Standards Employed

For this annual audit, the SCS auditor team evaluated the extent of conformance to selected elements (those elements of the Standard cited in all open CARs and OBSs as well as Principle 6) of the FSC Lake States Regional Standard, Version 3.0. Wisconsin DNR has been duly informed that this is the last audit that will be conducted against the Lake States Regional Standard. The 2011 annual surveillance audit will be conducted against the recently adopted FSC National Standard for the U.S.

2.0 SURVEILLANCE DECISION AND PUBLIC RECORD

2.1 Assessment Dates

The field and office components of this surveillance audit took place during August 16-19, 2010.

2.2 Assessment Personnel

Dr. Robert J. Hrubes, Lead Auditor: Dr. Hrubes is Senior Vice-President of Scientific Certification Systems. He is a registered professional forester and forest economist with 27 years of professional experience in both public and private forest management issues. Dr. Hrubes worked in collaboration with SCS to develop the programmatic protocol that guide all SCS Forest Conservation Program evaluations. Dr. Hrubes has led numerous SCS Forest Conservation Program evaluations of North American (U.S. and Canada) industrial forest ownerships, as well as operations in Scandinavia, Chile, and Japan. He also has professional work experience in Brazil, Germany, Guam (U.S.), Hawaii (U.S.), and Malaysia. Dr. Hrubes is the principal author of this audit report**.**

Mr. Michael Ferrucci, Team Member: Michael Ferrucci is a founding partner and President of Interforest, LLC, and a partner in Ferrucci & Walicki, LLC, a land management company that has served private landowners in southern New England for 18 years. Its clients include private citizens, land trusts, municipalities, corporations, private water companies, and non-profit organizations. He has a B.Sc. degree in forestry from the University of Maine and a Master of Forestry degree from the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies. Mr. Ferrucci's primary expertise is in management of watershed forests to provide timber, drinking water, and the protection of other values; in forest inventory and timber appraisal; hardwood forest silviculture and marketing; and the ecology and silviculture of natural forests of the eastern United States. He also lectures on private sector forestry, leadership, and forest resource management at the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies.

JoAnn Hanowski, M.Sc., Audit Team Member; Biology/Ecology Specialist-
JoAnn M. Hanowski was a senior research fellow at the University of Minnesota-Duluth's Natural Resources Research Institute. She has considerable expertise evaluating the effects of forest management on wildlife habitat, and is currently working on research projects involving the response of birds to various forest management practices in stream and seasonal pond buffers and the development of indicators of forest and water health and sustainability in Minnesota and across the Great Lakes. She was a member of the forest bird technical team for the original GEIS and participated on the wildlife technical team that wrote forest management guidelines for Minnesota. She served on the riparian science

technical committee that investigated the effectiveness of Minnesota's current guidelines for forest management in riparian systems and provided scientific expertise for Minnesota's biomass harvesting guidelines. She has published 67 peer-reviewed journal articles and over 75 reports in her 21 year tenure with the University of Minnesota. In 2005 JoAnn participated in the largest forest certification project ever conducted in the United States, the joint FSC/SFI certification of Minnesota's state lands. JoAnn has contributed regional ecological expertise to the FSC and SFI audits in MN, WI and MA and now lives in VT.

2.3 Assessment Process

The scope of the 2010 audit included the following activities: document review, auditors spending time in the field and office, interviewing management personnel and, as appropriate, interacting with outside stakeholders. To enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of the assessment, the audit team was divided into two sub-teams that traveled to different sites. The use of two sub-teams allowed for more diversity and geographic coverage of field sites that could be visited within the allotted time frame.
The auditors inspected a variety of field sites to assess conformance with selected elements of the Lakes States-Central Hardwoods FSC Regional Standard. During the audit planning phase, the Lead Auditor, supported by the other team members, and the WDNR representative reviewed the range of field activities and formulated a sampling plan. The Audit Team and WDNR representatives first determined appropriate sample areas or geographic strata within which to sample field sites. The Audit Team then used semi-selection methods to select a subset of all available sales and assigned a priority number to each site. Wisconsin DNR staff members worked with the Audit Team to designate the final selection list from this prioritized list and final adjustments were made during the audit to ensure flexibility and to allow for additional samples, as needed. Local WDNR field staff assisted with scheduling appropriate field site visits in a manner that balanced efficiency of travel routes, the priority number for sites, and factors designed to assure coverage of key issues relative to the certification standard.

Audit Sites and Participants:

<u>Sunday August 15</u>

Evening: Team Meeting; Opening Meeting, Barkers Island, Superior, WI
Teague Prichard, State Lands Specialist
John Gritt, Public and Private Lands Forester
Kristin Lambert, State Forest Planner
Robert Hrubes, FSC Lead Auditor
Mike Ferrucci, SFI Lead Auditor
JoAnn Hanowski, SFI-FSC Audit Team Member

August 16th (Monday)

Team #1 –West Team
Auditors: Robert Hrubes and JoAnn Hanowski
ICIT Team: Teague Prichard

Team #2 – East Team
Auditor: Mike Ferrucci
ICIT Team: John Gritt, Kristin Lambert, Randy Hoffman

Brule River State Forest (both teams)
Local Participants:
Kevin Feind, State Forest Ranger (law enforcement background)
Chris Sutherland, Forester
Greg Kessler, Wildlife Biologist
Nikki Martin, Forest Ranger (forestry background)
Jay Gallager, Wisconsin DNR, Area Forestry Supervisor
Also full group from above list (Sunday evening)

Site #1: Motts' Ravine State Natural Area, including 2009 Mott's Ravine Fire Plan Units M-1 and M-2: long-term project to restore Jack Pine and grasses by reducing scrub oak coverage.

Site #2: Tract #7-08 (Old Yeller Timber Sale) 77 acre active harvest of overmature Aspen retaining all pine and some oak and red maple saplings; interviewed John Grube, Grube Logging. Language for retaining dead standing trees was not in the contract. Forester indicated that he

verbally requests operator to leave snags. Wetlands were well protected with buffers and no slash was found within. DNR and logger emphasize the avoidance of rutting. Wood from this sale is being resold to 5 different customers. Grube Logging does not have a CoC certificate.

Site #3: Tract #10-09 (F. Willard Oak and Aspen): 60-acre regeneration harvest, seed tree retaining 50 square feet of basal area per acre, marked to leave, good esthetics.

Team #2 – East Team
Auditor: Mike Ferrucci
ICIT Team: John Gritt, Kristin Lambert, Randy Hoffman

White River Fishery Area – Bayfield (2 sales)
Property Type: Fisheries Management Property Acres: 3,258

Local Participants:
Prop Manager - Dave Lindsley
Team Leader– Steve Coffin
Forester - Brian Klobuchar

Site #4: Tract# 02-09 Planned, set up harvest two types: White pine over hardwood RX remove hardwood to regenerate pine; Aspen RX clearcut retaining all conifers, part will go to Aspen, part to fir, maple, aspen mix. Large buffers around both the Sejak Springs State Natural Area and the White River and its tributary stream.

Site #5 Tract 01-08 Completed regeneration harvest of 122 acre oak, birch stand with aspen component and some softwoods. Sandy loam on rolling topography. Harvested all Aspen and birch, leaving most oak and all softwoods. Allowed biomass removal to a 2-inch top. Excellent green tree retention and woody debris; no residual damage or rutting. Discussed landscape level planning; forester focused mostly on stand-level issues, with an emphasis on the need for oak regeneration and stating that the wildlife biologist likes Aspen (in the context of many acres of Oak-Birch. Confirmed buffer around wetland exclusion.

Chief River Wildlife Area

Property Type: Wildlife Management Property Acres: 1,189
Local Participants:
Kim Lemke , Forester
Mike Bulgrin, Wildlife Technician
Larry Glodoski, Area Forestry Leader
Neal Kephart, Chippewa Flowage Prop Manager
Randy Hoffman, Bureau of Endangered Resources

Site #6 Tract #01-09 Marked Northern hardwood described by forester as uneven aged but actually even-aged; prescribed selection harvest with only a few gaps; otherwise marked poor quality stems.

Chippewa Flowage
Property Type: Water Resources (Lands & Facilities) Property Acres: 7,029
Local Participants: same as Chief River Wildlife Area

Site #7 Tract #03-08 Moss Creek Sale, 65 acre Aspen stand clearcut with significant retention of White pine mostly; sale remediation complete but not officially closed out; portions of sale cut during the wet summer, used slash to armor roads, lighter loads, and moved to drier ground as needed; visual management a high priority.

Flambeau River State Forest
Property Type: State Forest Property Acres: 91,619
Local Participants:
State Forest Superintendent - Jim Halvorson
Heidi Brunkow, Assistant Superintendent
Maggie Hass, Forester
Carmen Wagner, Wisconsin DNR State Hydrologist

Site #8 Tract # 13-06, Sale 653 (Bull Creek Sale): Mostly complete northern hardwoods with 2 age classes; RX NH conversion to uneven-aged crop tree release, improvement thinning, and gaps; retaining hemlock, yellow birch, White pine and inclusions of aspen. Gaps had lots of Ash trees, but sugar maple seedlings were browsed heavily.

Site #9 Tract #15-06, Sale 654 (Leftovers Sale): Completed northern hardwoods, maintained aspen inclusions by cutting patches; gaps could have been larger but are full of regeneration including ash, some maple, much oak, some black cherry.

Site #10: Old growth and gap study area: ongoing intensive research into methods to accelerate old-growth characteristics using varied size gaps, girdling to add CWD, and deer exclosures.

Site #11 Tract #15-06, Sale 654 (Leftovers Sale): Completed northern hardwoods, maintained aspen inclusions by cutting patches; made smaller gaps intentionally in places with Ironwood trees.

Monday Afternoon

Team #1 –West Team
Auditors: Robert Hrubes and JoAnn Hanowski
ICIT Team: Teague Prichard

Bean Brook Fishery Area

Nancy Christel, Wildlife Biologist (Lands Division) & Property Manager

The forester who has provided support to this property retired; the vacancy has not been filled but an Area Supervisor is serving as acting forester for this property.

The property has a Master Plan written in the 1980's. The property manager still considers the Plan to be of value in her management of the property.

N. Christel is the manager of over 30 DNR properties. Each January, she holds a property management meeting in which work plans are set for the year. All 30 properties she manages are addressed in the same annual meeting. No minutes are taken for the management meeting. Representatives of Fisheries, Wildlife, Forestry and Law Enforcement participate in the annual management meeting.

Site #12: Red pine thinning and some restoration work in areas of disturbance with spotted knapweed. Property has an old master plan and is a Tier 3 planning property. Planning and accomplishments are achieved during an annual meeting. Discussed reluctance of prior forester to complete the harvest in a red pine planted stand in a way that would be more beneficial to wildlife (e.g., larger gaps and more coarse woody debris).

