



2000 Powell St., Suite 600
Emeryville, CA 94608, USA

www.scscertified.com

Brendan Grady

bgrady@scscertified.com

FOREST MANAGEMENT AND STUMP-TO-FOREST GATE CHAIN-OF-CUSTODY CERTIFICATION EVALUATION REPORT

State of Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources

SCS-FM/COC-00070N

CERTIFIED	EXPIRATION
01/13/09	01/13/14

DATE OF FIELD AUDIT
08/15/11
DATE OF LAST UPDATE
3/16/11

Organization of the Report

This report of the results of our evaluation is divided into two sections. Section A provides the public summary and background information that is required by the Forest Stewardship Council. This section is made available to the general public and is intended to provide an overview of the evaluation process, the management programs and policies applied to the forest, and the results of the evaluation. Section A will be posted on the FSC Certificate Database (<http://info.fsc.org/>) no less than 30 days after issue of the certificate. Section B contains more detailed results and information for the use of by the FME.

FOREWARD

Cycle in annual surveillance audits			
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 st annual audit	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 nd annual audit	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 rd annual audit	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 th annual audit
Name of Forest Management Enterprise and abbreviation used in this report:			
Forest Management Enterprise (FME)	Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (DNR)		

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 (CARs; see discussion in section 5.0 for a summary those CARs and their disposition as a result of this annual audit in the separate CAR report file);
- Follow-up inquiry into any issues that may have arisen since the award of certification or prior to the audit; and
- 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.

All items marked with an asterisk (*) are not required for FMUs that qualify as single SLIMFs.

Contents

Section A – Public Summary	4
1.0 General Information	4
1.1 Annual Audit Team.....	4
1.2 Total time spent on evaluation.....	5
1.3 Standards Employed	5
2.0 Annual Audit Dates and Activities.....	6
3.0 Changes in Management Practices.....	19
4.0 Annual Summary of pesticide and other chemical use	19
5.0 Corrective Action Requests (CARs) and Observations (OBSs).....	42
6.0 Stakeholder Comment*	51
7.0 Certification Decision	52
8.0 Current list of Non-SLIMF FMUs (multiple FMU and group certificates only).....	52
Section B - Appendices.....	53
Appendix 1 – List of FMUs selected for evaluation (CONFIDENTIAL)	53
Appendix 2 – Evaluation of Management Systems (CONFIDENTIAL)*	53
Appendix 3 – Stakeholder analysis (CONFIDENTIAL)*	53
Appendix 4 – Additional Audit Techniques Employed (CONFIDENTIAL)*	54
Appendix 5 – Changes in Certification Scope	54
Appendix 6 – Pesticide derogations.....	54
Appendix 7 – Detailed observations (CONFIDENTIAL).....	54

Section A – Public Summary

1.0 General Information

1.1 Annual Audit Team

Auditor Name:	David Wager	Auditor role:	Lead Auditor
Qualifications: As previous FM Director for SCS, Dave spent ten years managing and/or leading Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) endorsed certification assessments on more than 100 forest management operations covering over 25 million acres of forestland across 16 countries. As a certification practitioner, Dave Wager has led FSC forest management and chain-of-custody assessments on a range of private and public operations across North America, Asia, and Latin America. In other natural resources work, Dave played a key role in the development of Starbucks CAFE Practices- a program to ensure procurement of sustainably grown and processed coffee. Dave has 16 years experience working in forestry and the environmental field. He has expertise in forest ecology and business (B.S. business, Skidmore College; M.S. Forest Resources, Utah State University). While studying forest ecology at Utah State University, Dave was awarded a NASA Graduate Student Research Fellowship to develop dendrochronological techniques to assess Douglas-fir growth in Utah’s Central Wasatch Mountains.			
Auditor Name:	Mike Ferrucci	Auditor role:	Team Auditor
Qualifications: Mike Ferrucci is the SFI Program Manager for NSF – International Strategic Registrations and is responsible for all aspects of the firm’s SFI Certification programs. He is qualified as a RAB-QSA Lead Auditor (ISO 14001 Environmental Management Systems), as an SFI Lead Auditor for Forest Management, Procurement, and Chain of Custody, as an FSC Lead Auditor Forest Management and Chain of Custody, as a Tree Farm Group Certification Lead Auditor, and as a GHG Lead Auditor. Mike has led Sustainable Forest Initiative (SFI) certification and precertification reviews throughout the United States. He has also led or participated in joint SFI and Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) certification projects in nearly one dozen states and a joint scoping or precertification gap-analysis project on tribal lands throughout the United States. He also co-led the pioneering pilot dual evaluation of the Lakeview Stewardship Unit on the Fremont-Winema National Forest. Mike Ferrucci has 30 years of forest management experience. His expertise is in sustainable forest management planning; in certification of forests as sustainably managed; in the application of easements for large-scale working forests, and in the ecology, silviculture, and management of mixed species forests, with an emphasis on regeneration and management of native hardwood species. Mike has conducted or participated in assessments of forest management operations throughout the United States, with field experience in 4 countries and 30 states. Mike has been a member of the Society of American Foresters for over 30 years. Mike is also a Lecturer at the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, where he has taught graduate courses and workshops in forest management,			

operations, professional forest ethics, private forestry, and financial analysis.

Auditor Name:	JoAnne Hanowski	Auditor role:	Auditor
----------------------	-----------------	----------------------	---------

Qualifications: 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 is a participant in a 14-year project for monitoring avian populations on the Chequamegon National Forest. She is currently a member of the riparian science technical committee that is investigating the effectiveness of Minnesota's current guidelines for forest management in riparian systems. She has published 64 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. In 2006 and 2006 JoAnn contributed regional ecological expertise to the annual surveillance audits of the MN DNR's FSC and SFI certificates.

1.2 Total time spent on evaluation

A. Number of days spent on-site assessing the applicant:	3.5
B. Number of auditors participating in on-site evaluation:	3
C. Additional days spent on preparation, stakeholder consultation, and post-site follow-up:	1
D. Total number of person days used in evaluation:	11.5
(Line D = (Total number of days in Line A x Total number of auditors from Line B) + additional days from Line C.	

1.3 Standards Employed

Box 1.3.1. – Applicable FSC-Accredited Standards		
Title	Version	Date of Finalization
FSC-US Forest Management Standard	1.0	July 2010
All standards employed are available on the websites of FSC International (www.fsc.org), the FSC-US (www.fscus.org) or the SCS Forest Conservation Program homepage (www.scscertified.com/forestry). Standards are also available, upon request, from Scientific Certification Systems (www.scscertified.com).		

2.0 Annual Audit Dates and Activities

2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary, Activities, and Participants

August 15th (Monday)

Team #1 (Ferrucci)

Council Grounds State Park

Participants

Dawn Bishop, Property Manager
Dan Schuller, Director Parks and Recreation, Wisconsin DNR
Mike Lietz, DNR Forestry Team Leader
Rich LaValley, DNR Forest Ranger
Bill Millis, DNR Forester
Ken Symes, DNR Forest Certification Coordinator

Sites

1. Scotch Pine stand with invasive brush understory and storm damage; salvage planning underway
2. Salvage Harvest 3577-1-11: Tornado April 10, initial salvage conducted from paved roads due to concerns about rare plants and archeological disturbance; planning underway for a larger salvage
3. SNA site also salvaged, from road, only hazard trees removed.

Little Wolf Fishery Area

Project to protect the North Branch of the Little Wolf River with easements and fee purchases; own 2,300 acres with authorization to 2,600 acres within 9,000 acre purchase boundary; 1986 Master Plan consistent with SGCN Wildlife Action Plan in allowing old fields to succeed; river here is a Class II Trout Stream, excellent quality cold-water fishery

Participants

Jake Fries, Property Manager, Wisconsin DNR Biologist
Al Neibur, WISCONSIN DNR Fisheries, Waupaca County
Paul Cunningham, Fisheries, Madison WISCONSIN DNR
Mike Schuesslen, DNR Forester Waupaca County
Lucas Schmidt, DNR Forester Waupaca County
Lyle Eiden, DNR Forester Portage County
Ken Symes, DNR Forest Certification Coordinator

Rebecca Gass, Section Chief, Effectiveness and Outreach, Division of Forestry

Sites

1. River Road Timber Sale Tract 5011-0111: Sold, not cut including marked oak thinning and Aspen CC with retention of white pine, hemlock, and selected large oak
2. (Reviewed, did not visit) Jackson Creek Timber Sale Tract 5011-0307: Aspen CC, Swamp conifer/hardwood thinning; thorough documentation including pre-harvest inspection, harvest inspection reports, and closeout notes

Paul J. Olson Wildlife Area

Objective is solely management for Greater Prairie-Chicken; "Wisconsin Greater Prairie-Chicken Management Plan 2004-2014" and "Central Wisconsin Grassland Conservation Area Feasibility Study" comprise the current plans (master plan 1981 "completely obsolete" according to property manager); also Wisconsin Wildlife Action Plan and Wisconsin All-Bird Conservation Plan;

Participants

Lesa Kardash, Property Manager, Wisconsin DNR Biologist
Paul Cunningham, Fisheries, Madison Wisconsin DNR
Mike Warnke, DNR Forestry Team Leader
Kris Wimme, DNR Forester
Ken Symes, DNR Forest Certification Coordinator
Rebecca Gass, Section Chief, Effectiveness and Outreach, Division of Forestry

Sites

1. Tract 01-08 Completed CC of Aspen (7ac) and Red Pine (1ac) to convert to cool-season grass
2. Tract 01-09 Nordstrom Road Sold not cut marked Hardwood Thinning
3. Tract 02-09 Completed 8 acres Aspen CC and 10 acres Oak shelterwood

August 15th (Monday) – Team #2 (Wager, Hanowski)

Plover River Fishery Area

Objective: Managed to maintain the trout population in the Plover River.

Participants

Paul Cunningham, Fisheries
Alan Crosley, Wildlife

Teague Prichard, Forestry
Chad Keranen, Forestry
Tom Meronek (Fisheries)
JoAnn Hanowski, Auditor
Dave Wager, Auditor

Sites

1. SNA Plover River Woods (300 acres). Stand classified as “managed old growth”. Proposal for variable density thinning. Working closely with Endangered Resources to ensure that treatment is consistent with SNA values.
2. Class 1 brook trout stream in upper reaches of Plover River. Protected with large buffer.
3. Aspen clearcut from 2007, good retention including hardwood along ridge. Excellent regeneration.
4. Sportsman Drive, Red Oak planting. Planted spring of 2010; 20,000 seedlings planted across 18 acres.

Navarino Wildlife Area

Objective: (As described on DNR website) The Navarino WA is managed to provide opportunities for public hunting, trapping, fishing and other outdoor recreation while protecting the qualities of the unique native communities and associated species found on the property. Management includes maintenance of continuous, extensive floodplain communities and a hydrologic connection between the river and off-channel aquatic habitats. Flowage management with the use of periodic draw downs is used to maintain and improve the emergent marsh and open water wetland types. Bottomland hardwoods are maintained by favoring silver maple and swamp white oak while retaining other native tree and understory species. The aspen cover type is maintained through coppice cutting at rotation age to regenerate the type. Quality red oak sites are managed through shelterwood harvests that are timed to coincide with good acorn crops. Grassland and shrub-carr types are maintained and improved, through mowing and prescribed fire. Sedge meadow is maintained or restored where feasible. Share-cropping is used to maintain a mosaic of agricultural land. Populations of invasive species are controlled or eliminated by cutting, pulling, burning, herbicide treatment and/or bio-control.