Garlon is used on the property to control invasives; the DNR individuals that apply Garlon are not certified for chemical use on the understanding that someone higher in the organization is credentialed.

Unauthorized motor vehicle use (ATV's and pickups) use remains a management problem.

The audit team also walked to another, harvest area further south in the property and discussed regeneration success, invasive species control and fishery management issues in Bean Brook.

Crex Meadows Wildlife Area, Governor Knowles State Forest and Danbury WMA

Group discussion over lunch at Crex Meadows office/visitor center followed by field tours of the three areas.

James Becker,	Forestry Tech—Webster Field Office
Pete Engman	Wildlife Supervisor
Ross Larson	Forest Ranger – Grantsburg
Bob Hanson	Wildlife Tech—Crex Meadows
Jim Ulmaniec	Forestry Tech—Governor Knowles SF
Mike Wallis	Forester—Governor Knowles SF
Dan Thill	Property Manager—Governor Knowles SF
Renae Paulson	Forester—Webster Field Office
Bob Hartshorn	Team Leader—Burnett/Polk Counties
Steve Runstrom	St. Croix Area Forestry Leader
Teague Prichard	Forestry, Madison and ICIT member
JoAnn Hanowski	FSC/SFI Auditor
Robert Hrubes	Audit Co-Team Leader

Notes from Group Discussion:

The unit was established from tax delinquent lands. Primary management focus is wetlands and waterfowl habitat as well as barrens restoration.

There is an active prescribed fire program on the property.

Crex Meadows has a very active "Friends" group; the property manager considers the relationship with the Friends to be highly collaborative and non-contentious.

Division foresters who provide forestry support for the property characterize management prescriptions on the property to be no different than on other properties such as the state forests

Acreage goals for early successional cover have been problematic to attain.

Site #13: 0780-109 sale
Barrens restoration site which will convert a 184-acre oak site from 62ba to 10ba. Site will be burned post-harvest and will be managed for early successional habitat. The property manager feels good about the level of coordination with the foresters.

Governor Knowles State Forest

Site #14: 238 active sale
A regeneration harvest (clearcut) and biomass harvest site that was set-up and sold prior to the biomass guidelines—58-acre unit. The site would not qualify for a biomass harvest under the new regulations. Site was scarified pre-sale to promote jack pine regeneration. Even-aged management of jack pine, oak, and aspen. Very little green tree retention or snags.

Site #15: 234 marked sale, not yet harvested

A regeneration harvest unit with marked retention. The stated intent is to retain some of the larger, higher-quality red pine. On inspection of harvest mark, it appeared that all large and healthy red pine were marked for harvest and only decaying and smaller red pine would be left.

Danbury Wildlife Area

Site #16: 56 acres oak/ jack pine stand that was marked for thinning. Forester marked a sample area as a demonstration for the operator to follow in terms of which trees to retain. Goal is to promote growth of trees left after harvest which will then be removed at maturity. This site has barren (early successional) management opportunities, but the decision was made to maintain it in a more forested, later successional condition.

Tuesday, August 17, 2010

McKenzie Creek Wildlife Management Area

Mike Ferrucci, SFI lead auditor; JoAnn Hanowski, SFI/FSC audit team; Kristin Lambert, WIDNR; Alan Crosley WIDNR; Kevin Morgan, Property Manager; Paul Heimstead, Forester; Steve Runstrom, FR Area Leader; WDNR Forester – Janette Cain

Site #1: 3-08

Completed aspen regeneration harvest with great white pine retention and snags (individual retention trees were marked prior to harvest). This is a typed northern hardwood habitat that is being managed for wildlife by retaining aspen which is rare in this area. Site also included a 7 acre thinning removing Aspen from hardwood area, protected small seasonal wetland.

Site #2 Three-season public use access road: some minor surface erosion from recent heavy rainstorms (6 inches in the most recent storm, up to 20 inches over past 2 months); no dedicated road budget, instead most road work is accomplished through logging contracts.

Casey Lake Wildlife Management Area
Property Type: Wildlife Management Property Acres: 209

Mike Ferrucci, SFI lead auditor; JoAnn Hanowski, SFI/FSC audit team; Kristin Lambert, WIDNR; Alan Crosley, WIDNR; Mike Soergel, Property Manager; Harvey Halvorson, Property Manager; Dan Bohr, Forester

Site #3; Prairie restoration area- converted old agricultural field to native prairie habitat which is also open to dog training. Area is part of 2-3000 core acres that have been identified as core grassland bird habitat.

Site #4: Salvage harvest from winter of 2009. Wind event disturbed the site and a salvage harvest removed the damaged trees. A large riparian buffer strip was left along the tributary stream along with many residual trees that survived the blowdown. No harvest was planned on the site prior to the blowdown.

Menomonie DNR Station: 921 Brickyard Road - Menomonie, WI 54751
Office discussions (see attendees, above) and lunch

Hoffman Hills Recreation Area
Property Type: Parks Property Acres: 706

Mike Ferrucci SFI lead auditor; JoAnn Hanowski, SFI/FSC audit team; Kristin Lambert, WIDNR; Alan Crosley WIDNR; Scott Erickson, Property Manager; Rob Strand, Forester; Jay Jordan, Forester; Jess Carstens, Property Manager

- Dominant use is recreation, including education, nature hikes, observation tower; area is open for gun deer season;
- Mostly donated land, in early 1980's by Hoffman family, with many restrictions somewhat akin to an unofficial master plan, but many of these restrictions have expired;
- There is a 1982 Master Plan and the forest inventory and mapping have recently been updated.
- Intent to do pine thinning first (will be planned for esthetics and to help get snow on the trails).
- Will complete pine thinning then work on the hardwoods, which are over mature and changing to tolerant hardwoods.
- Have done prairie restoration work.
- Absent an up-to-date Master Plan, the timber management has been conservative. Gradually losing the opportunity to regenerate the oak and aspen types, and shifting to basswood and maple, which is moving further away from pre-settlement on the south and west slopes, while north and east slopes were probably a mixture with the basswood and red maple.

Site #5 Tract #1-09: Red Pine thinning not completed; White Pine plantation thinning harvested August 2009; heavier thinning near the X-country ski trails to allow more snow to reach the

ground, lighted in the interior portions. One of two main skid trails traverses much of the length of a swale, instead of being placed on higher ground. There were no water bars, as the improper location of the trail precluded any method to drain the trail. Heavy recent rainfall event has led to erosion along significant portions of the trail and sedimentation into the ephemeral drainage. Minor Non-conformance SFI Indicator 2.3.7 "Road construction and skidding layout to minimize impacts to soil productivity and water quality.

OR 2.3.4 "Post-harvest conditions conducive to maintaining site productivity."
inspection, ruts and erosion due to water draining down slope was noted. SFI Minor Car.

Site #6: Hoffman Hills Prairie Restoration. This area is on the edge of a pheasant opportunity area and an old fallow field was converted to a prairie to benefit pheasants and grassland bird species. Nice job.

Muddy Creek Wildlife Area
Property Type: Wildlife Management Property Acres: 3,382 (Tier 2 Property)

Flat topography, straddles Muddy Creek; woods, lowland brush, swamp, and prairie restored from farm fields.

Master Plan dated 1980: Managed for diverse habitat. Forests are changing and moving towards a maple/tolerant hardwood type. High deer populations for many years. Goal for 2009 of 15 deer per square mile was recently increased for political reasons to 25; current population 22.5; likely to go to 35 to 40. Regeneration challenges are only going to get worse.

North end of area had several impoundments, also many lateral ditches that need to be managed; some invasive cattails, which are choking off the open water; also starting the see Phragmites locally but not on the tract.

Wildlife technician is certified pesticide applicator. Have been using beetles for bio-control for loosestrife.

Not within a COA from the Wildlife Action Plan. The Unit has a small SNA.

Site #7. 75% done, objective is oak and aspen regeneration; maple/hardwood thinning (long walk through meadows and along dikes)

Site #8: Tract 1-06 Part 1 of the sale was an aspen regeneration where green retention trees were left (marked prior to harvest). About 1/3rd of the green trees were recently blown down (primarily the black cherry). Regeneration was checked spring of 2010 (after a 2009 winter harvest). Will check for regen again in about 2 years.

Part 2 of sale was a selective harvest where aspen, birch were removed and oak was retained. The goal is to increase within stand diversity by opening the forest canopy with gaps

Elk Creek Fishery Area (not visited, office discussions only)
Property Type: Fisheries Management Property Acres: 273

Local Participants:
Prop Manager – Bob Hujik, Fisheries
Forester – Jim Skorczewski)
Forester - Mike Rankin

Early 1980's Master Plan; goal: 670 acres; now 350+ including easement; most parcels are small
Proposed timber sale on the largest parcel; skinny, "Y" shaped parcel; lots of in-stream habitat improvement to deal with incised banks, which are sloped back and armored with rip-rap; understands impacts of climate change on fisheries… warmer weather, but habitat work done would benefit warm water species also if this change occurs;

Issues include:

- many adjacent landowners, formerly maintained lots of fence, still need to keep the cattle out of the streams; allow neighbors to maintain their stream crossings
- hunting only allowed on fee lands (not on easements)

Lower Chippewa River State Natural Area (no sales)
Property Type: Natural Area Property Acres: 1,701
Local Participants:
Jess Carstens, Prop Manager
Rob Strand, Forester

Jay Jordan, Forester

The unit does not have much active forest management. Savannah habitat is being created by removing some overstory trees and a 40-acre bottomland forest was planted on an old field. This area is a birding hotspot and is in a COA. Some diversity is being lost in lowland hardwood forest due to lack of management.

Team #2 – East Team

Beaver Brook Wildlife Area
Robert Hrubes, FSC Lead Auditor
John Gritt, ICIT
Randy Hoffman, State Natural Areas
Teague Prichard, ICIT
Steve Edge, Forestry Team Leader
Nancy Christel, Property Manager

One of 30+ units overseen by Nancy Christel. The main management issue if control of invasive exotic plants

Yellow River Fishery Area
Robert Hrubes, FSC Auditor
John Gritt, ICIT
Randy Hoffman, State Natural Areas
Teague Prichard, ICIT
Steve Edge, Forestry Team Leader
Ron Komro, Property Manager
Chris Rucinski, forester
Heath Beniki, fish biologist

The forester and biologist work out of the same office which helps to foster collaboration.
Harvesting setbacks along the river are quite substantial, clearly minimizing potential adverse impacts. Seasonal restrictions on site disturbing management activities are also employed.

Stop #1: amalgamated timber sale. Soon to be re-advertized; no bids on this sale last year. A mosaic of thinning as well as regeneration harvests, primarily of tamarack.

No chemicals are used on this property. No DNR employees actively working on the property are certified chemical applicators and there is some uncertainty as to what the requirements are.

Stop #2: planned thinning and regeneration harvest (aspen); no major issues observed

Chippewa Moraine Recreation Area
Robert Hrubes, FSC Auditor
John Gritt, ICIT
Randy Hoffman, State Natural Areas
Teague Prichard, ICIT
Steve Edge, Forestry Team Leader
Rod Gart, Naturalist, Chippewa Moraine
Jim Skorczewski, DNR Forester
Mike Rankin, DNR Forester
Brenda Rederer, CM Property Manager

This property is 1 of 9 Ice Age/Glacial units in WI; this property is part of the National Ice Age Trail. The dominant management mandate is to protect the glacial land features. To: "preserve, protect and interpret"

No logging, motorized recreation or bicycles allowed on the property; no campgrounds or picnic grounds, though those are being contemplated. Hunting, fishing and trapping are allowed activities.

The property manager and the naturalist are quite disinterested in commercial timber sales on the property; their perspectives form a tension point with DNR foresters who, per Act 166, believe that there is a mandate to identify "management opportunities" on the property.

An impressive interpretive center is a featured part of the property. Extensive use by area primary schools.

Main vegetative manipulation is driven by efforts to maintain viewsheds and to control invasive exotics.

Future challenges are felt to be avoiding forest fragmentation and controlling unauthorized use, such as ATVs entering the property from adjoining county forests.

McCann Creek Fishery Area
322 acres
Property Manager: Vacant Acting Property Manager: Bob Hujik
Forester: Jim Skorczewski

Hujik is the Fisheries Supervisor for 11 counties

Objectives for the property: stream bank protection including but not limited to keeping cows out of the creek; controlling exotics (e.g., reed canary grass)

Hunting is allowed but only on the fee lands.

The timber harvest on the property was in response to Act 166 but the acting property manager had no concerns about the operation.

Tom Lawin Wildlife Area
2,318 acres
Property Manager: Vacant John Dunn, past property manager is a re-employed annuitant working part time as the stand-in property manager.

Also present on the tour was another past property manager, Michelle Woodford (now stationed in Rhinelander)

Forester: Jim Skorczewski

No Master Plan for this property, yet; it is classed as a tier 3 property for future master planning. The only planning document is a feasibility study written in support of the property acquisition;

it does contain statements of objectives for the property. There is 1 paragraph addressing timber management, focusing on game species habitat management.

11% of property is upland forest; the remainder is wetland.

Main management objective is restoration of hydrologic function and converting to natural vegetation in what are now agricultural fields.

A SNA was recently established on the property; the establishment of the SNA did not change the management objectives for the designated acres—it remains "as little active management as possible."

We walked to a relatively recent aspen clear cut that was completed in an exemplary manner with an impressive amount of structural retention within the unit.

Lake Wissota State Park
Park Superintendent: Scott Erickson

1, 062 acres, established in 1961; 108,000 visitor days in 2009; open year around; mostly summer use; deer hunting with shotguns is allowed (antlerless, only)

2 of 3 FTE's for the property are vacant; 8 LTE's

There is a Nature Center supported by a Friends group. The Friends group is, after 15 years, experiencing some "burn out."

To address special considerations associated with the property being a park, timber harvesting has these additional constraints:

- logging only in winter
- consultation up through the Parks Division
- higher than normal residual stocking levels
- heavier harvests near CC ski trails
- location of intensive harvests coincide with campground expansion

Master Plan completed in 1986; "it's an old one." Goals and objectives in the Plan are still considered to be relevant.

The auditors walked through two harvest sites; no issues or concerns arose.

August 18th (Wednesday)

Team #1 –West Team
Auditors: Robert Hrubes and Mike Ferrucci
ICIT Team: Kristin Shy & Teague Prichard

Visit #1: 7:30 am – 8:15 am
Property Name: **Buffalo River State Trail** (1 sale)
Property Type: Parks Property Acres: 285

Local Participants:
Property Manager - Lois Larson
Managing Superintendent: Jim Thompson
Forester – Dan Dehmer

This is a "rails to trails" property; railroad was abandoned in 1972. Master Plan: 1978.

Original focus was on bicycle use but it has shifted over to motorized recreation; the transition was a contentious process. Very little forest cover on this property; mostly ag land.

Management of runoff from the trail is much improved; the trail is in the process of being resurfaced.

New issue: UTV's; another issue: "volunteer trails"

Brush encroachment due to fire exclusion is an issue. There is interest in biomass harvesting to keep the area open.

Site 1: Completed Red Pine Thinning adjacent to the trail, 1-acre area part of a 110-acre timber sale along various parts of the trail; confirmed timber sale planning, set-up, and administration methods are the same as other areas.

Site 2: Buffalo River State Trail: inspected trail surface and discussed planned resurfacing project; some wear and some limited erosion was observed.

Buckhorn Wildlife Area/Buckhorn State Park
Property Type: Wildlife Management/Parks Property Acres: 3,741/1,575

Local Participants:
Joe Stecker-Kochanski, Park Manager for both Buckhorn and Roche Creek State Parks as well as the Wildlife Area
WL Manager - Jon Robaidek - 715-498-2338
Kris Wimme, WDNR Forester
Steve Courtney, Area Forestry Leader, Central Wisconsin
Jean Reagle, District Supervisor, Parks
Jeremy Humel, Forest Technician

This complex of units is comprised of a State Park and two Wildlife Areas. Two large SNA's on the property. Oak wilt is an issue as is jack pine budworm. The desire is to convert red pine planted areas to native cover.

Site 1: Tract 03-09 Buckhorn Wildlife Area: 58 acre Barrens Restoration Project: marked leave trees based on spacing goals for restoration and fire-control (much wider spacing at outside edges); harvested for pulpwood using processor/forwarder; mulched using drum-flail mower; excellent results. Follow up planned fall frost-seeding, possible use of Garlon to treat invasives as needed, eventually fire rotation. Pesticides are used as a management tool; the use application form constitutes the written prescription

Site 2: Sandblow Area in Jack Pine Barrens: boardwalk, interpretative signs, and viewing platform.

Site 3: Tract# 01-08 Yellow River Wildlife Area Completed 107-acre clearcut to regenerate 68-year old Jack Pine / black oak mix driven by health particularly oak wilt; retained Bur and White Oak and White Pine; also row thinning in a young red pine plantation.

Site 4: Tract 02-09 Yellow River Wildlife Area "West Side Sale": Set up un-cut regeneration harvest in mixed Jack Pine/Oak stand to release existing natural regeneration and to get coppice regeneration Aspen. Discussed Level 1 Lupine survey and Level 2 Karner Blue Butterfly survey, neither of which showed presence.

Grant funds from the Friends group are important for accomplishing management program; the Friends group is active and collaborative.

Public outreach is done to let visitors know about pending treatments.

A youth and novice deer hunt is held each year.

Team #2 – East Team
Augusta Wildlife Management Area
John Dunn, Property Manager, Chris Widstrand Forester, Alan Crosley, JoAnn Hanowski, John Gritt, Paul Westergaard, Randy Hoffman.

Site 7. Prairie restoration of old pine plantation. Site was harvested, burned and was vegetated with natural seeding of big bluestem.

Site 8. Harvest 01-10
White pine thinning was marked on one portion of the stand and goal was to enhance growth of white pine. The major area of the harvest was an oak regeneration harvest. A retention island was left along with large trees along the edges of the harvest site. No retention planned within the sale body. Confirmed that island would remain identified with harvest unit and not cut out and identified as another stand.

Buffalo River Fisheries Area
Russ Kind (Forester), Alan Crosley, JoAnn Hanowski, John Gritt, Paul Westergaard, Randy Hoffman.

Site 9. Red pine first thinning along the buffalo river-left nice riparian strip of no harvest along the edge. Will check growth within the first five years after harvest.

Site 10: Tract Number 1-07

53 acres harvest that removed hardwoods. Many white pine were left standing as well as snags and den trees. Checked buffer along a wetland adjoining site. A buffer of trees were left along the wetland and no slash was found in the wetland. Goal for the site is to manage toward the climax forest condition of the area. Good regeneration of a variety of tree species two years after harvest.

Sandhill Wildlife Area

Neal Paisley,Property Manager, Mark Chryst Forester, Alan Crosley, JoAnn Hanowski, John Gritt, Randy Hoffman.

Site 11. SH3-08

An active aspen regeneration harvest. Retention trees were marked with green paint and by prescription of leaving white oak and all red/white pine. Site was surrounded by wetlands. Operators are instructed to avoid wetlands and to keep slash out of these areas. Sites are visited at least twice a week when they are active.

Site 12 SH1-10

Aspen regeneration harvest and oak salvage. Red and white pine along with black oak was retained-lots of retention Prescription includes mandate for no harvest until September due to Karner Blue Butterfly concerns.

Site 13
Gallagher Marsh water control structure controls water on one flowage in the area. Gallagher Marsh is the largest marsh on the property (3000 acres) and is an important stopover migraton site for sandhill cranes and other waterfowl.