Participants

Kay Brockman-Medegas, Property Manager
Jed Hopp, Wildlife
James Robaidek, Wildlife
Rob Gropp, Forestry
Alan Crosley, Wildlife
Teague Prichard, Forestry
JoAnn Hanowski, Auditor
Dave Wager, Auditor

Sites

1. Stand 2-2007- Regeneration harvest of aspen and red oak to accomplish the objective of having young forest on the Navarino. Good scattered retention leaving a mix of softwood and hardwood to provide mix of habitat. Working with nature center to conduct bird surveys on the site.
2. McDonald Timber Sale: 43 acre aspen regeneration harvest. Long linear harvest. Objective to provide young aspen and oak forest for wildlife habitat and because private lands in the area are succeeding to sugar maple and basswood. Sale closed in spring of 2011 due to breakthrough on haul road. Damage very minor, and no rutting was observed on the sale.
3. Maintenance thinning of a bottomland hardwood forest. Very good cooperation amongst wildlife, ecology and forestry in this project along the river. Goal is to release swamp oaks through harvest of silver maple.

High Cliff State Park

Objectives/Vision:

- Conserve and protect the outstanding collection of scenic, scientific, biological, historical, archeological, and cultural features and values along the Niagara Escarpment landscape.
- Provide recreational connections to the surrounding community
- Preserve the benefits of the mostly natural, undeveloped Lake Winnebago shoreline for present and future generations.

Participants

Alan Crosley, Wildlife
Teague Prichard, Forestry
Jeff Prey, Parks
Carolyn Norgren, Park Manager
Frank Kirschling, Forestry
JoAnn Hanowski, Auditor
Dave Wager, Auditor

Sites

1. Visitor Center: Received update on master planning, overview of the park, staffing vacancies, accomplishments with Friends Group, invasive spp management, and other activities.
2. Old Kiln Ruins Rd/Lime-Kiln Trail: Japanese Knotweed infestation along park road and trail. There is no budget for regular treatment, but park may receive a grant due to the threat of invasive impact to High Cliffs SNA.
3. Lime Kiln: Historic site of lime kiln ruins.
4. Demonstration Forest:
 - a. Old Farm Fields: buckthorn, honeysuckle, box elder and other invasives had colonized this old field.
 - b. Shelterwood harvest from mid-1980's
 - c. Tract 3-2000- 40 acre timber harvest from 2000-2001. All selection harvest except 1 acre aspen clearcut. 91 mbf and 104 cords harvested. Residual stocking of 89.

5. Tree Planting Block 1: Fall 2001. 7 acre direct seeding of red and white oak. Regeneration surveys scheduled for this year.
6. Effigy Mounds: Viewed trail through site containing numerous Native American burial mounds.

August 16th (Tuesday) – Team #1 (Ferrucci)

Big Roche A Cri Fishery Area

Big Roche A Cri Fishery Area is managed for trout habitat and upland best forest management practices.

Comstock Bog-Meadow

“Site Objectives

Manage the site as a southern sedge meadow reserve, as an oak barrens restoration site, as a wetland protection area, and as an ecological reference area. Natural processes and prescribed vegetation manipulation will determine the structure of the wetland communities. Provide opportunities for research and education on the highest quality sedge meadows.

Management Approach

The sedge meadow species are managed actively through tree/shrub control using tree harvest, brushing and fire to mimic natural disturbance patterns. The native dominant savanna tree species (primarily oaks) form the basis for an oak barrens restoration. Some thinning of the canopy, understory manipulation and shrub control via harvest, brushing or fire may be needed to mimic natural disturbance patterns. Augmentation of the ground layer will only add species that historically would have been found on the site, using seeds or plugs from local genetic material; this usually occurs in the early stages of restoration. Other allowable activities include control of invasive plants and animals, and access to suppress wildfires.

Site-Specific Considerations

- Roadside easement area may be managed sporadically by township.
- Two parking areas are maintained for visitors.
- Although removal of hazardous trees from over and near state-approved snowmobile trails is an allowed activity, manipulation/removal of vegetation and soil disturbance must be minimized, and must have no impact on the rare species found at the site.”

Source: <http://dnr.wi.gov/org/land/er/sna/index.asp?SNA=123>

Participants

Paul Bruett, Property Manager, State Natural Areas, Endangered Resources, WDNR
Mark Martin, State Natural Areas, Endangered Resources, WDNR
Sue Swanson, DNR Forestry Team Leader

Scott Sullivan, DNR Forester
Matt Wappler, DNR Forester
Ken Symes, DNR Forest Certification Coordinator
Paul Cunningham, Fisheries, Madison Wisconsin DNR

Sites

1. Parking area and overview of bog
2. Forest area to south being planned for restoration to savannah

Follow-up Information Requested

Documentation of chemical application including pre-treatment analysis (focus on invasive treatments currently authorized please)

Rocky Run Fishery Area

50 acres of wetland, 400 acres of upland, and 285 acres of wooded habitat. Rocky Run Fishery Area includes the Rocky Run Oak Savanna State Natural Area.

Master Planning: A Tier 2 master plan is being developed for this property as well as 17 other state fish and wildlife properties and associated state natural areas.

Restoration Lessons Learned Thus Far: Triage- focus on larger, less degraded areas. BER is getting more prescribed burning done (currently 4-6,000 acres per year) with larger burn units and by creating within-burn refugia rather than the previous approach of rotating adjacent units. Challenges: completing burns frequently enough; spotted knapweed control-perennial plant mechanical means ineffective but chemicals could harm intermixed native plants; implementing biomass harvesting guidelines when converting (flexibility was explained by Carmen Wagner)

Participants

Matt Zine, Property Manager, Conservation Biologist, South Central Region, BER, WDNR
Jessica Renley, LTE SNA Crew Leader, South Central Region, BER, WDNR
Sara Kehrl, Wisconsin DNR Biologist. Columbia County
David Rowe, WDNR Forestry Fish Team Supervisor and Biologist for 2 counties
Jim Bernett, DNR Forester
Paul Cunningham, Fisheries, Madison Wisconsin DNR
Kate Fitzgerald, Chief Land Management Section, Lands Division, WDNR
Ed Jepsen, Planner, Lands Division, WDNR

Carmen Hardin, Forest Hydrologist, WDNR
Ken Symes, DNR Forest Certification Coordinator

Sites

1. Oak woodland: buckthorn was removed 8 years ago, fire program underway, dense canopy will let fire dictate further thinning, good structure, mostly native plant understory
2. Oak savannah: mostly native plant understory in great condition, some invasive plants (e.g. Jap hedge parsley) being treated
3. Oak prairie: good condition
4. 1 acre "test" area 2000 harvested red pine plantation, challenges with woody understory notably black locust and black oaks, some good sandy areas
5. Adjacent 17 acres remaining red pine plantation: considering how to convert to savannah without setting up challenges of 1 acre test; interim approach thinned and delayed conversion

Follow-up Information Requested

None

August 16th (Tuesday) – Team #2

Eldorado Wildlife Area

The wildlife area is primarily managed for waterfowl but provides essential habitat for a vast array of wildlife species, including non-game species. A critical feature of the wildlife area is the ability to manipulate water levels through the use of the dam and a series of complementing small ponds and wildlife scrapes. Water levels are managed to provide optimal conditions for wetland vegetation and aquatic invertebrates critical for waterfowl production. Annually, grasslands are maintained on the wildlife area by prescribed burning in both spring and fall.

Participants

JoAnn Hanowski, Auditor
Dave Wager, Auditor
Ellen Barth, Wildlife
Mark Randall, Wildlife
Tom Vandelzen, Forestry
Alan Crosley, Wildlife
Teague Prichard, Forestry

Sites

1. Dike on West Branch of Fond Du Lac River: Discussed history of and current challenges in maintaining quality waterfowl production. Primary challenge is cattail monoculture and the

loss of wild rice, sedge/meadow marsh, and other forage habitat to cattails. Herbicide applications have been successful at beating back the cattails on limited portions of the marsh.

2. Tract 5-10: 32 acre aspen regeneration and oak shelterwood. Mix of ash, oak, and hickory in a stand that had heavy grazing. High levels of buckthorn and prickly ash infestation throughout stand. Pre-harvest spray of buckthorn, ash, and dogwood nearly complete. Good kill of buckthorn. Timber marking looks good removing about 60 ft basal area. Will plant with oak and hickory as stump sprouting is unlikely due to age and heavy deer pressure.

Horicon Marsh Wildlife Area

Participants

Randy Stampfl, Forestry
Brenda Kelly, Property Manager
Doug Fendre, Wildlife
Alan Crosley, Wildlife
Teague Prichard, Forestry
JoAnn Hanowski, Auditor
Dave Wager, Auditor

Sites

1. Visitor Center/Park Headquarters: Site built with substantial contributions from Friends Group. Discussed park history and management objectives. Primary objectives include waterfowl production for hunting, fishing, education, and other recreational activities. Overview of restoration activities on Marsh. Cattail cover is being reduced through herbicide treatments and water level management through impoundment.
2. A linear row of trees was harvested adjacent to an old field. The site was converted to open grassland to provide a larger block of habitat for wildlife.
3. This site had a lot of invasive species and received fecon mower treatment prior to harvest. The goal is to manage for oak habitat and some oak was planted after the harvest. Burning will be required to keep oak as the major tree component in this stand.

Waterloo Wildlife Area

Management Objective (from DNR website): Historically, Waterloo Wildlife Area has been known as pheasant country. The Wisconsin Conservation Department managed the property for ring-necked pheasant hunting and collected considerable hunter/user data throughout the years of ownership. In the 1970's Wisconsin DNR research personnel accomplished a large range of important research projects which included pheasant nest success, habitat manipulation for pheasants, and predator/prey

relationships which included red fox and various raptors. In more recent years management emphasis has focused on wetland restoration, reestablishment and maintenance of native prairie, and protection and management of remnant native habitats. The [Waterloo Prairie State Natural Area](#) lies within the boundaries of Waterloo Wildlife Area. The Waterloo Prairie consists of two units of low, wet grasslands and feature raised calcareous fens and springs which still harbor numerous native species of flora.

Participants

Charlie Kilian, Property Manager
Jeff Weatherly, Forestry
Randy Stampfl, Forestry
Doug Fendre, Wildlife
Alan Crosley, Wildlife
Teague Prichard, Forestry
JoAnn Hanowski, Auditor
Dave Wager, Auditor

Sites

1. Mounsey Lane Prairie Restoration: Viewed the progression of restoration techniques from original planting of switch grass to current approach of planting predominantly forbs, including “prairie in a cube” technique that won manager national recognition. Site has been burned every 4 years.
2. Bland Rd- Manage grass invasive spp outbreak adjacent to SNA. Scheduled to be sprayed this fall.
3. SNA Island Road. Unique plant community of calcareous fen.
4. Prairie restoration at Kilian homestead site.
5. Tract # 3-08: Area D. Marked improvement cut in oak and hickory stand. Removal of boxelder and other poor quality understory trees. Excellent oak legacy tree retained. Area C: improvement cut retaining oak and hickory.

August 17th (Wednesday) – Team #1

Auditors: Ferrucci and Hanowski

Brooklyn Wildlife Area

Objective is to provide habitat for wildlife species that provide hunting and fishing opportunities for the public. The Master Plan for the property is outdated (1984) and current objectives for the property include savannah habitat restoration, grassland management, marsh restoration and to provide a corridor for the Ice Age Trail. The property is currently 3,540 acres.

Participants

Paul Cunningham, Fisheries, Madison Wisconsin DNR
Kate Fitzgerald, Chief Land Management Section, Lands Division, WDNR
Ed Jepsen, Planner, Lands Division, WDNR
Carmen Hardin, Forest Hydrologist, WDNR

Sites

1. Oak forest that is currently being managed with fire to restore oak savannah habitat type conditions. Forest management is not currently being done because there are no close markets for the wood products.
2. Marsh restoration project. Old drainage ditches will be filled to change the hydrology of the site to a more natural condition.
3. Ice Age Trail corridor. Some aesthetic management occurs along the trail. Members of the Trail complete many hours of service in maintaining the trail and adjacent forest (pulling garlic mustard).

Yellowstone State Park

Objective is to provide recreational opportunities for the public including camping, hiking, cross country skiing, boating, snowmobiling, and fishing in this 1,000 acre property. The Master Plan is dated 1981.

Challenges: 60% staffing level; no budget for vegetation management or invasive species management

Adjacent to Yellowstone Wildlife Area “Management Objective: Half of the property was purchased in the 1950’s. The remaining was the first Stewardship purchase in 1989. Today the property is managed for oak savannah restoration. The property offers excellent hunting opportunities for small game, pheasants, turkey and deer, especially for those willing to walk. Waterfowl hunting is available but limited.” Source: http://www.dnr.state.wi.us/org/land/wildlife/wildlife_areas/yellowstone.htm

Participants

Paul Cunningham, Fisheries, Madison Wisconsin DNR
Kate Fitzgerald, Chief Land Management Section, Lands Division, WDNR
Ed Jepsen, Planner, Lands Division, WDNR
Carmen Hardin, Forest Hydrologist, WDNR

Sites

1. White pine thinning. Third entry into a small (3 acre) white pine plantation.
2. Thinning of southern hardwood stand to release desirable oak trees.
3. Savannah restoration experiment site using goats for understory grazing.

Follow-up Information Requested

- Columbia County Integrated Planning Meeting notes
- Trail inspection portion of notes from recent biannual property inspections

August 17th (Wednesday)

Auditor: Wager

Blue Mound State Park

Participants

Kathy Gruentzel, State Parks, WDNR
Jeff Prey, State Parks, WDNR
Jason Sabel, DNR Forester
Kevin Swenson, Park Manager, WDNR
Ken Symes, DNR Forest Certification Coordinator
Aaron Young, Forestry Area Leader, WDNR
Dave Wager, SCS

Sites

1. Park office/visitor center
2. East Observation Tower: Vantage point for overview of park. Interviews about recreation opportunities on Blue Mound, forest conditions, Blue Mound Friends Group, public involvement, education and outreach, vegetative management involves limited invasive treatments and plans for prairie burns.
3. Swimming pool, Blue Mound State Park is the only Wisconsin state park with a swimming pool. The pool was built in 1972 because so few swimming opportunities were available in the area.
4. Maintenance Shop, view chemical storage and discussed chemical records and training

Follow-up Information Requested

Pesticide Use Form for invasive treatments at Blue Mound

Cross Plains State Park/Ice Age Complex

Participants

Rene Lee, State Parks, WDNR
Jeff Prey, State Parks, WDNR
Ken Symes, DNR Forest Certification Coordinator
Steve Holaday, DNR Forester
Dave Wager, SCS Auditor

Sites

1. National Park Kiosk and Prairie Restoration: Ground broadcast 2,4-D to treat garlic mustard, ragweed, leafy spurge, and other non-prairie species.
2. Stand 1: Mature oak stand where forester had proposed an improvement cut, but it is on hold until plan for park is completed.
3. Geiger Field Prairie Restoration: prairie restored directly from agricultural production in 2007. No herbicide treatment was necessary and prairie was successful after first seeding. Burned in 2010 for the first time.
4. Gorge, Stand 11: Hiking trail along the ridge of the gorge through northern hardwood stand. Some isolated patches of buckthorn.

Preliminary Exit Briefing with ICIT Team members and DNR staff

Time: 3:00pm – 5:00pm

Participants

Paul Cunningham, Fisheries, Madison Wisconsin DNR
Kate Fitzgerald, Chief Land Management Section, Lands Division, WDNR
Diane Brusoe, Lands Division, WDNR
Teague Prichard, State Forest Specialist, WDNR
Ken Symes, DNR Forest Certification Coordinator
JoAnne Farnsworth, WDNR Wildlife SC
Tom Watkins, Facilities and Land, WDNR
Alan Crossley, WDNR Wildlife SC
Kristin Lambert, State Forests Program, WDNR

Follow-up on selected topics selected by audit team (1.25 hours):

1. Planning issues under 6.1.a(6) and 4.1.5
 WISFirs tool available, not being fully used, other managers not trained in WISFirs;
 Also use FIA
 Ecological Landscape
2. FSC 4.4a Social Impact assessment
3. FSC 8.2 .d (2) Roads Monitoring
4. FSC 6.3 h and 9.1 (Mgmt plan) Invasive plans for state parks? Invasive plans for wildlife areas?
 RECON is a tool, but imperfect
5. Heritage Data backlog

2010 Findings Discussion (30 minutes):

Other Topics, Discussion as Time Allows:

5 pm Adjourn:

Thursday August 18, 2011 – FSC / SFI Closing Briefing

Audit Team

Mike Ferrucci, SFI Lead Auditor
 Joann Hanowski, Team Auditor
 Dave Wager, FSC Lead Auditor

Participants

Craig Anderson, Parks Ecologist, WDNR Parks
 Rebecca Gass, Section Chief, Effectiveness and Outreach, Division of Forestry
 James K. Warren, Section Chief, Forest Resources, Division of Forestry
 Tom Hauge, WDNR Wildlife
 Alan Crossley, WDNR Wildlife SC
 Dave Schuller, Parks
 Quinn Williams, DNR Forestry Attorney
 Darrell Zastrow, Deputy Administrator, Forestry, WDNR
 Sanjay Olson, Deputy Administrator, Lands, WDNR
 Teague Pritchard, State Forest Specialist
 Paul DeLong, State Forester, WDNR
 Jeff Prey, State Parks, WDNR
 Kristin Lambert, State Forest Programs Planning Analyst, DoF
 Steve Miller, Facilities and Lands Division, WDNR
 Laurie Osterndork, ER Bureau Director
 Kurt A. Thiede, Land Administrator

Paul Cunningham, Fisheries, Madison Wisconsin DNR
 Kate Fitzgerald, Chief Land Management Section, Facilities and Lands Division, WDNR
 Diane Brusoe, Lands Division, WDNR
 Teague Prichard, State Forest Specialist, WDNR
 Ken Symes, DNR Forest Certification Coordinator
 JoAnne Farnsworth, WDNR Wildlife SC
 Tom Watkins, Facilities and Land, WDNR
 Kristin Lambert, State Forests Program, WDNR

3.0 Changes in Management Practices

There were no significant changes in the management and/or harvesting methods that affect the FME's conformance to the FSC standards and policies.

4.0 Annual Summary of pesticide and other chemical use

Site	County	Chemical(s) and Amount(s) Used	Area Treated (acres)	Site	County	Chemical(s) and Amount(s) Used	Area Treated (acres)
Young Prairie SNA	Walworth, Jefferson	Element 4 - 13.0 gallons	105	Swan Lake WA	Columbia	Milestone VM - 2.4 gallons, Escort - 26.0 ounces-dry	25
Mazomani e Oak Barrens SNA	Dane, Dane	Element 4 - 0.3 gallons	10	Grassy Lake WA	Columbia	Milestone VM - 1.7 gallons, Escort - 20.0 ounces-dry	13
Snowbottom SNA	Grant, Grant	Element 4 - 1.0 quarts, Milestone VM - 2.0 quarts, Amine 4 2,4D - 57.2 ounces-wet	65	Pine Island WA - Tritz Rd	Columbia	Escort - 6.0 ounces-dry, Element 4 - 2.5 gallons, Glyphomate 41 - 2.5 gallons	6
Lulu Lake SNA	Walworth, Waukesha	Element 3A - 3.25 gallons, Element 4 - 1.4 gallons	30	Pine Island WA	Columbia, Columbia, Columbia, Columbia	Escort - 0.25 ounces-dry, Element 4 - 0.5 gallons, AquaNeat - 0.5 gallons	2

Pike Lake Unit Kettle Moraine State Forest	Washington, Washington, Washington	Escort XP - 13.47 ounces-dry, Oust XP - 2.6 ounces-dry	678	Pine Island WA	Columbia	Milestone VM - 0.3 gallons, Escort - 3.0 ounces-dry	2
Warnke - GHRA	Winnebago	Duango DMA - 12.0 gallons	24	Pine Island WA - WHIP	Columbia	Element 4 - 2.0 gallons, Escort - 6.0 ounces-dry	5
Snowbottom SNA	Grant, Grant	Amine 4 2,4D - 101.4 ounces-wet	8	Campground & trails	Iowa	Round Up 2, 4, D - 3.0 gallons, Garlon 4 Ultra - 1.0 quarts	20
Ferry Bluff SNA	Sauk	Transline - 0.1 ounces-wet	0.1	Black River State Forest	Jackson, Jackson, Jackson	Plateau - 4.4 ounces-wet	0.5
Pea GHRA	Fond du Lac	Garlon 4 - 10.0 ounces-wet	40	Dell Creek Wildlife Area - Timber Sale 2-08	Sauk, Sauk, Sauk, Sauk	Cellu-treat Dot Wood Preservative - 50.0 gallons	89
Pluim GHRA	Fond du Lac	Garlon 4 - 10.0 ounces-wet	40	Kettle Moraine State Forest-NU	Fond du Lac, Fond du Lac	MAX-IW ZMB - 8.0 quarts, CAPRENO 4XLS - 41.0 ounces-wet, STANLEY BLUE - 0.15 ounces-wet, SUPURB HC - 5.0 quarts	10
Schmitz GHRA	Fond du Lac	Garlon 4 - 10.0 ounces-wet	40	Kettle Moraine State Forest-NU	Washington, Washington	EXTREME - 39.0 pints, REQUEST - 91.0 ounces-wet, STEADFAST - 17.25 ounces-wet, STATUS - 34.5 ounces-wet, ATRAZINE -	24.5

						5.75 pounds	
Bruin GHRA	Fond du Lac	Garlon 4 - 30.0 ounces-wet	40	Kettle Moraine State Forest-NU	Washington	ROUND UP ULTRA - 62.5 quarts	40.6
Panzer GHRA	Fond du Lac	Garlon 4 - 15.0 ounces-wet	40	Avon Wildlife Area	Rock, Rock	Oust - 28.0 ounces-dry, roundup - 2.0 quarts	14
Clark GHRA	Fond du Lac	Garlon 4 - 50.0 ounces-wet	80	Kettle Moraine State Forest-NU	Sheboygan, Sheboygan	ROUND UP - 57.0 quarts	38
Rens and Steenburg Heuttl GHRA	Fond du Lac, Fond du Lac	Garlon 4 - 280.0 ounces-wet	200	Clam Lake Wildlife Area	Burnett	Garlon 4 - 66.0 ounces-wet	4
Schumacher GHRA	Columbia	Milestone VM - 20.0 ounces-wet	100	Kettle Moraine State Forest-NU	Sheboygan, Sheboygan, Sheboygan	ACCENT - 19.0 ounces-wet, ROUNDUP - 9.5 quarts	24
Clam River FWA	Burnett	Milestone - 3.0 ounces-wet	0.25	Avon Wildlife Area	Rock	Transline - 1.0 quarts	2
Kiezer Lake Wildlife Area	Burnett	Milestone - 0.75 ounces-wet, Garlon 3A - 3.75 ounces-wet	1.5	Sawyer Creek Fish and Wildlife Area	Washburn	Garlon 4 - 52.0 ounces-wet	2
McKenzie Creek FWA	Washburn	Milestone - 0.5 ounces-wet	0.25	Peshtigo River State Forest	Marinette	element 4 - 48.0 ounces-wet	27