Final Stop Madison : 2:00 pm (1 hour 45 min drive to Madison from Buckhorn)
3:00pm – 5:00 pm – Room 413

Robert Hrubes, FSC Auditor
Jeff Prey, State Parks
Teague Prichard, Forestry
JoAnn Hanowski, FSC/SFI team member
Mike Ferrucci, SFI Leaders/ FSC team member
Avery Dorlane, Nursery Coordinator
John Gritt, DNR Forester
Randy Hoffman, DNR State Natural Areas
JoAnne Farnsworth, Section Chief Wildlife
Kristin Lambert, Forestry
Paul Cunningham, Fisheries
Kelly Kerns, Invasive Plants
Wendy McCown, Forestry Business Services Director
Paul Delong, Forestry Administrator
Tom Boos, Forestry Invasives
Alan Crosley, Wildlife

August 19 (Thursday)

8 am – 10 am Madison, GEF 2 G09
WDNR All lands Forest Certification Exit Report

Robert Hrubes, FSC Auditor
Jeff Prey, State Parks
Teague Prichard, Forestry
JoAnn Hanowski, FSC/SFI team member
Mike Ferrucci, SFI Leaders/ FSC team member
Avery Dorlane, Nursery Coordinator
John Gritt, DNR Forester
Randy Hoffman, DNR State Natural Areas
Alan Crosley, Wildlife
Jim Warren, Forestry
Kristin Lambert, Forestry
Paul Cunningham, Fisheries
Jeff Barkley, Forestry

Tam Hauge, Bureau Director
Laurie Ostendorf, Land Division Leader
Steve Miller, Facilities Land Director
Dan Schuller, Parks Director

Purpose: Preliminary Findings from the field audit and status of CARS

2.4 Status of 2009 Corrective Action Requests Based Upon the 2010 Surveillance Audit

Note: All text in the cells below associated with "Accomplishments for 2010 surveillance audit" was submitted to SCS by Wisconsin DNR. For the Major CARs, the initial responses were submitted to SCS in late December, 2009; additional responses were provided in August, 2010. DNR's response to the Minor CAR was submitted on August 6, 2010. Documents referenced via imbedded electronic links in the DNR responses are not accessible in this certification report but they are on file at the SCS offices and can be obtained upon request to DNR.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">Background/Justification: This Major Corrective Action Request is a follow-on to CAR 2008.1 (related to Master Plans), as insufficient progress in addressing the Minor CAR was observed during the 2009 surveillance audit. Accordingly, SCS is obligated to raise the issue to the status of a Major CAR.</td></tr>
<tr><td>FSC Major CAR 2009.1</td><td>By the end of calendar year 2009, DNR will:

a) Post property Internet pages with land management objective information for most Tier 1 and Tier 2 DNR properties. (Small Tier 3 property objectives that are not individually listed on the Internet would be covered by the program-wide statements described under "c", below.)
b) Develop a timely schedule for updating the remainder.
c) Provide program-wide statements of objectives for each Land Bureau's property and post them on the Internet.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Deadline</td><td>December 31, 2009</td></tr>
<tr><td>Reference</td><td>FSC Indicators 7.1.a.2, 7.2.a., 7.3.a</td></tr>
<tr><td>DNR Response to the CAR</td><td>Part "a":

For perspective, WI DNR land falls into the following master planning categories:
<table><tr><td>Tier 1</td><td>56 properties</td><td>943,579 acres (includes State Forests)</td></tr><tr><td>Tier 2</td><td>430 properties</td><td>511,540 acres</td></tr></table></td></tr>
</table>

Tier 3	936 properties (of which 656 are included in certification)	230,716 acres (of which about 100,000 acres are included in certification)

The Land Division Bureaus report the following status for the approximate 250 Tier 1 and Tier 2 properties that needed additional objective statements at the time of the 2009 surveillance audit:

Fishery Lands – A fishery property page (similar to WM, ER) was developed. Property write-ups for 33 of the 34 Tier 1 and Tier 2 Fishery areas were completed and posted. The N. Branch Embarrass River F.A. was not completed because the Department does not yet own any property.

Note: The public web pages also contain write-ups for some Tier 3 fishery properties. These write-ups were not required by the CAR. The excel spreadsheet above lists the Tier 1 and Tier 2 fish areas.

Endangered Resources—Although ER has only 8 Tier 1 or Tier 2 properties, objectives have been added to the web site for 347 DNR-owned state natural areas.

Wildlife Management – There were 177 Tier 1 or Tier 2 wildlife properties for which narratives needed to be added to the State Wildlife Areas website. These are all done, but not all are posted as of 12/18/09. WM is striving to have them all posted by 12/30/09 (but will have them all online by Jan. 29).

Additional Actions and Accomplishments: The Tier 1 and 2 wildlife management property descriptions were completed and posted by January 29, 2010. Updates and additional features are being added as material becomes available.

Facilities and Lands – The only property requiring a write-up was the Pike Wild River property. This has been done. The remaining properties either have recent master plans, or the plans will be updated within 5 years.

Parks and Recreation – The Parks Internet site includes a master plan link for

each State Park and Trail property web page.

(Note: the objectives contained in these State Park and Trail property plans are current. Any modifications to those objectives would require a master plan amendment process which involves public involvement and Natural Resources Board approval.)

DNR is working on a web re-design that will make finding information about Department properties much easier for the public. We anticipate the current property pages will migrate to this new system by the end of 2010. All DNR properties, regardless of property type will be in one location for a "one stop shopping approach".

Part "b" – schedule for updating the remaining property objectives:

Land Function	Number Remaining	Planned Completion Date
Fishery Areas	1	Unknown. When property is acquired. No DNR owned/managed property currently in this project
ER	N/A	
WM	N/A. All 177 are written but not all are posted yet.	Targeting completion of posting by 12/30/09. Latest completion of posting by 1/29/10. Completed – see "part a" above.
LF	N/A	
Parks	N/A	

Part "c" –

Program-wide statements of objectives:

Program-wide objectives such as those found in Statute, Administrative Code, and in Strategic Plans have been incorporated into the respective property web pages. The Bureau of Parks will also be including "The Heritage Resources Management Plan" and "Managing Forests on State Park Lands Policy" to their external website (anticipated posting Jan. 29, 2010).

Additional Actions and Accomplishments: The two documents referenced above have been posted to the Department's internet page at:

	http://dnr.wi.gov/org/land/parks/reports/
Auditors' Response	*Sufficient evidence of the development of preliminary land management objectives was provided to warrant closure of this non-conformance. This evidence was provided electronically or is available on the internet. The Lead Auditor reviewed a sample of the information to confirm that it brings the Department into conformance with the FSC requirements under Indicators 7.1.a.2, 7.2.a., 7.3.a. While the Department has clearly accomplished a substantial level of increased performance regarding the articulation of land management objectives for each of the properties it manages, the articulation of objectives to guide management activities remains an ongoing task. We are confident that the Department will continue on the course of action initiated in response to this CAR. See the pertinent 2010 Observation later in this report.* **CAR 2009.1 is Closed**

Background/Justification: This Major Corrective Action Request is a follow-on to CAR 2008.3 (Master Plan implementation monitoring), as insufficient progress in addressing the Minor CAR was observed during the 2009 surveillance audit. Accordingly, SCS is obligated to raise the issue to the status of a Major CAR.	
FSC Major CAR 2009.2	By the end of calendar year 2009, the Land Division must develop a Master Plan implementation monitoring system for Tier 1 and Tier 2 properties with DNR Administrative Rule NR 44 plans that is functionally equivalent to the State Forests program.
Deadline	December 31, 2009
Reference	*FSC Indicator 8.1.b*
DNR response to the CAR	Monitoring for completed NR 44 Plans: On November 5 the Land Leadership Team approved a policy to annually measure accomplishments against master plan objectives for completed NR44 plans (there are 16) and those master plans completed in the next 5-year window of planning (2010-2014). On average, six new plans would be added to the monitoring list each year. Annual monitoring reports will be completed by property managers or their supervisors and follow a common template (attached below under additional documentation) with guidance for completing the templates covered in a memo from the Regional Land Leader (also attached below).

Additional Actions and Accomplishments:

- A "monitoring team" was established with representatives from each program
- A comprehensive monitoring report template was developed that is functionally equivalent to the state forest template (see updated template below).
- The request for reports was shared via a memo (see updated memo below) from the program bureau directors to the impacted property managers. The memo shows a list of the properties for which monitoring reports were requested.
- All Tier 1 and Tier 2 state properties which had a NR 44 compliant master plan completed prior to 2009 completed a 2009 monitoring report.
    - Six state forest master plan monitoring reports were completed. Reports were posted online.
    - Twelve state park system master plan monitoring reports were completed and posted online.
    - Five monitoring reports were completed for Fisheries, Wildlife, and Natural Resource Areas and were posted online.

The following systems will be used to monitor accomplishments in lieu of completed NR44 plans:

The State Natural Areas Program- Endangered Resources (ER) has eight properties that require Tier II master plans:

- Cedarburg Bog
- Quincy Bluff
- Bibon Swamp
- Dells of the Wisconsin River
- Rush Creek
- Lulu Lake
- Spread Eagle Barrens
- Baileys Harbor Boreal Forest and Wetlands.

ER will use the same monitoring format as that used on state forests. Of the eight sites, four have old management plans with activities that will fit with that format. Two are in master planning, and two are old plans without

	measureable objectives. These four sites will be filled in when the master plans are completed. Two of these should be completed in early 2010. This will be ERs primary plan monitoring tool but ER is also involved in the monitoring process described in the paragraph below. **Additional Actions and Accomplishments:** - The Lower Chippewa River SNA master was approved by the NRB at the February Board meeting. http://dnr.wi.gov/org/land/er/sna/index.asp?SNA=342 - The Cedarburg Bog SNA is an active master plan project. http://dnr.wi.gov/org/land/er/sna/index.asp?SNA=2 - The status of monitoring reports including 2009 accomplishments is found on all 8 Tier II SNA web pages (http://dnr.wi.gov/org/land/er/sna/alpha.htm). The Fisheries, Wildlife and Facilities and Lands programs- These programs will use the triennial evaluation of the goals and objectives of the Fisheries, Wildlife, and Habitat Management Plan for Wisconsin (2007 – 2013) (FWHMP) as the monitoring tool for Tier 1 and Tier 2 properties without NR44 plans. This Fish, Wildlife, and Habitat Management plan specifically describes how the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) will implement DNR's mission and its strategic plan in the programs that work with fish, wildlife, and their habitats. It is the document that guides Department staff in the work that we do to protect, improve and manage habitat, game animals, sport fish, and non-game wildlife and related outdoor recreation opportunities. Every three years we report our accomplishments in meeting the goals and objectives of the FWHMP plan by addressing the following points: • Did we accomplish the objectives? If not, why not? • Highlight the most significant accomplishments. • Highlight the most significant objectives that were not accomplished and explain why. Regional supervisors, Bureau sections chiefs and the Bureau director coordinate periodic reviews of projects under their supervision to determine what is being accomplished compared to objectives and performance measures, identify any problems and possible solutions for completing a project and determine if a project should be modified in budget and/or scope.