Namekagon Barrens Wildlife Area	Burnett, Burnett, Burnett, Burnett	Milestone - 4.0 gallons	86	Nichols Creek WA	Sheboygan, Sheboygan	2,4-D - 11.0 pints	11
Sawyer Creek FWA	Washburn	Milestone - 12.0 ounces-wet	2	Rock county wildlife areas	Rock, Rock, Rock, Rock	Element 4 - 6.0 gallons, Escort XP - 4.0 ounces-dry	20
Shell Lake Habitat Area	Washburn	Rodeo - 1.0 ounces-wet	3.5	Kettle Moraine State Forest-NU	Washington, Washington	ROUNDUP - 43.0 quarts	21.5
Clam River Fish and Wildlife Area	Burnett	Rodeo - 0.5 ounces-wet	1	Havenwoods State Forest	Milwaukee	Glyphosate Pro - 4.0 gallons	6
LAX comp fish Hornby property	Vernon, Vernon	Round Up - 2.5 gallons, Oust - 6.0 ounces-dry	12	Kettle Moraine State Forest-NU	Sheboygan	ROUNDUP XTRA - 42.0 quarts	28
Beaver Brook WA	Washburn	Rodeo - 0.125 ounces-wet	0.1	Harrington Beach State Park	Ozaukee	HARNESS EXTRA - 110.0 quarts, STEADFAST - 27.5 pounds	55
Northern Highland - American Legion State Forest	Vilas, Vilas, Vilas, Vilas	Accord XRT 2 - 194.0 quarts, Chopper - 1746.0 ounces-wet, Oust - 97.0 ounces-dry	97	Sheboygan Marsh WA	Sheboygan	2,4-D - 4.0 pints	3.5
Northern Highland - American Legion State Forest	Oneida	Accord XRT 2 - 18.0 quarts, Oust - 9.0 ounces-dry	9	Havenwoods State Forest	Milwaukee	Gordon's Trimec - 0.05 gallons	0.25

Northern Highland - American Legion State Forest	Vilas	Accord XRT 2 - 88.0 quarts, Garlon XRT - 1760.0 ounces-wet, Oust - 44.0 ounces-dry	44	Kettle Moraine State Forest-NU	Sheboygan, Sheboygan	PACE - 24.0 quarts	12
Northern Highland - American Legion State Forest	Oneida, Oneida, Vilas, Vilas, Vilas	Accord Concentrate - 145.0 quarts, Oust - 145.0 ounces-dry	145	Flambeau River State Forest	Sawyer	escort - 2.5 grams	0.25
Turtle-Flambeau Scenic Waters Area	Iron, Iron, Iron	Habitat - 3.0 gallons	10	Flambeau River State Forest	Sawyer	escort - 2.5 grams, milestone - 0.5 ounces-wet	1
Northern Highland American Legion State Forest	Iron, Iron, Iron	Habitat - 1.5 gallons	5	flambeau	Sawyer	milestone - 0.5 ounces-wet, element 4 - 1.0 ounces-wet	1.5
Flambeau River State Forest	Sawyer	Outrider - 1.0 ounces-wet	0.5	Wildcat Mountain State Park	Vernon	Buccaneer Plus - 1.0 gallons	2
Spread Eagle Barrens SNA	Florence, Florence, Florence, Florence, Florence, Florence, Florence, Florence, Florence, Florence, Florence	milestone herbicide - 47.2 ounces-wet, Lesco Prosecutor Professional Max Herbicide - 811.25 ounces-wet	43.6	flambeau	Sawyer	escort - 2.5 grams, milestone - 0.5 ounces-wet, element 4 - 1.0 ounces-wet	5
Greenwood wildlife area	Waushara	Milestone VM - 46.0 ounces-wet, Tahoe 4E - 1.8 gallons	40	Mill Bluff State Park	Monroe	Buccaneer Plus - 2.0 ounces-wet	1

Namekagon Barrens Wildlife Area	Burnett, Burnett	Plateau - 15.0 ounces-wet	2	Flambeau River State Forest	Rusk	element 4 - 3.0 ounces-wet	0.25
Sawyer Creek FWA	Washburn	Rodeo - 30.0 ounces-wet	1	Flambeau River State Forest	Sawyer	element 4 - 3.0 ounces-wet	0.5
Killsnake Wildlife Area	Calumet, Calumet, Calumet	Garlon 4 - 6.0 liters	1	La Crosse River State Trail	LaCrosse	Garlon 4 - 4.0 ounces-wet	1
Bean Brook FWA	Washburn	Plateau - 1.0 ounces-wet	0.5	Brule	Douglas, Douglas	element 3A - 8.0 ounces-wet	5.5
Chaffee Creek FA	Marquette	Tahoe 4E - 16.0 ounces-wet, Milestone VM - 6.0 ounces-wet	2	La Crosse River State Trail	LaCrosse	Buccaneer Plus - 30.0 ounces-wet	3
Soules Creek F.A.	Waushara	Milestone VM - 1.5 ounces-wet	2	Elroy-Sparta State Trail	Monroe	Garlon 4 - 4.0 ounces-wet	1
Mecan River F.A.	Waushara	Element 4 - 32.0 ounces-wet, Milestone VM - 7.0 ounces-wet	2	Brule River State Forest	Douglas, Douglas, Douglas, Douglas	milestone - 16.0 ounces-wet	23
Greenwood W.A.	Waushara	Honcho Plus - 28.0 ounces-wet	10	Elroy-Sparta State Trail	Monroe	Buccaneer Plus - 30.0 ounces-wet	3
Greenwood W.A.	Waushara	Honcho Plus - 6.0 ounces-wet	5	400 State Trail	Juneau	Garlon 4 - 4.0 ounces-wet	1
White River F.A.	Waushara	Honcho Plus - 1.0 ounces-wet	0.25	400 State Trail	Juneau	Buccaneer Plus - 30.0 ounces-wet	3
Chaffee Creek F.A.	Waushara	Honcho Plus - 8.0 ounces-wet	1	Devils Lake State Park	Sauk	Sulfometuron methyl - 7.5 ounces-dry	7.5
Lawrence Creek W.A.	Marquette	Honcho Plus - 6.0 ounces-wet	2	Fenley Recreation Area	Grant	Oust - 15.0 ounces-dry	20

Willow Creek F.A.	Waushara	Honcho Plus - 0.25 ounces-wet	0.125	Fenley Recreation Area	Grant	Milestone - 8.0 quarts	6
Willow Creek F.A.	Waushara	Honcho Plus - 5.0 ounces-wet	1	Devils Lake State Park	Sauk	Element 4 - 3.27 gallons, Glystar Plus - 2.25 gallons, Helostate Plus - 88.0 ounces-dry	46
Mud Lake Wildlife Area	Columbia	AquaNeat - 2.25 gallons	0.025	Fenley Recreation Area	Grant	Garlon4 - 5.0 quarts	6
Spread Eagle Barrens State Natural Area	Florence, Florence, Florence	Element 4 Hebricide - 5.0 gallons, Stalker Herbicide - 1.0 gallons	150	Rush Creek SNA	Crawford	Oust - 0.5 ounces-dry	20
Roelke Creek FA	Columbia	Garlon 3A - 1.5 gallons, ClearCut - 64.0 ounces-dry	2	Battle Bluff SNA	Vernon	Glyphosate - 20.0 ounces-wet	0.5
Paul J. Olson Wildlife Area	Portage	Metsulfuron methly - 17.0 ounces-dry	17	Rush Creek SNA	Crawford	Milestone - 13.4 ounces-wet	20
Paul J. Olson Wildlife Area	Portage	Metsulfuron methly - 6.0 ounces-dry	6	Lower Wisconsin State Riverway	Sauk, Sauk, Iowa, Iowa	Milestone - 201.1 ounces-wet, Escort - 0.39 ounces-dry, Escort - 5.3 gallons	50
Governor Thompson Fish Hatchery	Washburn	Hydrogen Peroxide - 6.561 gallons	0.1	Lower Wisconsin State Riverway	Richland, Richland, Richland	Buccaneer Plus - 2.6 liters, Glyphos Extra - 16.0 ounces-wet, Tenkoz - 2.0 liters	2.5
Governor Thompson Fish Hatchery	Washburn	Terramycin - 271.0 grams	8	Lodi Marsh Wildlife Area	Dane	Element 3A - 60.0 ounces-wet, Razor - 20.0 ounces-wet	15

Beaver Brook Wildlife Area	Washburn	Escort - 6.5 grams	10	Vosse Coulee SNA	Trempealeau	Glyphosate - 40.0 ounces-wet	1
Clam River FWA	Burnett, Burnett	Gly - Star Plus - 12.0 ounces-wet	5	Great River Trail	LaCrosse	Milestone - 3.25 ounces-wet	15
Beulah Bog State Natural Area	Walworth	Tahoe 4e Herbicide - 18.0 ounces-wet	5	Lodi Marsh Wildlife Area	Dane	Element 3A - 14.0 gallons, Escort XP - 40.0 ounces-dry	10
Willow River State Park	St. Croix	Cornerstone Plus - 30.0 ounces-wet	1	Lower Wisconsin State Riverway	Iowa, Iowa, Iowa, Iowa, Iowa, Iowa, Iowa, Iowa	Tenkoz - 11.4 liters, Buccaneer Plus - 15.1 liters, Glyphos Extra - 64.0 ounces-wet	12.05
Kinnickinnic State Park	Pierce	Cornerstone Plus - 0.0 ounces-wet	0	Lower Wisconsin State Riverway	Iowa	Tenkoz 2, 4-D - 16.0 ounces-wet	0.5
Paradise Marsh Wildlife Area	Columbia	Roundup PowerMax Bulk - 11.0 gallons, Powerlock 2.5 GAL - 2.0 gallons	32	Horicon Marsh Wildlife Area	Dodge	Element 4 - 60.0 ounces-wet	0.25
Mud Lake Wildlife Area	Columbia	Honcho Plus (Glyphosate) - 12.0 gallons, Element 4 (Triclopyr) - 10.0 gallons	25	Tiffany WMA	Buffalo	Oust XP - 2.0 ounces-dry	3
Mud Lake Wildlife Area	Columbia	Element 4 - 8.5 gallons	22	Dell Creek Wildlife Area	Sauk, Sauk, Sauk, Sauk, Sauk	Escort - 0.39 ounces-dry	10

Rocky Run	Columbia	Milestone VM - 19.0 ounces-wet	10	Blackhawk Lake Wildlife Area	Iowa, Iowa, Iowa, Iowa, Iowa	Escort - 0.234 ounces-dry, Milestone - 10.5 ounces-wet	5
Muralt	Green	Milestone VM - 18.0 ounces-wet, Element 4 - 28.0 ounces-wet	4	Coon Creek Cliffs SNA	Vernon	Oust XP - 0.6 ounces-dry	12
Ferry Bluff	Sauk	Milesone VM - 12.0 ounces-wet, Element 4 - 7.0 ounces-wet	2	Lower Wisconsin State Riverway	Sauk, Sauk, Sauk, Sauk	Tenkoz 2, 4-D - 64.0 ounces-wet, Buccaneer Plus - 96.0 ounces-wet	2
Devils Lake	Sauk, Sauk	Element 4 - 387.0 ounces-wet	25	Lower Wisconsin State Riverway	Sauk, Sauk, Sauk, Sauk, Sauk	Tenkoz 2, 4-D - 3.8 liters, Glyphos Extra - 5.3 liters	5.03
Stauffacher	Green	Amine 4 - 2.0 ounces-wet	2	Horicon Marsh Wildlife Area	Dodge	2-4D - 2.0 gallons, Cornerstone Plus - 4.5 gallons	16
Blue Spring Oak Opening	Jefferson	Element 4 - 84.0 ounces-wet	4	Lower Wisconsin State Riverway	Grant, Grant, Grant, Grant, Grant, Grant, Grant, Grant, Grant	Tenkoz 2, 4-D - 24.0 ounces-wet, Buccaneer Plus - 12.0 ounces-wet	2
Paul J. Olson Wildlife Area	Wood, Wood	Glyphosate - 3.0 pints	65	La Crosse River Trail	LaCrosse, LaCrosse, Monroe, Monroe	Milestone - 16.5 ounces-wet	30
Paul J. Olson Wildlife Area	Portage	Glyphosate - 48.0 quarts	32	Lower Wisconsin State Riverway	Crawford, Crawford, Crawford, Crawford, Crawford	Tenkoz 2, 4-D - 18.0 ounces-wet, Buccaneer Plus - 6.0 ounces-wet	1.8

Brunet Island State Park	Chippewa	R - 16.0 ounces-wet	1	Horicon Marsh Wildlife Area	Dodge	Element 4 - 16.0 ounces-wet	0.1
Portage County State Properties	Portage, Waupaca, Portage, Portage, Portage, Portage, Portage	Element 4 Herbicide - 5.5 gallons, Krenite S - 2.5 gallons, GlyStar Plus - 27.0 ounces-wet, Milestone Herbicide - 8.7 ounces-wet	54	Shaw Marsh State Wildlife Area	Dodge	2-4D - 2.0 gallons, Cornerstone Plus - 4.5 gallons	16
Clam Lake Wildlife Area	Burnett	Garlon 4 - 26.0 ounces-wet, Glystar plus - 5.0 ounces-wet	10	Mud Lake Wildlife Area	Dodge	2-4D - 0.5 gallons, Cornerstone Plus - 3.0 quarts	4.5
Beaver Brook Wildlife Area	Washburn	Garlon 4 - 2.0 ounces-wet	1	Lower Wisconsin State Riverway	Dane, Dane, Dane, Dane	Glyphos Extra - 11.7 liters, Tenkoz 2, 4-D - 4.8 liters, Buccaneer Plus - 15.1 liters	18.35
LAX comp fish Hornby property	Vernon, Vernon	Oust XP - 5.5 ounces-dry	12	Horicon Marsh Wildlife Area	Dodge, Dodge	Element 4 - 32.0 ounces-wet	3
Mecan Springs SNA	Waushara	Milestone - 4.5 ounces-wet, Tahoe 4E - 1.75 pints	8.5	Horicon Marsh Wildlife Area	Dodge	Garlon 4 - 32.0 ounces-wet	3
Lawrence Creek SNA	Adams	Tahoe 4E - 2.0 pints	3	Lower Wisconsin State Riverway	Dane, Dane	Tenkoz 2, 4-D - 3.8 gallons	9
Karner Blue SNA	Waushara	Tahoe 4E - 8.0 pints	6	Horicon Marsh Wildlife Area	Dodge, Dodge	Milestone - 4.0 ounces-wet	4

Mt. Hope Conservati on Area	Grant	Cornerstone Plus - 28.0 ounces-wet	1.6	Mecan River Fishery Area	Waushara	Element 4 - 26.0 ounces-wet, Milestone VM - 3.0 ounces-wet	1
Buckhorn State Park	Juneau, Juneau	Round-Up - 1.0 quarts	0.02	La Crosse River Trail	LaCrosse, LaCrosse, Monroe	Milestone - 16.5 ounces-wet	30
Roche-A-Cri State Park	Adams, Adams	Round-Up - 0.5 quarts	0.01	West Port Fish Property	Dane	Arsenal - 0.5 gallons, Element 4 Herbicide - 8.0 gallons	13
Coulee Experimen tal State Forest	LaCrosse	RAZOR PRO - 6.0 quarts, OUST - 6.0 ounces-dry, PATHFINDER II - 6.0 quarts	8	Lake Mills Wildlife Area	Jefferson	Element 4 Herbicide - 11.0 gallons	5.8
Northfield Lake Fish Rearing pond	Jackson	ChemFish Synergized Rotenone - 2.0 gallons	1	Mud Lake Wildlife Area	Dodge, Dodge, Dodge	Glypro - 2.0 gallons, Element 4 Herbicide - 7.0 gallons	12.4
Winding Creek Fish Rearing Pond	Marathon	ChemFish Synergized Rotenone - 2.0 gallons	1	Horicon Marsh State Wildlife Area	Dodge, Dodge, Dodge	Element 4 Herbicide - 6.0 gallons	15.4
Black Earth Creek Fishery Area	Dane, Dane, Dane, Dane, Dane	pathfinder II - 6.0 gallons	3	Military Ridge State Trail	Dane, Iowa	Agrisolution s 2, 4-D LV4 - 2.0 gallons	16
Dell Creek Wildlife Area	Sauk	Gordon's Cleanout Brush and Stump Spray - 200.0 ounces-wet	29	Hook Lake Wildlife Area	Dane	Roundup pro max - 93.0 quarts	62
Interstate Park	Polk	Razor Pro Herbicide - 1.0 quarts	2	Sullivan/Jeffer son Co. state land	Jefferson	Element 4 Herbicide - 2.0 gallons	2

McGilvra Woods SNA	Sauk	Sulfometuron methyl - 8.0 ounces-dry	8	Shaw Marsh State Wildlife Area	Dodge	Element 4 - 1.0 quarts	1
Poynette Game Farm	Columbia	Tahoe 4E - 2.0 gallons	3	Waterloo Wildlife Area	Jefferson, Jefferson	Element 4 Herbicide - 15.0 gallons	31.2
Devil's Lake State Park	Sauk	Round-Up Pro - 2.0 gallons	2	Goose Lake Wildlife Area	Dane	Element 4 Herbicide - 8.0 gallons	29.8
Devil's Lake State Park	Sauk, Sauk	Razor Pro - 5.0 gallons	5	Waterloo Wildlife Area	Dodge	Roundup - 1.2 gallons	3.9
Devil's Lake State Park	Sauk	Garlon 4 - 2.0 gallons	5	State Game Farm	Columbia	Roundup Original - 21.0 gallons	70
Devil's Lake State Park	Sauk	Spectracide Wasp & Hornet Spray - 500.0 ounces-wet	1	Waterloo Wildlife Area	Jefferson	Beyond - 23.6 ounces-wet	5.9
Semrad Slough	Grant	Transline - 38.5 ounces-wet	0.5	Black River State Forest	Jackson	Cornerstone - 45.0 gallons	45
NHAL state forest	Vilas	element 4 - 6.0 ounces-wet	40	Waterloo Wildlife Area	Dodge	Beyond - 15.6 ounces-wet	3.9
Waneks	Richland	Pathfinder II - 2.5 ounces-wet	0.1	Lake Mills Wildlife Area	Jefferson	Beyond - 20.0 ounces-wet	5
NHAL state forest	Vilas	element 4 - 5.0 gallons	20	Waterloo Wildlife Area	Jefferson	Garlon 4 - 18.0 gallons	20
Baxter Lane Wildlife Area	Grant	Tahoe 4E - 20.0 ounces-wet	0.33	Mazomanie Bottoms	Dane, Dane	Element 4 - 671.0 ounces-wet	15
Blue River Bottoms	Grant	Milestone - 7.0 ounces-wet	0.75	Jefferson Marsh Wildlife Area	Jefferson	Garlon 4 - 6.0 gallons	4

Windward Square Wildlife Area	Richland	Glyfos X-TRA - 2.5 gallons, Makaze - 2.4 gallons	13.5	Gibraltar Rock	Columbia, Columbia	Element 4 - 127.8 pounds	7
NHAL state forest	Vilas, Vilas	Aquaneat - 3.0 ounces-wet	1	Waterloo Wildlife Area	Jefferson	Cornerstone - 4.0 quarts	2
NHAL state forest	Vilas, Vilas, Vilas, Vilas	milestone - 1.0 ounces-wet	4	Young Prairie	Jefferson	Element 4 - 127.8 pounds	8
NHAL state forest	Vilas	milestone - 30.0 ounces-wet	10	Bluff Creek East	Walworth	Element 4 - 224.0 ounces-wet	42
NHAL state forest	Vilas	element 4 - 32.0 ounces-wet	11	MacGregor's	Grant	Element 4 - 37.0 ounces-wet	15
French Creek WA	Columbia	Element 4 - 25.0 quarts	5	Olson Oak Woods	Dane, Dane, Dane	2,4-D Amine - 4.5 ounces-wet	5
Millville Unit	Grant	Tahoe 4E - 7.75 ounces-wet	0.2	Waterloo Wildlife Area	Jefferson	Cornerstone - 13.0 quarts	6.5
Mead Wildlife Area	Marathon, Marathon, Marathon, Wood, Marathon, Marathon, Marathon, Marathon, Marathon	Milestone - 8.0 ounces-wet	30	Waterloo Wildlife Area	Jefferson	Cornerstone - 9.0 quarts	4.5
Mud Lake Wildlife Area	Columbia, Columbia	Element 4 - 3.125 gallons, Glyphomate 41 - 18.0 gallons	15	Waterloo Wildlife Area	Jefferson	Basis - 2.9 ounces-wet, Harness - 1.1 gallons	5.8
Garner Lake	Richland	Transline - 12.0 ounces-wet	0.125	Waterloo Wildlife Area	Jefferson	Touchdown - 1.5 gallons, Status - 17.4 ounces-wet	5.5
Lake Mills State Fish Hatchery	Jefferson	Cornerstone Plus - 15.2 gallons	25	Waterloo Wildlife Area	Jefferson	Outlook - 10.5 pints	10.5

Millville Unit	Grant, Grant	Round Up Power Max - 13.4 gallons, 2-4,D LV4 - 4.875 gallons	39	Waterloo Wildlife Area	Jackson	Outlook - 22.0 ounces-wet	10.5
Paradise Marsh Wildlife Area	Columbia	Element 4 - 2.5 gallons	7	Waterloo Wildlife Area	Jefferson	Roundup - 33.0 ounces-wet	33
Rowan Creek Fishery Area	Columbia	Element 4 - 0.25 gallons	0.5	Waterloo Wildlife Area	Jefferson	Gangster - 99.0 ounces-wet, Pursuit - 132.0 ounces-wet	33
Pine Island WA	Columbia	Glyphomate 41 - 2.0 gallons, Oust - 9.0 ounces-dry	27	Waterloo Wildlife Area	Jefferson	Roundup original Max - 132.0 ounces-wet	33
Pine Island WA	Columbia	Glyphomate 41 - 18.0 quarts	9	Deansville wildlife area	Dane	status - 41.0 ounces-wet, surestart - 4.65 gallons, integrity - 1.67 gallons, select - 0.87 gallons, roundup weather max - 20.85 gallons	63
Millville Unit	Grant, Grant, Grant	Round Up Power Max - 16.0 gallons, 2-4,D LV4 - 5.75 gallons	46	Waterloo Wildlife Area	Jefferson	Roundup - 34.0 pints	34
Mead Wildlife Area	Marathon, Marathon, Marathon, Marathon	Buccaneer Plus - 2.8 gallons	5	Waterloo Wildlife Area	Jefferson	Gangster - 45.0 ounces-wet, Pursuit - 60.0 ounces-wet	15
Buena Vista Wildlife Area	Portage, Portage, Portage, Portage	Element 4 - 70.0 gallons	160	Waterloo Wildlife Area	Jefferson	Roundup original Max - 60.0 ounces-wet	15