	The information gathered is also used as a means for evaluating the need to modify/add/delete objectives for the next 6 year FWHMP. **Additional Actions and Accomplishments:** - The mid-term evaluation of the FWHMP has recently been completed. Updates on individual objectives within the FWHMP are imbedded within the text in *italics* – see attachment below (under "additional documentation"). The follow-up actions to be taken as a result of this evaluation have not yet occurred and shall be reported on during the FY2011 audit. - Wildlife has implemented a new accomplishment reporting system that is property based and set up as an Access database that will meet the annual reporting needs for the 6-year plan and allow Wildlife to collect property specific accomplishments for the first time. That accomplishment reporting is occurring now. (Access database will be made available upon request). The State Parks Program- The Bureau of Parks will monitor properties without NR 44 plans by evaluating progress on reaching 4 strategic goals from the Parks Strategic Plan. This plan was developed with extensive public input and was approved by the Park Management Team and the Natural Resources Board. Goals (attached below) will be monitored annually and tied to the annual property inspection reports (attached below) that are already required by Statute. Monitoring results will be sent through supervisory channels to the Parks Bureau and the Parks Management Team (PMT). The PMT will update the Land Leadership Team on the results and report on their recommended courses of action. **Additional Actions and Accomplishments:** The Bureau of Parks developed a document (attached below) which describes the monitoring actions of the four Park System Strategic Plan goals related to this CAR.
Additional Documentation	Additional documentation confirming ongoing follow-up work in completing unit-specific annual accomplishment reports was provide to the audit team prior the August 2010 surveillance audit; this information was conveyed electronically and is

	on file at the SCS offices.
Auditors' Response	*Sufficient evidence of the development of master plan implementation monitoring procedures and the posting of completed templates on the internet was provided to warrant closure of this non-conformance. The audit team reviewed a sample of the unit-specific accomplishment reports to confirm that the Department has now instituted an implementation monitoring system that is sufficiently responsive to this CAR and that constitutes adequate conformance with the FSC requirements under FSC Indicator 8.1.b. The audit team takes positive note of the fact that DNR's response exceeds what was requested in this CAR by incorporating into its response strategy units that do not have NR44 plans. See the pertinent 2010 Observation later in this report.* **CAR 2009.2 is Closed**

Background/Justification: This Major Corrective Action Request is a follow-on to CAR 2008.6 (training and licensing for pesticide applicators), as insufficient progress in addressing the Minor CAR was observed during the 2009 surveillance audit. Accordingly, SCS is obligated to raise the issue to the status of a Major Corrective Action Request.	
FSC Major CAR 2009.3	By the end of calendar year 2009, WI DNR will: a) Revise Manual Code 4230.1 in respect to consistent pesticide training requirements and implement the changes by Land and Forestry Division Administrator directives pending the DNR Secretary signing the revision. b) Create a DNR Intranet page with training requirements and pesticide use information. c) Inform DNR managers and staff of the pesticide use training policy through an internal newsletter.
Deadline	December 31, 2009
Reference	*FSC Indicator 6.6.b*
Accomplishments	a) The Land, Forestry and Water Division Administrators have approved a Division Directive that implements a uniform pesticide-use training standard. A team is being appointed to develop a comprehensive revision of MC 4230.1 in 2010. The training standard is but a small part of the planned revision, which will take more time to formally complete. **Additional Actions and Accomplishments:** The majority of the language and policy are in place for developing into a

	manual code. Finalizing the proposed manual code will be done when the Department-wide pesticide use team is in place. The full team has not yet been appointed by Department Administration. DNR staff recently met with DATCP and UWEX staff to discuss certification and training issues. DNR and UW staff will be suggesting revisions to ATCP 29 administrative rules to expand the right-of-way certification to include natural area management. This would greatly reduce the number of categories DNR staff and others would need to get certified in. b) A DNR Intranet Pesticide Use page has been completed and linked for the DNR Intranet homepage, which all staff have easy access to. The Pesticide-Use Toolbox has also been mirrored on the Wisconsin SAF Internet for access by external foresters. c) Availability of the Toolbox was announced via e-mail on Nov. 24 and included in a December Forestreeporter newsletter. **Additional Actions and Accomplishments (for b & c):** - The toolbox and website are in place. Revisions will be made as needed. - Trainings have been conducted for some, but not all DNR staff who use pesticides. - A comprehensive, interdisciplinary, Property Managers Handbook is currently being developed. Pesticide use is one of the topics. The text will point the reader in the direction of the toolbox, website, manual code and other pertinent resources. Expected posting date of September 15, 2010. - Wildlife staff were updated during a Land Management Update spring 2010 to remind staff of the page and its value for guiding pesticide use.
Additional Documentation	Prior to the 2010 surveillance audit, DNR provided the audit team with 4 additional electronic documents indicating ongoing actions in response to this CAR. These documents are on file at the SCS offices.
Auditors' Response	*Overall, the audit team concludes that the responsive actions undertaken by the Department warrant closure of this CAR. While new Manual Code has not yet been instituted, a Divisional Directive was formally promulgated that, in our judgment, is functionally equivalent in its effect if not as permanent and insulated from change/reversal. Regarding part (b) of the CAR: the Department has posted pesticide training procedures on their Intranet site, linked to the homepage so as to enable easy access by all staff. Regarding part (c) of the CAR: the new*

	pesticide training and guidance materials have been announced to all DNR staff through the Departmental newsletter, Forestreeporter. The Department is committed to but has not yet accomplished the creation of a Deparment-wide pesticide use team. See: follow-up CAR 2010.1 **CAR 2009.3 is Closed**

Background/Justification: During the 2009 field audit, it was learned that a DNR Wildlife Biologist had planted GMO Roundup-Ready Soybeans with DNR equipment on a field being preparing for conversion to prairie. This field is within the scope of the FSC certificate as it is not an excised sharecropping parcel. The DNR biologist did not know that FSC prohibits use of GMOs on certified land.	
FSC Minor CAR 2009.4	DNR must develop a policy in regard to staff not planting GMOs on lands within the scope of the Department's FSC certificate and provide related training by the end of 2009.
Deadline	December 31, 2009
Reference	*FSC Criterion 6.8*
Accomplishments	A GMO policy was developed and submitted to the Land, Forestry and Water Division Administrators for approval. It will be implemented by directive while the Manual Code is going through the formal approval process. **Additional Actions and Accomplishments:** The Directive went out to all staff. All Wildlife staff were reminded at the Spring 2010 Land Management Update.
Additional Documentation	Prior to the 2010 surveillance audit, DNR provided the audit team with 2 additional electronic documents pertinent to this CAR: the GMO Cover Memo and the GMO Administrative Directive. These documents are on file at the SCS offices.
Auditor's Response	*On the basis of the corrective actions undertaken by DNR in response to this CAR, the audit team concludes that closure of the CAR is warranted. We have reviewed the new Administrative Directive and we find it to accomplish what is needed—to assure that GMO plants are not introduced onto the lands managed by the DNR. We also conclude that follow-up actions, such as wide distribution of the Directive, constitute adequate training on the new GMO policy. That is, the procedures now in place assure that DNR is managing the lands within the scope of the certificate in full compliance with FSC Indicator 6.8.*

	CAR 2009.4 is Closed

Observations: The 2009 audit team issued three Observations.

Observation 2009.1: The ICIT is presently developing new Manual Code guidance for the appropriate seed mixes to use on DNR properties and guidance for evaluating seed mix content. This process was underway during the August 2009 surveillance audit. Completion of this initiative and Secretary approval as new Manual Code will be helpful in better demonstrating conformance with FSC Criterion 6.8.

DNR Response: Other accomplishments have been made related to the use of appropriate seed mixes in both the Invasive Species and Water Quality BMP manuals. Both documents include appendices that provide guidance on species mixes recommended for revegetation. The appendix in the draft update to the water quality BMP manual was based on the invasive species BMP seed mix information.

Auditor Comments after 2010 Audit: Development of new Manual Code guidance regarding seed mixes simply was not a priority for the Department over the past year due to workload issues associated with ongoing staff and budget reductions. DNR Staff believe that there is little to no risk of the current seed mixes leading to invasive plant species problems. This will be examined in subsequent annual surveillance audits.

Observation 2009.2: There is an opportunity for establishing better guidance for field foresters who develop timber harvesting prescriptions in State Natural Areas and Native Community Management Areas.

DNR Response: All SNA data found in WisFIRS was quality checked to assure the natural area codes and passive/active management codes were in place. A draft ER Handbook chapter on the management of oak savanna has been accomplished. The handbook update process is the only task remaining for the guidance to be published. Two meetings among the SNA program staff, local field foresters, and the state silviculturalist has developed basic guidance for managed old-

growth at two sites. The old-growth hemlock chapter has been completed and is now part of the old-growth handbook. Staff are continuing to work on new chapters for additional forest cover types.

Auditor Comments after 2010 Audit: DNR Staff have made significant progress in producing new chapters for the ER Handbook and continue to add new forest cover types to the handbook. It is our sense that DNR has taken actions that will improve the coordination between SNA/ NCMA managers and Division of Forestry foresters who develop harvesting prescriptions that may intersect with or occur within these special allocation areas.

Observation 2009.3: There is an opportunity to enhance protection of vernal pools by developing additional guidelines.

DNR Response:
Accomplishments:

- The Forestry BMPs for Water Quality were updated (effective 1/1/11) to include a discussion of types of common forested wetland types (including ephemeral ponds) and a filter strip provision is now applicable to all types of wetlands, including ephemeral ponds.
- A grant was secured from the USDA Forest Service State and Private Forestry Northeastern Area to evaluate a mapping protocol for ephemeral ponds and to monitor ephemeral ponds in northern Wisconsin. At least 25 ephemeral ponds will be selected in Conservation Opportunity Areas (COAs) identified in the State Wildlife Action Plan. The monitoring information will be used to develop a classification system and to evaluate different management histories around the ephemeral ponds. When the project is complete, the data and classification system are expected to inform the development of management guidelines for ephemeral ponds.

Auditor Comments after 2010 Audit: DNR staff has completed a significant amount of background work on the science behind vernal pools and other riparian buffers and have modified existing guidelines to protect water resources. The new guidelines will go into effect in January of 2011. Overall, a solid response to this Observation.

2.5 General Observations from the 2010 Surveillance Audit

Significant Changes, Initiatives and Actions in the Wisconsin State Forest program

No change in lands included or excluded within the scope of the certificate.

Changes to programs since the 2009 surveillance audit:

1) New BMP's for ponds, wetlands will go into effect in January of 2011.
2) The nursery in Hayward will be closed.
3) The Department was reorganized and was reduced from 4 to 3 Bureaus. The Forest Science group was combined with another Bureau.
4) New strategy for Forestry (all forests) was completed in June.
5) Stewardship land acquisition was reauthorized. Counties can now share the 7.5million/year but must cost-share 50%.
6) Master planning filled a new LTE position for wildlife facilities. The Black River master plan has been completed; Flambeau is going to the Board for approval and the Governor Knowles plan is still in process. Other divisions continue to work their way through the master planning process.

Changes in personnel from last year:

1) Personnel changes: Paul Pingrey retired, position has not yet been filled—it is considered to be a "priority position;" however, there is little confidence that it will be filled within the next year. In the interim, ICIT team will play a central role in heading up certification issues. In general, unfilled positions increased to 12% (from 3% in 2009) and staff are required to take furloughs days/year. In addition, there was a 10% budget cut from 2009 to 2010. More outside contractors were hired to complete work. There was a proposal to close some camp sites, but it did not pass. There is a 25% vacancy rate for Parks.

2) A new Governor will be elected in the fall and there has been an emphasis on government down-sizing. As with all changes in administrations, it is possible/likely that the Department will have a new Director after the election and some administrators have already left their positions.

Summary of Auditor Findings:

The bottom line conclusion of the SCS audit team, as represented by the absence of any new Major Non-Conformities, is that the Wisconsin DNR's administration and management of the State Forests and "other state lands" within the scope of the FSC certificate continues to constitute a high level of land stewardship that is demonstrably in conformance with the certification standard. As with prior years' audits, the ongoing pattern of staff and budget reductions within the Department establishes a tension between what the Department is able to accomplish and what the certification standard requires. To date, the Department has been able to resolve this tension through variations on the strategy of "making do with less" but clearly this approach has its limits. It is our sense that continued reductions in staff and budgets will, sooner rather than later, lead to irreconcilable gaps in the Department's capacity to operate in conformance with the certification standard.

2.6 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations Resulting from the 2010 Surveillance Audit

Background/Justification:	
Minor CAR 2010.1	In order to assure a more permanent solution to the requirement for adequate training in the use of pesticides on lands managed by the DNR, complete the creation of the Department-wide pesticide use team which, in turn, must develop revised Manual Code language regarding pesticide use training requirements.
Deadline	2011 Surveillance Audit
Reference	*FSC Regional Indicator 6.6.d*

2010 Observations:

Observation 2010.1: There is an opportunity to enhance the robustness (depth and clarity) and operational utility of property-specific land management objectives that have been articulated in response to Major CAR 2009.1.

Observation 2010.2: There is an opportunity to enhance the robustness of management plan implementation, and the reporting thereof, that has been established in response to Major CAR 2009.2.

Observation 2010.3: A more permanent solution for assuring that GMO plant material is not deployed on the lands covered by the certificate would be beneficial (e.g., Manual Code versus Directive

Observation 2010.4: Filling the vacancy in the certification coordinator position detracts would be beneficial in terms of maintaining and enhancing conformity to the certification standard. More generally, continued reductions in staffing levels incrementally increase the risks that the Department will be unable to demonstrate ongoing conformity to the certification standard

Observation 2010.5: There are opportunities for property managers to better document (and then utilize) the results of annual property planning meetings in which personnel from across divisions meet to establish intended activities for the coming year.

Observation 2010.6: Senior management should continue to encourage foresters to adopt a service mentality when working with managers of properties other than state forests so that harvesting prescriptions are more fully responsive to property managers' habitat management objectives.

Observation 2010.7: Conformance to rutting policy, while sufficient to constitute compliance with the standard, could be more consistent.

Observation 2010.8: On the part of field foresters, there could be better uptake and utilization of new structural retention guidelines for even-aged harvesting prescriptions.

Observation 2010.9: It would be beneficial for senior management to clarify how Act 166 applies to properties that have a master plan that is considered to still provide relevant direction and guidance, especially in circumstances where master plan guidance does not call for commercial timber harvesting.

2.7 Certification Decision Resulting from the Annual Surveillance Audit

Based upon information gathered through site visits, interviews, and document review, SCS concludes that management of the WI DNR administered State Forests and "Other Lands" continues to be in sufficient overall conformance with the FSC Principles and Criteria, as elaborated by the Lake States Regional Standard. That is, the SCS audit team has concluded from this annual audit that the DNR's forest management program is in general conformance with FSC Principles 1 through 9 (Principle 10 is not applicable as the State Forests are classified as "natural forest management" under the FSC definitions). As such, we conclude that continuation of the WI DNR FSC-endorsed forest management (FM) certificate is

warranted, subject to timely closure of open one CAR and subject to future annual surveillance audits.

3.0 Detailed Observations

This section presents the auditors' conformity assessment against selected elements of the certification standard. Note that annual surveillance audits are not "full scope." Only during initial and subsequent 5-year re-certification evaluations is the audit conducted against the full scope of the certification standard. In addition to focusing on the elements of the standard associated with the open CARs, SCS auditors selected Principle 6 for assessment in 2010.

3.1 Evaluation of Conformance

C= Conformance
C*= Overall Conformance, but there are outstanding discretionary CARs
NC= Non-Conformance

PRINCIPLE #6: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
Forest Management shall conserve biological diversity and its associated values, water resources, souls, and unique and fragile ecosystems and landscapes, and, by so doing, maintain the ecological functions and the integrity of the forest

C6.1. Assessments of environmental impacts shall be completed—appropriate to the scale, intensity of forest management and the uniqueness of the affected resources—and adequately integrated into management systems. Assessments shall include landscape level considerations as well as the impacts of on-site processing facilities. Environmental impacts shall be assessed prior to commencement of site-disturbing operations.		**C**
1.a. Using credible scientific analyses and local expertise, an assessment of current conditions is completed to include: Disturbance regimes and successional pathways;	C	Managers do an excellent job of assessing all of the affected resources. DNR has information or created data layers that allow them to assess current condition of managed properties. This information is located in a variety of

Unique, vulnerable, rare, and threatened communities; Common plants, animals, and their habitats; Sensitive, threatened, and endangered species and their habitats; Water resources; and • Soil resources (see also Indicators 7.1.a and b).		locations/documents. As an example, the planning handbook indicates that "Maintaining or improving biological diversity is essential to an ecological approach. Activities that improve biological diversity vary depending on the ecosystem and its capability: the mix, relative abundance, and patch sizes of vegetative communities should be based in part on natural disturbance regimes and historical vegetation". This information is used to "set the stage" for activities planned in the Master Plan for a management unit. The NHI has data on occurrence and locations of rare features. Silvicultural handbook has information on natural disturbance regimes and historical locations of habitat types in the State. The Master Planning process currently in use utilizes a range of regional assessments compiled by staff specialists. Natural Heritage Inventory identifies rare species and their habitats and is reviewed prior to project implementation.

6.1.b. Using available science and local expertise, the current ecological conditions are compared to both the historical conditions and desired future conditions within the landscape context. This comparison is done by employing the baseline factors identified in 6.1.a.	C	Field visits confirmed use of available science and local experience. Master plans that have been completed recently compare current condition of the management unit to both historic and desired future condition. Recent Master Plans include reference to historical conditions through incorporation of ecological assessments. Restoration efforts underway on numerous properties to enhance unique communities (e.g., Lower Chippewa River SNA, Casey Lake, Crex Meadows Barrens).
6.1.c. Prior to the commencement of management activities, potential short-term environmental impacts and their cumulative effects are evaluated.	C	The WDNR is doing an excellent job of evaluating environmental impacts. It is evident that DNR assess potential short-term impacts of management activities prior to commencement of these activities (e.g., impacts of logging equipment on soil compaction). Impacts to water resources are addressed in water quality permitting process.
6.1.d. Using assessments derived from the above information, management options are developed and implemented to achieve the long-term desired future conditions and ecological functions of	C	The WDNR is doing an excellent job of long-term management. It is evident that DNR personnel have developed appropriate management options for various habitat types to move them to a desired future condition.

the forest (see also Criterion 7.1).		Updated Master Plans incorporate ecological assessments and clearly identify a variety of management options.
C 6.2. Safeguards shall exist which protect rare, threatened and endangered species and their habitats (e.g., nesting and feeding areas). Conservation zones and protection areas shall be established, appropriate to the scale and intensity of forest management and the uniqueness of the affected resources. Inappropriate hunting, fishing, trapping, and collecting shall be controlled.		**C**

6.2.a. Although species that are state and/or Federally listed as threatened, endangered, of special concern, or sensitive, and their habitats are identified, their specific locations remain confidential.	C	Locations of rare features are pixilized up to a township section in data that are accessible by the public. The NHI database identifies species locations and is utilized across all units. Data remains confidential for sensitive species. The data base is only accessible to managers. The backlog in entering new occurrences into the database, which was the focus of prior corrective action requests, has been eliminated.
6.2.b. If scientific data indicate the likely presence of state and/or Federally listed as threatened, endangered, of special concern, or sensitive populations, either new surveys are carried out before field-management activities begin or the forest owner or manager assumes their presence and makes appropriate modifications in forest management.	C	We observed that foresters routinely use the NHI database to determine presence and location of rare features in a stand that has been identified for management. Surveys are carried out prior to management activities taking place. A meeting with a wildlife biologist determines whether new surveys are required or what the appropriate management should be to protect the feature. Audit revealed numerous examples of modifications made to project plans to protect sensitive species and their habitats. Biotic inventories conducted prior to Master Plan developments on state forests. DNR has array of species experts that are available for consultation. Where warranted, DNR does carry out new surveys for special status species (e.g., level 1 and level 2 surveys for Karner blue butterfly).

6.2.c. For management planning purposes, forest owners or managers of publicly owned and large privately owned forests use, participate in, or carry out on-the-ground assessments for the occurrence of state and/or Federally listed as threatened, endangered, of special concern, or sensitive species.	C	This happens on many of the properties; however, staff shortages and low budgets make it difficult to do the job as thoroughly as most managers would like. This information is collected during RECON. For areas that do not have a master plan, or that have an old master plan, new biotic inventories have been or are currently being conducted. Biotic inventories and ecological assessments conducted prior to State Forest Master Planning processes.
6.2.d. Where they have been identified, state and/or Federally listed as threatened, endangered, of special concern, or sensitive species and their habitats are maintained and/or restored. Multiple-use management activities are acceptable, where the law allows, in these species' habitat areas to the extent that they are compatible with maintenance and restoration of the species.	C	SNAs protect or restore habitat for rare ecological species. The species and habitats are protected and enhanced if possible. Fire is often used to restore more open habitats like pine or oak barrens. Priority given to rare and sensitive species and habitats across all state lands. State Natural Areas primary role is protection and maintenance of special communities. Wildlife management areas often target unique habitats and rare species.
6.2.e. If a state and/or Federally listed as threatened, endangered, of special concern, or sensitive species is determined to be present, its location is reported to the manager of the species' database.	C	The observed backlog of data input to NHI data base in 2008 has been remedied. As of 2009, there are 104 records/reports that are ready to be mapped in the backlog. 140 additional records are not ready to be mapped. Staff indicated that the NHI backlog will be greatly reduced by the end of 2010.
C6.3. Ecological functions and values shall be maintained intact, enhanced, or restored, including: a) Forest regeneration and succession. b) Genetic, species, and ecosystem diversity. c) Natural cycles that affect the productivity of the forest ecosystem.		**C**
C6.3.a. Forest regeneration and succession		**C**
6.3.a.1. Forest owners or managers make management decisions using credible scientific information (e.g., site classification) and information	C	All of the factors are evaluated and considered when the managers make the decision on what prescriptions will be carried out on the properties.

on landscape patterns (e.g., land use/land cover, non-forest uses, habitat types); ecological characteristics of adjacent forested stands (e.g., age, productivity, health); species' requirements; and frequency, distribution, and intensity of natural disturbances		This information is available in a number of documents including the Silvicultural Handbook. Land managers utilize the Kotar Habitat Classification System in assessing land capabilities. Field audit demonstrated a full range of management options being implemented that address local management goals and objectives. Planting activities target biodiversity considerations and promotion of unique communities. DNR Bureau of Endangered Resources personnel, especially regional ecologists, work closely with area managers.