Buena Vista Wildlife Area	Portage, Portage	Milestone - 800.0 ounces-wet	160	Rome Pond Wildlife Area	Jefferson, Jefferson, Jefferson	Touchdown Total - 448.0 ounces-wet, Harness Extra - 56.0 quarts	28
Mead Wildlife Area	Marathon	Garlon - 0.5 gallons	1	Lodi wildlife Area	Dane	Element 3A - 10.0 pounds, Escort XP - 10.0 ounces-dry	10
Buena Vista Wildlife Area	Portage, Portage, Portage	Escort XP - 140.0 ounces-dry	140	Lake Kegonsa State Park	Dane, Dane	Foray - 91.0 gallons	136
Leola Wildlife Area	Adams, Adams, Adams	Milestone - 7.5 ounces-wet, Escort XP - 0.5 ounces-dry	2	Lake Kegonsa State Park	Dane	Tahoe - 33.0 ounces-wet, Water - 81.0 ounces-wet	25
Quincy Bluff NA	Adams, Adams	Milestone - 3.0 ounces-wet, Escort XP - 4.0 ounces-dry	2.5	Lake Kegonsa State Park	Dane	Sethoxydim - 4.0 ounces-wet, Water - 2.0 gallons	25
Mead Wildlife Area	Marathon, Marathon	Garlon 3A - 2.0 gallons	2.4	Lake Kegonsa State Park	Dane, Dane	Round-Up Ultra Max - 18.0 ounces-wet, Water - 9.0 gallons	50
Mead Wildlife Area	Marathon, Marathon, Marathon, Marathon, Marathon	Element 3A - 7.5 gallons	11	Lake Kegonsa State Park	Dane	2, 4-D - 2.0 ounces-wet, Water - 1.0 gallons	30
Mead Wildlife Area	Marathon, Marathon, Marathon, Marathon, Marathon	Habitat - 27.0 ounces-wet	11	Lake Kegonsa State Park	Dane, Dane	Round-Up Ultra Max - 40.0 ounces-wet, Water - 20.0 gallons	40
Lake Katrine	Dane	Chem Fish Synergized - 50.0 gallons	38	Grassy Lake Wildlife Area	Columbia	Glystar Plus - 2.0 gallons	7

Lima Pond	Rock	Reward - 2.0 gallons	2.5	Pine Island Wildlife Area	Columbia	Dual 2 Magnum - 30.0 quarts, Glyphosate - 18.0 gallons	51
Nevin Ponds	Dane	Reward - 1.5 gallons	0.5	NHAL state forest	Vilas	element 3A - 5.0 ounces-wet	15
Lake Katrine	Dane	Reward - 8.0 gallons	38	Brule River State Forest	Douglas, Douglas, Douglas	element 4 - 16.0 ounces-wet	23
Nevin Hatchery	Dane	Reward - 2.0 gallons	4	Flambeau River State Forest	Sawyer	glyphosate - 1.0 gallons	1
Steel, Huettl, Pinno Properties	Fond du Lac, Fond du Lac	Garlon 4 - 112.0 ounces-wet	100	Kettle Moraine State Forest- NU	Fond du Lac, Fond du Lac, Fond du Lac	Touchdown - 55.5 quarts	37
Vielbig Property	Fond du Lac	Garlon 3A - 4.0 gallons	100	Kettle Moraine State Forest- NU & Sheboygan Marsh WA & EWH	Sheboyga n, Sheboyga n, Sheboyga n, Sheboyga n, Sheboyga n	Lumax - 259.5 quarts, Cornerstone - 207.0 quarts, Aim - 6.5 quarts, Prefix - 207.0 quarts	190
Steger Property	Fond du Lac	Garlon 4 - 72.0 ounces-wet	100	Garner Lake	Richland	Glyphosate - 7.5 quarts	13
Vielbig	Fond du Lac	Garlon 3A - 3.0 gallons	100	Garner Lake	Richland	Medal II Generic Dual - 6.5 pints	6.5
Reise	Fond du Lac	Garlon 3A - 1.0 gallons	141	Pine Road	Grant	Medal II Generic Dual - 6.5 pints	6.5
Brian Wright, Homres	Dodge	Garlon 4 - 26.0 ounces-wet	66	Willow Creek Wildlife Management Area	Richland	Cornerstone Plus - 3.0 gallons	8

Zemlo	Fond du Lac	Garlon 3A - 1.0 gallons	78	New Glarus Woods State Park	Green, Green	Glyphosate - 1.0 gallons	2.41
Rens	Fond du Lac	Element 4 - 34.0 ounces-wet	224	New Glarus Woods State Park	Green, Green	Wasp Killer - 98.0 ounces-wet	0.000 36
Riese	Fond du Lac	Garlon 3A - 192.0 ounces-wet	141	Military Ridge State Trail	Iowa	Tordon RTU - 0.25 quarts	0.08
Hoffman	Fond du Lac	Garlon 4 Ultra - 320.0 ounces-wet	56	Sawyer Creek FWA	Washburn	Element 4 - 26.0 ounces-wet	3
Jarapko	Dodge	Milestone - 40.0 ounces-wet	43	Paradise Marsh	Columbia	Glyfos Xtra - 10.0 gallons	17
Baber	Fond du Lac	Garlon 4 - 6.0 ounces-wet	1	Mud Lake Wildlife Area	Columbia	Surestart - 10.0 gallons, Durango Glyphosate - 7.5 gallons, Status - 7.5 pounds	40
Klapperich	Fond du Lac	Element 4 - 96.0 ounces-wet	53	Seely Tract	Crawford	Hornet - 31.5 ounces-wet, Round Up Power Max - 231.0 ounces-wet, Harness - 21.0 pints	10.5
Hull	Fond du Lac	Element 4 - 40.0 ounces-wet	198	Seely Tract	Crawford	Harness - 39.0 pints, Hornet - 58.5 ounces-wet, Round Up Power Max - 429.0 ounces-wet	19.5
Westford Wildlife Area	Dodge	Touchdown - 19.5 gallons	38	Governor Dodge State Park	Iowa	Pramitol 25E - 2.0 gallons	2

Westford	Dodge	LV4 - 7.4 gallons	40	Governor Dodge State Park	Iowa	Tordon RTU - 1.0 quarts	1
Popp	Dodge	Element 4 - 16.0 ounces-wet	10	Governor Dodge State Park	Iowa	Cornerstone Plus - 5.0 quarts	3
Pea	Fond du Lac	Journey - 5.0 gallons	26	Kettle Moraine State Forest-NU	Fond du Lac	E-99 ester (2,4-D) - 1.15 gallons, Helosate Plus - 3.2 gallons, Sterling - 0.1 gallons, Glyphogan - 1.25 gallons, Raptor - 0.33 gallons	26.4
Buwalda	Fond du Lac	Oust - 50.0 ounces-wet	10	Meadow Valley Wildlife Area	Juneau, Monroe, Wood	Milestone VM - 4.0 quarts, Garlon 4/Element 4 - 19.0 ounces-wet, Habitat - 3.0 ounces-wet	10
Popp	Dodge	Glypro - 2.0 quarts	1	Hinkson Creek F.A.	Columbia	Camix - 2.275 pounds, Touchdown - 1.203 pounds	7
Popp	Dodge	lv4 - 1.0 pints	1	Peter Helland W.A.	Columbia	Touchdown Total - 3.5 gallons	13
Zuelke	Fond du Lac	Glypro - 11.0 gallons, lv4 - 4.0 gallons	22	Sawyer Creek FWA	Washburn	Element 4 - 111.0 ounces-wet	15

Sleepy Valley	Crawford	Round Up Power Max - 3.25 gallons, 2-4,D LV4 - 1.25 gallons	10	Wild Rose Fish Hatchery	Waushara, Waushara	Calcium Chloride - 350.0 pounds, Copper Sulfate - 4.0 pounds, Furunculosis vaccine - 42.0 liters, Hydrogen Peroxide - 6.0 liters, Induchlor (chlorine) - 4.0 pounds, Induchlor - 4.0 gallons, MS 222 - 280.0 grams, Muratic acid - 3.0 gallons, Parasite-S - 331.0 gallons, P.V.P. Iodine (Argentyne) - 14.0 gallons, Sodium Hydroxide - 2.5 liters, Sodium Thiosulfate - 140.0 pounds, Virkon - 43.0 pounds	200
KMSF-NU	Sheboygan	Stout - 13.0 ounces-wet, Northstar - 13.0 ounces-wet, Touchdown Total - 46.0 ounces-wet	72.2	Kettle Moraine State Forest-Northern Unit	Sheboygan	Oust XP - 19.0 ounces-dry	19

Rib Mountain State Park	Marathon	Barron - 4.0 gallons	0.25	Kettle Moraine State Forest-Northern Unit	Washington	Oust XP - 4.6 ounces-dry	5
Black River State Forest	Jackson, Jackson, Jackson, Jackson	Element 3A - 5.1 gallons	93	Yellowstone Wildlife Area	Lafayette, Lafayette	milestone - 10.0 pints, escort - 20.0 ounces-dry, garlon 4 - 10.0 gallons	100
Merrick State Park	Buffalo	Roundupsu per concentrate weed and grass killer - 2.0 quarts	1.5	Kettle Moraine State Forest-Northern Unit	Fond du Lac	Oust XP - 10.0 ounces-dry, Garlon 4 - 30.0 quarts	10
Black River State Forest	Jackson, Jackson, Jackson, Jackson	Element 4 - 65.2 gallons	151	Kettle Moraine State Forest-Northern Unit	Sheboygan	Oust XP - 14.3 ounces-dry, Garlon 4 - 3.125 gallons	25
Mud Lake Wildlife Area Aspen	Columbia	Element 4 - 27.5 gallons, Escort - 20.0 ounces-dry	50	Kettle Moraine State Forest-Northern Unit	Washington	Oust XP - 22.0 ounces-dry, Escort - 6.0 ounces-dry, garlon 4 - 6.0 quarts	22
Black River State Forest	Jackson, Jackson	Razor Pro - 7.1 gallons	7.7	Kettle Moraine State Forest-Northern Unit	Sheboygan	Makaze - 6.0 gallons, Oust XP - 12.0 ounces-dry, transline - 1.5 gallons	12
Mud Lake Wildlife Area King Road	Columbia, Columbia, Columbia	Escort - 35.0 ounces-dry, Element 3A - 24.0 gallons	50	Kettle Moraine State Forest-Northern Unit	Fond du Lac	makaze - 16.0 quarts, Oust XP - 8.0 ounces-dry	8
Rock county wildlife areas	Rock, Rock, Rock, Rock, Rock	Beyond - 120.0 ounces-wet	30	Sawyer Creek FWA	Washburn	Element 4 - 26.0 ounces-wet	2