6.3.a.2. Silvicultural practices encourage regeneration that moves the forest toward a desired future condition, consistent with information gathered in 6.3.a.1.	C	We observed that field personnel use appropriate silvicultural techniques to move the forest toward a desired future condition. Management practices promote underrepresented communities (e.g., jack pine, white pine, oak). Early successional management emphasis on several wildlife management areas with big tree silviculture and native community management evident on state forests. Every effort is made to move the forest to the desired future condition. The Silviculture Handbook plays a key role in assuring conformance to this Indicator.
6.3.a.3. Measures are taken to ensure the retention of endemic and difficult-to-regenerate species.	C	We observed that considerable effort is being made to regenerate oak (red, white and burr). Management practices promote underrepresented communities.
6.3.a.4. Across the forest, or the landscape in which it is located, management actions lead to a distribution of successional stages, age classes, and community types appropriate to the scale and intensity of the operation and desired future conditions.	C	There are solid efforts being made to make this happen. We observed a variety of forest management activities that will result in a number of different successional stages and community types across the landscape. State Forests and WMA's address a wide range of community types and successional stages. Harvests target stand improvement and address gaps in age class distributions. State Forest Master Plans

		incorporate Native Community Management emphasis.
6.3.a.5. When even-aged management (see Glossary) is employed, live trees and native vegetation are retained within the harvest unit in a proportion and configuration that is consistent with the characteristic natural disturbance regime in each community type (see Glossary). Exceptions may be allowed when retention at a lower level is necessary for purposes of forest restoration and/or rehabilitation or to maintain community types that exist on the site (e.g., oak-hickory, jack pine). The level of retention increases proportionally to the size of the harvest unit.	C	New green tree retention guidelines went into effect in January of 2010 and training has been done to get foresters and biologists up to date with the new BMP's. The audit team found that the uptake and use of the new BMP's was not uniformly strong across the sites visited in 2010, especially on two sites in the Governor Knowles State Forest. See OBS 2010.8.

C6.3.b. Genetic, species, and ecosystem diversity	**C**	
6.3.b.1. Forest management conserves native plant and animal communities and species.	C	We observed that forest management on SNA's and State Parks are consistently managing for native plant communities. .Management activities across all divisions emphasize native communities with efforts observed to reduce or eliminate non-native species (ie. buckthorn removal). Solid effort is made to conserve and enhance native plant and animal communities.
6.3.b.2. The forest owner or manager cooperates with local, state, and Federal agencies to protect and manage native plant and animal communities and species.	C	DNR is doing an excellent job in this respect. The DNR is mandated to protect Federally listed species. State land management clearly demonstrates emphasis of native communities and species.
6.3.b.3. There is a consistent scientific method for selecting trees to plant, harvest and retain in order to preserve and/or enhance broad genetic and species diversity.	C	Silvicultural handbook was developed by working groups of species experts familiar with local land capabilities. Excellent job.
6.3.b.4. Forest owners or managers maximize habitat connectivity to the extent possible at the landscape level (e.g., through an ecological classification system, at the subsection or land-type association level).	C	Master plans for several SNA's include plans to purchase private in-holdings to protect larger blocks of habitats and communities. This is also a conservation action in the new Wildlife Action Plan. Ecological assessments utilized in recent Master Plans include opportunities to promote connectivity and were incorporated into native

		community management areas.
C6.3.c. Natural cycles that affect the productivity of the forest ecosystem	**C**	
6.3.c.1. Biological legacies of the forest community are retained at the forest and stand levels, consistent with the objectives of the management plan, including but not limited to: large live and declining trees, coarse dead wood, logs, snags, den trees, and soil organic matter.	C	New green tree retention guidelines went into effect in January of 2010 and training has been done to get foresters and biologists up to date with the new BMP's. FSC Obs 2010.5. The audit team found that the uptake and use of the new BMP's was not uniformly strong across the sites visited in 2010, especially on two sites in the Govenror Knowles State Forest.
6.3.c.2. Forest management practices maintain soil fertility and organic matter, especially in the A horizon, while minimizing soil erosion and compaction. If degradation of soil quality occurs, as indicated by declining fertility or forest health, forest owners or managers modify soil management techniques.	C	Emphasis shown on restricting harvests in moist soils to dry or frozen ground conditions. BMP's in place and being utilized to reduce soil impacts. Rutting guidelines in timber sale contracts. Policy is under development that will greatly assist mangers in this endeavor and they are already doing an adequate job with current techniques and knowledge.
6.3.c.3. Forest management practices maintain or restore aquatic ecosystems, wetlands (including peatlands, bogs, and vernal pools), and forested riparian areas (see also Criterion 6.5).	C	We observed that in one area of the State a concerted effort to map and protect vernal pools was undertaken. BMP's followed for protecting wetlands across state lands. Harvest plans include areas identified where equipment use is restricted to protect wetlands. Excellent job. New guidelines will go into effect January of 2011.
6.3.c.4. Responses (such as salvage) to catastrophic events (such as wildfire, blowdown, and epidemics) are limited by ecological constraints.	C	Several pine harvests (Brule River) were in response to insect and disease outbreaks. Responses to catastrophic events, (windfall and disease vectors) show a reasonable degree of environmental restraint. All factors are considered prior to conducting salvage operations.
C6.4. Representative samples of existing ecosystems within the landscape shall be protected in their natural state and recorded on maps, appropriate to the scale and intensity of operations and the uniqueness of the affected resources.		**C**

6.4.a. Forest owners and managers protect and reserve ecologically viable representative areas that are appropriate to the scale and intensity of the operation.	C	Wisconsin has one of the best SNA programs in the US and new properties are continually added. The audit included reviews of portions of the State Natural Area system. Biotic inventories and ecological assessments prepared with BER staff involvement were utilized during preparation of State Forest Master Plans. Field observations confirmed that the managers go to great lengths to protect and preserve ecologically viable representative areas.
6.4.b. Where existing protected areas within the landscape are not of adequate size and configuration to serve as representative samples of commonly occurring forest types as defined above, owners or managers of mid-sized and large forests, whose properties are conducive to the establishment of such areas, designates ecologically viable areas to serve these purposes.	C	BER staff heavily involved in development of current network of reserve areas across the state. Outstanding efforts in this area.
6.4.c. The size and arrangement and time scale of on-site representative sample areas are designated and justified using assessment methods and sources of up-to-date information described in 6.1.	C	The WAP identifies areas in the State (all land ownerships) that have significant conservation value. State Natural Areas cover full representation of natural communities across the state. Up to date information is utilized where available.
6.4.d. Unless exceptional circumstances can be documented, known areas of intact old-growth forests are designated as representative sample areas under purpose 3. (See Applicability Note under 6.4 above) and are reviewed for designation as High Conservation Value Forests (HCVF- see also Applicability note under 6.3). Known areas of unentered stands of old-growth are carefully reviewed, screened for uniqueness, and considered as potential representative sample areas prior to undertaking any active management within them (see Applicability Note under 6.4). Old growth stands not designated as either a HCVF or a representative sample area are, at a minimum, managed to maintain their old-growth structure, composition, and ecological functions under purpose 3.	C	Biotic inventories conducted prior to recent Master Plan development identified and protected representative samples of old forests areas on NH/AL State Forest. A 1500 acre old growth forest was recently purchased in Iron County.
6.4.e. The size and extent of representative samples on public lands being considered for certification is determined through a transparent planning process that not only utilizes scientifically credible analyses and expertise but is also accessible and responsive to the public.	C	DNR has a process to include public input on planning documents. Master Plan process currently in place allows public participation and incorporates scientific analysis. Field observation indicates that this is occurring where there are current plans and as new plans are being developed they will be responsive to the public.
6.4.f. The process and rationale used to determine the size and extent of representative samples are	C	A biotic inventory is conducted prior to Master Plan development and is available to the public.

explicitly described in the public summary.		
6.4.g. Managers of large, contiguous public forests (>50,000 acres) create and maintain representative protected areas within the forest area, sufficient in size to encompass the scale and pattern of expected natural disturbances while maintaining the full range of forest types and successional stages resulting from the natural disturbance regime.	C	Several of the SNA's that the team visited protect large blocks of native habitat. While state lands vary in size, the larger state forests include protected areas of sufficient size to encompass the scale and pattern of natural disturbances.

C6.5. Written guidelines shall be prepared and implemented to control erosion; minimize forest damage during harvesting, road construction, and all other mechanical disturbances; and to protect water resources.		**C**
6.5.a. A set of forestry best management practices (BMPs), approved by the state forestry agency or otherwise appropriate jurisdiction (e.g., BIA), that address water quality and soil erosion is adhered to (see also 1.1.b). These guidelines may include provisions on riparian management zones (RMZs), skidding, access roads, site preparation, log landings, stream crossings, disturbance of sensitive sites, and wetlands.	C	BMP's for forestry practices are in the Silvics Manual, and are utilized on all department properties and incorporated into all timber sale contracts. BMP's for invasive species are in development. BMPs have been developed and they are constantly being updated. Field observation indicated that mangers are using and are knowledgeable of the BMPs.
6.5.b. At a minimum, implementation of BMPs and other resource protection measures will result in the following:	C	By Department policy, BMP's are considered mandatory.
Logging and Site Preparation Logging operations and construction of roads and skid trails are conducted only during periods of weather when soil is least susceptible to compaction, surface erosion, or sediment transport into streams and other bodies of water.	C	Sites are evaluated for proper operating seasons during project planning. Restrictions are documented in timber sale contract to reduce soil movement and compaction. All of the harvest operations visited had specifications in the sale contract to address these issues.
Logging damage to regeneration and residual trees is minimized during harvest operations.	C	Objectives of harvest specified in sale contracts. Sale administrators review sales weekly and notify contractors of excessive damage.
Silvicultural techniques and logging equipment vary with slope, erosion hazard rating, and/or soil instability with the goal of minimizing soil disturbance. Areas that exhibit an extreme risk of	C	In general, harvesting is avoided on steep slopes or areas with high potential for erosion.

landslide are excluded from management activities that may precipitate landslides.		
Plans for site preparation specify the following mitigations to minimize impacts to the forest resources: 1) 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. 2) Top soil disturbance and scarification of soils is limited to the minimum necessary to achieve successful regeneration of desired species.	C	The biomass BMP's should minimize possible future impacts to soil resources. Slash left scattered across most sale areas. Site preparation methods used appear to be the minimum necessary to achieve successful regeneration of target species.
Transportation System (including permanent and temporary haul roads, skid trails, and landings) The transportation system is designed, constructed, maintained, and/or reconstructed to minimize the extent of the road network and its potential cumulative adverse effects.	C	The team observed that roads were adequately maintained and designed. Sales planned to utilize existing road and trail systems to extent possible and protect natural features.
Access to temporary and permanent roads is controlled to minimize significant adverse impacts to soil and biota while allowing legitimate access, as addressed by Principles 3 and 4 and identified in the management plan.	C	We observed that many access roads had permanent locked gates to control access. DNR appears to find a good balance between allowing access and closing roads to avoid potential damage.

Failed drainage structures or other areas of active erosion caused by roads and skid trails are identified, and measures are taken to correct the drainage problems and stabilize erosion.	C	Measures were noted across properties to reduce impacts of transportation systems. Foresters lay out the roads and skid trails on the sales and the logger has to use the designated trails. We noted a failed drainage structure along a trail in the Hoffman Hills State Recreation area caused erosion to occur on a skid trail. The skid trail was placed in the lowest portion topographically on the site which contributed to the erosion problem. See OBS 2010.7.
Stream and Water Quality Protection Stream crossings are located and constructed in a way that minimizes fragmentation of aquatic habitat (see Glossary) and protects water quality.	C	New stream crossings were avoided if at all possible. Excellent job

Visual and Aesthetic Considerations Forest owners or managers limit and/or reduce negative impacts on visual quality caused by forest management operations.	C	The team found a number of management activities that were planned to accommodate visual concerns of trail users. Aesthetics are considered in the design and execution of sales for example at the Hoffman Hills State Recreation Area visited in 2010.
C6.6. Management systems shall promote the development and adoption of environmentally friendly non-chemical methods of pest management and strive to avoid the use of chemical pesticides. World Health Organization Type 1A and 1B and chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides; pesticides that are persistent, toxic or whose derivatives remain biologically active and accumulate in the food chain beyond their intended use; as well as any pesticides banned by international agreement, shall be prohibited. If chemicals are used, proper equipment and training shall be provided to minimize health and environmental risks.		**C**
6.6.a. Forest owners and managers demonstrate compliance with FSC Policy paper: "Chemical Pesticides in Certified Forests, Interpretation of the FSC Principles and Criteria, July 2002" (available at http://www.fsc.org/en/whats_new/documents/Docs_cent/2) and comply with prohibitions and/or restrictions on World Health Organization Type 1A and 1B and chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides; pesticides that are persistent, toxic or whose derivatives remain biologically active and accumulate in the food chain beyond their intended use; as well as any pesticides banned by international agreement.	C	Wisconsin DNR uses many chemicals in their efforts to reduce the impact or eliminate invasive plants and animal species.
6.6.b. Forest owners or managers employ silvicultural systems, integrated pest management, and strategies for controlling vegetation that minimize negative environmental effects. Non-chemical techniques are preferred in the implementation of these strategies.	C	Biotic control included in pest management strategies. In many instances it appeared that the use of chemicals was the preferred choice over alternate treatments.
6.6.c. Forest owners or managers develop written strategies for the control of pests as a component of the management plan (see Criterion 7.1).	C	DNR staff have BMP's for controlling invasive species. Master plans include strategies for pest management on properties. Many of the management plans were written prior to the

		current invasive species problem and new plans will better address this issue.

6.6.d. If chemicals are applied, the most environmentally safe and efficacious chemicals are used. Chemicals are narrowly targeted, and minimize effects on non-target species.	C	BMP's for controlling invasive species outline manual, chemical and biological control for individual species. Guidelines are sensitive to issues involving safety and efficacy. Chemicals being used are most environmentally safe to obtain desired objectives. We did not see evidence that the most environmentally safe chemicals were used or that managers looked at using the minimal dose needed to accomplish the objectives. See "follow on" CAR 2010.1.
6.6.e. Chemicals are used only where they pose no threat to supplies of domestic water, aquatic habitats, or Rare species or plant community types.	C	We observed that field staff had a good awareness of applying appropriate chemicals in the community in which they were working. Emphasis on using "over the counter" herbicides if possible. Field observations indicated this to be the case.
6.6.f. If chemicals are used, a written prescription is prepared that describes the risks and benefits of their use and the precautions that workers will employ.	C	DNR staff are required to get written permission from the agency before applying chemicals. Chemical use plans prepared prior to implementation on state properties. There is an approval process that must be followed prior to the use of chemicals. We observed that Garlon 4 equivalent (Element 4) was used at the Buckhorn and a form 4200-009 was used to get approval for use.
6.6.g. If chemicals are used, the effects are monitored and the results are used for adaptive management. Records are kept of pest occurrences, control measures, and incidences of worker exposure to chemicals.	C	Chemical use is documented and records maintained by certified applicators. Chemicals are generally used as a last resort for treating invasive species.
C6.7. Chemicals, containers, liquid and solid non-organic wastes including fuel and oil shall be disposed of in an environmentally appropriate manner at off-site locations.		
6.7.a. In the event of a spill of hazardous material, forest owners or managers immediately contain the material, report the spill as required by applicable regulations, and engage qualified personnel to perform the appropriate removal and remediation.	C	Sale contracts call for operators to effectively contain spills with on-site spill kits. During field reviews spill kits were not always stored in close proximity of operating equipment. All employees applying restricted use chemicals are required to have a Certifies Applicator License and to follow

		all applicable procedures regarding spills and the use of chemicals.
6.7.b. Waste lubricants, anti-freeze, containers, and related trash are stored in a leakproof container until they are transported to an approved off-site disposal site.	C	Field reviews confirmed proper storage of lubricants and fuel.
6.7.c. Broken or leaking equipment and parts are repaired or removed from the forest.	C	No evidence observed during field review on sale sites of excessive spills or leakage.
6.7.d. Equipment is parked away from riparian management zones, sinkholes, or supplies of ground water.	C	Equipment viewed during audit was parked in acceptable locations. BMP's are incorporated through sale layout to minimize potential for equipment impact in or near riparian areas.
C6.8. Use of biological control agents shall be documented, minimized, monitored, and strictly controlled in accordance with national laws and internationally accepted scientific protocols. Use of genetically modified organisms shall be prohibited.		**C**
6.8.a. Exotic (i.e., non-indigenous), non-invasive predators or biological control agents are used only as part of a pest management strategy for the control of exotic species of plants, pathogens (see Glossary), insects, or other animals when other pest control methods are, or can reasonably be expected to prove, ineffective. Such use is contingent upon peer-reviewed scientific evidence that the agents in question are non-invasive and are safe for indigenous species because, for example, exotic species can host pathogens that might diminish biodiversity in the forest.	C	DNR is employing biological agents for the control of purple loosestrife with great success. Use of biological control agents is limited on state properties. Audit noted evidence of use of agents to control purple loosestrife and spotted knapweed. Where biological control agents are used they are very carefully monitored and all applicable factors are considered prior to use.

C6.9. The use of exotic species shall be carefully controlled and actively monitored to avoid adverse ecological impacts.	**C**	
6.9.a. Except on plantation sites (see also Criterion 10.4), the use of exotic tree species is permitted only in the first successional stages or other short-term stages for the purposes of restoring degraded ecosystems.	C	Native tree species and local genotypes are used in reforestation efforts.

6.9.b. The use of exotic species (see Glossary) is contingent on peer-reviewed scientific evidence that the species in question is non-invasive and will not diminish biodiversity. If non-invasive exotic species are used, the provenance and location of use are documented, and their ecological effects are actively monitored.	C	Little use of exotic species is currently occurring on state properties. Historically, exotics were often planted to obtain habitat objectives especially on state wildlife areas. Seed mixtures used by DNR may contain exotic species, however staff feel that the mixes do not contain any species that would become an evasive problem.
6.9.c. Written documentation is maintained for the use of exotic species.	NA	
6.9.d. Forest owners or managers develop and implement control measures for invasive exotic species.	C	DNR has drafted Best Management Practices for Invasive Species. While no coordinated statewide effort to control invasive plants is underway, local managers are conducting a variety of techniques to reduce species presence. Chemicals, hand removal and prescribed burning are being conducted. Division of Forestry conducting invasive species inventory on priority areas. Wisconsin is very aggressive in developing and implementing control measures for invasive species
6.10. Forest conversion to plantations or non-forest land uses shall not occur, except in circumstances where conversion: a) Entails a very limited portion of the forest management unit; and b) Does not occur on High Conservation Value Forest areas; and c) Will enable clear, substantial, additional, secure, long-term conservation benefits across the forest management unit.		**C**
6.10.a. Over the life of the ownership, forest to non-forest conversions are limited to the threshold of 1% of the forest area or 100 acres, whichever is smaller, except that a parcel up to two acres in size may be converted for residential use by the forest owner or manager.	C	Conversions to non-forested areas primarily restricted to prairie restoration and large grassland management areas for specific desired habitat conditions (e.g., sharptail grouse and Karner Blue Butterfly). That is, the conversion is ecologically and restoration driven and does not involve adverse impacts to high conservation values.

6.10.b. When private forest lands are sold, a portion of the proceeds of the sale is reinvested in additional forest lands and/or forest stewardship.	NA	Forest stewardship funds are being used to acquire desired parcels for state control and management

3.1 Stakeholder Comment

Wisconsin DNR has not reported to SCS that it has received any stakeholder complaints or disputes since the July, 2008 re-certification and scope expansion evaluation, and stakeholder outreach by the audit team has not revealed any stakeholder complaints or disputes.

3.2 Controversial Issues

No exceptionally controversial or difficult issues presented themselves during this surveillance audit.

3.3 Changes in Certificate Scope

There were no changes in the scope of this certificate as part of or resulting from this annual surveillance audit.

3.4 Topics to Focus on during 2011Audit

Wisconsin DNR will be informed as to the subject area focus (i.e., selected elements of the certification standard) of the 2011 annual surveillance audit at least 60 days prior to the scheduled date of that audit (tentative for 15-18 August, 2011). Due to the fact that next year's audit will be conducted against the recently adopted FSC National Standard for the U.S., Wisconsin DNR is advised that the focus of next year's audit will principally be on those elements of the National Standard that constitute a change from the Lake States Regional Standard.