Green county wildlife areas	Green, Green, Green	Beyond - 72.0 ounces-wet	18	Kettle Moraine State Forest-Northern Unit	Sheboygan	makaze - 26.0 gallons, Oust XP - 52.0 ounces-dry	52
Deansville wildlife area	Dane	Beyond - 24.0 ounces-wet	6	Kettle Moraine State Forest-Northern Unit	Fond du Lac	Oust XP - 4.0 ounces-dry	4
Pine Island WA Dog Trial Grounds	Columbia	Milestone VM - 177.0 ounces-wet	65	Kettle Moraine State Forest-Northern Unit	Sheboygan	transline - 1.0 gallons	9
French Creek WA	Columbia, Columbia	Escort - 10.5 ounces-dry, Element 4 - 9.5 gallons	22	Kettle Moraine State Forest-NU	Fond du Lac, Fond du Lac	RoundUp Ultra - 16.0 gallons	32
Peter Helland WA - Poser	Columbia, Columbia	Escort - 20.0 ounces-dry, Milestone VM Plus - 10.0 gallons	12	Kettle Moraine State Forest-NU	Sheboygan, Sheboygan	Lumax - 10.125 gallons	18
Peter Helland WA - Poser and Pacholski	Columbia, Columbia, Columbia	Element 4 - 7.0 gallons, Escort - 45.0 ounces-dry, Milestone VM Plus - 19.5 gallons	44	Kettle Moraine State Forest-Northern Unit	Sheboygan	transline - 8.0 pints	8
Peter Helland WA - Raddatz Rd	Columbia	Escort - 10.0 ounces-dry, Milestone VM - 1.0 gallons	6	Kettle Moraine State Forest-Northern Unit	Fond du Lac	garlon 4 - 6.0 quarts	14
Peter Helland WA - Sawyer Rd	Columbia	Element 3A - 5.0 gallons, Escort - 10.0 ounces-dry	6	Kettle Moraine State Forest-Northern Unit	Fond du Lac	garlon 4 - 2.0 quarts	4

Peter Helland WA - Poser and Pardeeville Rd	Columbia, Columbia	Escort - 14.0 ounces-dry, Element 4 - 4.0 gallons	11	Kettle Moraine State Forest-Northern Unit	Fond du Lac	garlon 4 - 4.0 quarts	18
Peter Helland WA - Sawyer Rd	Columbia	Element 4 - 2.0 gallons	10	Kettle Moraine State Forest	Fond du Lac	garlon 4 - 4.0 quarts	11
Perrot State Park	Trempealeau	Roundupsu per concentrate weed and grass killer - 2.0 quarts	2	Kettle Moraine State Forest-Northern Unit	Sheboygan	Escort - 4.0 ounces-dry, garlon 4 - 8.0 quarts	10
Great River State Trail	Trempealeau	Roundupsu per concentrate weed and grass killer - 0.0 quarts	0	Kettle Moraine State Forest-Northern Unit	Fond du Lac	Escort - 20.0 ounces-dry	10
Mud Lake WA - Hagan Prairie Knapweed	Columbia	Milestone VM - 5.5 ounces-wet	5	Kettle Moraine State Forest-Northern Unit	Fond du Lac	Oust XP - 18.0 ounces-dry	9
Black River State Forest	Jackson, Jackson	Oust - 0.4 ounces-dry	1.25	Beaver Brook Wildlife Area	Washburn	Garlon 4 - 2.0 ounces-wet	0.5
Pine Island WA - Sauk	Sauk	Milestone VM - 11.0 ounces-wet	3	Goose Lake Wildlife Area	Burnett	Milestone - 1.0 ounces-wet	1
Kettle Moraine State Forest-Northern Unit	Fond du Lac	garlon 4 - 2.0 quarts	7	Tozer Springs	Washburn	Escort - 2.0 grams	5

				Art Oehmcke State Fish Hatchery	Oneida	35% perox- aid - 105.0 gallons, Ovadine - 10.3 gallons, Aquashade - 10.25 gallons, Terramycin- 343, oxytetracycli ne HCL - 68.0 grams	0

5.0 Corrective Action Requests (CARs) and Observations (OBSs)

5.1 Open Findings from Previous Audits

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	A response is due by the 2011 annual audit.
Reference	FSC Regional Indicator 6.6.d
Action Taken By Company:	
<p>The DNR has created a Department-wide pesticide use team. Tom Boos, forestry invasive plants coordinator, and Kelly Kearns, plant conservation biologist will act as leaders for the new team. Darrell Zastrow, forestry deputy administrator, Mike Staggs, fishery management bureau director, and Sanjay Olson, deputy director for the lands division will act as advisors for the team. The charge of the team includes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Develop manual code revisions for the use, storage, disposal and reporting of chemicals for disease, pests and management (MC 4230.1). 2) Develop and deliver appropriate and timely staff training related to pesticide use. 3) Continue to enhance and update the Department pesticide use intranet site 4) Advise Department leadership and staff about pesticide use issues as they arise. 	

Auditor Comments: SCS auditor verified that the pesticide use team was created and that the committee has been charged with revising the manual code for pesticide use.
--

Position in the end of this audit: Closed
--

Observations: Status of Observations Issued in 2010

DNR did not provide formal written responses to the nine observations that were issued during the 2010 audit. Observations were reviewed verbally with DNR Certification Coordinator, and the following summary characterizes DNR's actions in response.

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.

DNR Actions in Response: The depth and clarity of land management objectives were greatly improved for SNA's. Improvements to other state land properties have been limited.

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.

DNR Actions in Response: DNR developed a solid framework for reporting of plan implementation once a revised Master Plan is implemented. In the absence of a revised Master Plan- monitoring and reporting of implementation remain much less rigorous.

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

DNR Actions in Response: At the time of the audit, a revision to the Manual Code was awaiting final signature for approval.

Observation 2010.4: Filling the vacancy in the certification coordinator position 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

DNR Actions in Response: DNR filled the vacancy of certification coordinator with Kenneth Symes beginning in calendar year 2011.

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.

DNR Actions in Response: In 2011 the Annual Integrated Property Planning Meeting were conducted in a more formal manner and with significantly improved documentation and framework.

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.

DNR Actions in Response: A DNR ecologist is currently reviewing all State Parks to determine if and how timber harvesting fits with the goals for those properties. Additionally, further review by the SCS audit team confirmed that the this observation was due to an isolated occurrence, and the audit team does not find there to be widespread problem with forestry appropriately considering habitat management objectives of property managers.

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

DNR Actions in Response: No additional action taken.

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.

DNR Actions in Response: DNR managers met with the forester responsible for harvests with inadequate retention. A statewide training on green tree retention guidelines for even-aged harvests was provided. During the 2011 audit, all even-aged harvests that were visited were consistent with structural retention guidelines.

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.

DNR Actions in Response: The Land Leadership Team was briefed on how to apply Act 166. A DNR ecologist is currently reviewing all State Parks to determine if and how timber harvesting may fit with the goals for those properties. Once suitability to timber harvesting is determined, WisFIRS will be updated accordingly.

5.1 New Findings as a Result of the 2011 Audit

Certificate holder/applicant	WI Department of Natural Resources
CAR/OBS identified by (SCS representative)	Dave Wager, Mike Ferrucci, JoAnn Hanowski
Date of Issuance	081811
Audit Year/Type (select from pull down menu)	Surveillance Audit Expansion (3 rd annual audit)

TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	CAR/OBS Number (e.g. 1, 2, ...)			CAR 2011.2 ¹										
	Select one:			<input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR	x	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> Observation							
	Site CAR/OBS issued to (where more than one site)													
	Deadline for Corrective Action by FME													
	<table border="1"> <tr> <td style="width: 5%;"></td> <td>3 months from above Date of Issuance</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">x</td> <td>Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation)</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Pre-condition to certification</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Other deadline (specify):</td> </tr> </table>							3 months from above Date of Issuance	x	Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation)		Pre-condition to certification		Other deadline (specify):
		3 months from above Date of Issuance												
	x	Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation)												
	Pre-condition to certification													
	Other deadline (specify):													
Standard and Requirement Reference			FSC US FM STD; 4.4.a.											
<p>NON-CONFORMITY (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations) <i>(Describe and provide objective evidence)</i></p> <p>A summary of the social impact assessment activities, as defined in Indicator 4.4.a., have not been made available.</p> <p><u>Background:</u> The summary portion is a new requirement in the FSC standard. The summary requirement in 4.4.a does not require the completion of a new comprehensive social impact assessment. Rather the intent is to briefly summarize existing social impact assessment activities and programs assuming that these address all the bulleted items of 4.4.a.</p>														
<p>REQUESTED CORRECTIVE ACTION</p> <p>DNR shall produce a summary to demonstrate that management understands the likely social impacts of management activities, and incorporates this understanding into management planning and operations. Social impacts include effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Archeological sites and sites of cultural, historical and community significance (on and off the FMU); • Public resources, including air, water and food (hunting, fishing, collecting); • Aesthetics; • Community goals for forest and natural resource use and protection such as employment, subsistence, recreation and health; • Community economic opportunities; • Other people who may be affected by management operations. 														
<i>Press Enter twice below table to leave a space, then copy and paste table below for each CAR/OBS</i>														

¹ Draft CAR 2011.1 was removed after WDNR provided further evidence, but the remaining CAR numbers were not updated in order to retain consistency with earlier versions of the report.

TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	CAR/OBS Number (e.g. 1, 2, ...)			2011.3	
	Select one:		<input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> Observation
	Site CAR/OBS issued to (where more than one site)				
	Deadline for Corrective Action by FME				
	<input type="checkbox"/>	3 months from above Date of Issuance			
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation)			
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Pre-condition to certification			
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other deadline (specify):			
	Standard and Requirement Reference		FSC US FM STD; 6.1.b		
	<p>NON-CONFORMITY (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations) (Describe and provide objective evidence)</p> <p>Audit team finds that DNR has not completed the following certification requirements: Prior to commencing site-disturbing activities, the forest owner or manager assesses and documents impacts of planned management activities on Forest community types and development, size class and/or successional stages, and associated natural disturbance regimes.</p> <p>This finding only applies to State lands that conducting site disturbing activities and are not operating under a revised master plan.</p>				
<p>REQUESTED CORRECTIVE ACTION (or Observation)</p> <p>DNR must ensure that prior to undertaking site disturbing activities that managers assess and document impacts of planned management activities on Forest community types and development, size class and/or successional stages, and associated natural disturbance regimes.</p>					
<i>Press Enter twice below table to leave a space, then copy and paste table below for each CAR/OBS</i>					

TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	CAR/OBS Number (e.g. 1, 2, ...)				2011.4
	Select one:		<input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation
	Site CAR/OBS issued to (where more than one site)				
	Deadline for Corrective Action by FME				
	<input type="checkbox"/>	3 months from above Date of Issuance			
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation)			
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Pre-condition to certification			
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other deadline (specify):			
	Standard and Requirement Reference			FSC US FM STD; 6.1.c	
	BACKGROUND/JUSTIFICATION				
6.1.c. Using the findings of the impact assessment (Indicator 6.1.b), management approaches and field prescriptions are developed and implemented that: 1) avoid or minimize negative short-term and long-term impacts; and, 2) maintain and/or enhance the long-term ecological viability of the forest.					
OBSERVATION					
DNR should ensure that management approaches avoid or minimize long-term impacts that regeneration harvests can have on age and size class distribution across the landscape.					
<i>Press Enter twice below table to leave a space, then copy and paste table below for each CAR/OBS</i>					

CAR/OBS Number (e.g. 1, 2, ...)	2011.5								
Select one: <table border="1" style="display: inline-table; margin-left: 20px;"> <tr> <td style="width: 20px;"></td> <td style="width: 100px;">Major CAR</td> <td style="width: 20px; text-align: center;">x</td> <td style="width: 100px;">Minor CAR</td> <td style="width: 20px;"></td> <td style="width: 100px;">Observation</td> </tr> </table>			Major CAR	x	Minor CAR		Observation		
	Major CAR	x	Minor CAR		Observation				
Site CAR/OBS issued to (where more than one site)									
Deadline for Corrective Action by FME									
<table border="1" style="width:100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 20px;"></td> <td>3 months from above Date of Issuance</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">X</td> <td>Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation)</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Pre-condition to certification</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Other deadline (specify):</td> </tr> </table>			3 months from above Date of Issuance	X	Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation)		Pre-condition to certification		Other deadline (specify):
	3 months from above Date of Issuance								
X	Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation)								
	Pre-condition to certification								
	Other deadline (specify):								
Standard and Requirement Reference	FSC US FM STD; 6.3.h								
NON-CONFORMITY (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations) (Describe and provide objective evidence) Audit team finds DNR has not consistently assessed the risk of, prioritized, and, as warranted, developed and implemented a strategy to prevent or control invasive species , including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. a method to determine the extent of invasive species and the degree of threat to native species and ecosystems; 2. implementation of management practices that minimize the risk of invasive establishment, growth, and spread; (Addressed Invasive BMP's) 3. eradication or control of established invasive populations when feasible: and, 4. monitoring of control measures and management practices to assess their effectiveness in preventing or controlling invasive species. <p>Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Actions being taken to address invasive spp problems at Blue Mound, Yellowstone, and Cross Plains were found to be insufficient to meet the requirements for 6.3.h. - Although DNR is making considerable efforts to control invasive plants on Wildlife Areas - most of the properties visited in 2011 were unable to demonstrate systematic efforts to determine the extent (e.g., inventory of invasives) and have planned strategy for prioritizing and treating invasives. <p>Background: Finding is mostly driven by observations on State Parks where in some cases we observed minimal or no efforts to identify, prioritize, and treat invasives- despite moderate levels of infestation on a property.</p>									
REQUESTED CORRECTIVE ACTION (or Observation) DNR shall assess the risk of, prioritize, and, as warranted, develop and implement a strategy to prevent or control invasive species as required by Indicator 6.3.h.									

TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE

Press Enter twice below table to leave a space, then copy and paste table below for each CAR/OBS

TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	CAR/OBS Number (e.g. 1, 2, ...)		2011.6		
	Select one:		<input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation
	Site CAR/OBS issued to (where more than one site)				
	Deadline for Corrective Action by FME				
	<input type="checkbox"/>	3 months from above Date of Issuance			
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation)			
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Pre-condition to certification			
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other deadline (specify): Observation, thus no deadline.			
	Standard and Requirement Reference		7.1.f		
	BACKGROUND/JUSTIFICATION <i>(Describe and provide objective evidence)</i> 7.1.f. requires that if invasive species are present, the management plan describes invasive species conditions, applicable management objectives, and how they will be controlled (see Indicator 6.3.j). Properties visited in the 2011 audit had varying levels of conformance with this requirement. There is an opportunity to improve coverage of invasive species in management planning documents, particularly for properties that do not have an updated master plan or a stand-alone invasive species management plan.				
OBSERVATION DNR should take measures to ensure that invasives are addressed in planning documents.					
<i>Press Enter twice below table to leave a space, then copy and paste table below for each CAR/OBS</i>					

TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	CAR/OBS Number (e.g. 1, 2, ...)			2011.7								
	Select one: <table border="1" style="display: inline-table; margin-left: 20px;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50px;"></td> <td style="width: 100px;">Major CAR</td> <td style="width: 20px; text-align: center;">x</td> <td style="width: 100px;">Minor CAR</td> <td style="width: 50px;"></td> <td style="width: 100px;">Observation</td> </tr> </table>					Major CAR	x	Minor CAR		Observation		
		Major CAR	x	Minor CAR		Observation						
	Site CAR/OBS issued to (where more than one site)											
	Deadline for Corrective Action by FME											
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 30px;"></td> <td>3 months from above Date of Issuance</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">x</td> <td>Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation)</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Pre-condition to certification</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Other deadline (specify):</td> </tr> </table>					3 months from above Date of Issuance	x	Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation)		Pre-condition to certification		Other deadline (specify):
		3 months from above Date of Issuance										
	x	Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation)										
		Pre-condition to certification										
		Other deadline (specify):										
Standard and Requirement Reference		6.6.d										
NON-CONFORMITY (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations) (Describe and provide objective evidence)												
Audit Team Finds a non-conformity with the following FSC requirement. When chemicals are used a written prescription is prepared that describes the site-specific hazards and environmental risks, and the precautions that workers will employ to avoid or minimize those hazards and risks, and includes a map of the treatment area. Chemicals are applied only by workers who have received proper training in application methods and safety. They are made aware of the risks, wear proper safety equipment, and are trained to minimize environmental impacts on non-target species and sites.												
Evidence: Chemical pesticides are being used on Blue Mound State Park without a written prescription and without approval through the DNR chemical use process.												
REQUESTED CORRECTIVE ACTION (or Observation) DNR must ensure its chemical use is done consistently with the requirements of 6.6.d.												
<i>Press Enter twice below table to leave a space, then copy and paste table below for each CAR/OBS</i>												

TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	CAR/OBS Number (e.g. 1, 2, ...)				2011.8
	Select one:		<input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation
	Site CAR/OBS issued to (where more than one site)				
	Deadline for Corrective Action by FME				
	<input type="checkbox"/>	3 months from above Date of Issuance			
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation)			
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Pre-condition to certification			
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other deadline (specify): Observation			
	Standard and Requirement Reference			8.2.d.2	
	BACKGROUND Indicator 8.2.d.2. requires that certificate holders have a monitoring program is in place to assess the condition and environmental impacts of the forest-road system. While DNR has a program in place for many of the roads particularly when associated with timber harvests- there is an opportunity to improve upon the monitoring of closed or infrequently used roads on other state lands.				
OBSERVATION 8.2.d.2- DNR should ensure that there is a monitoring program in place to assess the condition and environmental impacts of the forest-road system- particularly on other state lands.					
<i>Press Enter twice below table to leave a space, then copy and paste table below for each CAR/OBS</i>					

6.0 Stakeholder Comment*

SCS conducts stakeholder outreach as part of annual audits in order to assess on-going conformance to the applicable FSC standards. Stakeholder consultation activities can include telephone calls, written letters, emails or consultation in the field. The results of stakeholder consultation activities are summarized below. Where a stakeholder comment has triggered a subsequent investigation during the evaluation, the corresponding follow-up action and conclusions from SCS have been noted.

Box 6.1 – Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Responses from the Team Where Applicable	
SCS did not receive any comments from interested parties as a result of stakeholder outreach activities during this annual audit.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

7.0 Certification Decision

Box 7.1 Surveillance Decision	
The certificate holder has demonstrated continued overall conformance to the applicable Forest Stewardship standards. The SCS annual audit team recommends that the certificate be sustained, subject to subsequent annual audits and the FME's response to any open CARs.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>

8.0 Current list of Non-SLIMF FMUs (multiple FMU and group certificates only)

Certificate is audited as a single FMU of 1,541,187 acres.

Section B - Appendices

Appendix 1 – List of FMUs selected for evaluation (CONFIDENTIAL)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FME consists of a single FMU – <i>No further action required</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> FME consists of multiple FMUs – <i>See table below, which applies to multiple FMU and group management evaluations, but is inapplicable if the scope of the evaluation is a single FMU.</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> FME consists of a single FMU – <i>No further action required</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> FME consists of multiple FMUs – <i>See table below, which applies to multiple FMU and group management evaluations, but is inapplicable if the scope of the evaluation is a single FMU.</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> FME consists of a single FMU – <i>No further action required</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> FME consists of multiple FMUs – <i>See table below, which applies to multiple FMU and group management evaluations, but is inapplicable if the scope of the evaluation is a single FMU.</i>

Appendix 2 – Evaluation of Management Systems (CONFIDENTIAL)*

The surveillance audit was performed by SCS August 14-18, 2011 by an audit team headed by Dave Wager, Lead Auditor. The team included JoAnn Hanowski- Wildlife specialist and Mike Ferrucci- Forester. The process included the assembly and review of audit evidence consisting of documents, interviews, and on-site inspections of ongoing or completed forest practices. Documents describing these activities and lists of management activities were provided to the auditors in advance, and a sample of the available field sites was designated by the audit team for review. The selection of field sites for inspection was based upon the risk of environmental impact, special features, past non-conformances/observations, and other factors. During the audit, the audit team reviewed a sample of the available written documentation as objective evidence of FSC conformance. Documents that were reviewed during this audit included management plans, policy and procedure documents, timber sale inspection forms, chemical use records, among other policies, procedures and records.

At the start of the audit, each audit team member was assigned a subset of the relevant indicators for this audit. During deliberation, the audit team used a consensus approach to determine whether or not there was conformance with each of the indicators being assessed during this audit. The audit team also selected and interviewed contract loggers and DNR employees within the organization to assess conformance with the FSC standards.

Appendix 3 – Stakeholder analysis (CONFIDENTIAL)*

3.1 Stakeholder list (confidential)

See Participants listed in Section 2.1. No outside stakeholders were consulted during the 2011 audit. Extensive stakeholder outreach on previous audits revealed a high level of stakeholder support for the management of the state lands.

3.2 Stakeholder review, complaints, and resolution

Box 3.2.1 – Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Responses from the Team Where Applicable	
FME has not received any stakeholder complaints and the annual audit uncovered no known disputes since the previous evaluation. SCS has not received any complaints from stakeholders regarding its performance or treatment of FME’s management system.	☒

Appendix 4 – Additional Audit Techniques Employed (CONFIDENTIAL)*

The audit team did not employ any additional audit techniques for this annual surveillance audit.

Appendix 5 – Changes in Certification Scope

There were no changes in the scope of the certification during the previous year.

Appendix 6 – Pesticide derogations

No approved pesticide derogations for WDNR.

Appendix 7 – Detailed observations (CONFIDENTIAL)

Evaluation year	FSC P&C Reviewed
2008	All – Recertification Evaluation
2009	P3 and P7
2010	P6
2011	Criteria 1.2, 1.5, 1.6, 2.3, 3.2, 4.2, 4.4, 4.5, 5.5, 5.6, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.9, 6.10, 7.1, 8.1, 8.2, and 9.4.
2012	Criteria 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.2, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 5.6, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.9, 8.2, 8.3, 8.4 and 8.5, and P9 .

C= Conformance with Criterion

C/NC= Overall Conformance with Criterion, but there are Indicator non-conformances

NC= Non-Conformance with Criterion

Approved by FSC-IC, July 8, 2010

REQUIREMENT	N/C	COMMENT/CAR
P1 Forest management shall respect all applicable laws of the country in which they occur, and international treaties and agreements to which the country is a signatory, and comply with all FSC Principles and Criteria.		
*C1.2. All applicable and legally prescribed fees, royalties, taxes and other charges shall be paid.	C	
1.2.a. The forest owner or manager provides written evidence that all applicable and legally prescribed fees, royalties, taxes and other charges are being paid in a timely manner. If payment is beyond the control of the landowner or manager, then there is evidence that every attempt at payment was made.	C	As a state agency, matters related to taxes are largely not applicable. However, to provide further incentive to buy public lands and soften the tax burden on people living near public properties, state laws provide a variety of community payments in lieu of taxes when public lands are bought. Written evidence that payments are made is available.
*C1.5. Forest management areas should be protected from illegal harvesting, settlement and other unauthorized activities.	C	
1.5.a. The forest owner or manager supports or implements measures intended to prevent illegal and unauthorized activities on the Forest Management Unit (FMU).	C	SCS auditors observed a sufficient number of gates, berms, boundary markings, road closures, enforcement efforts, and posted signs indicating allowed uses to conclude that managers are implementing measures to prevent illegal activities.
1.5.b. If illegal or unauthorized activities occur, the forest owner or manager implements actions designed to curtail such activities and correct the situation to the extent possible for meeting all land management objectives with consideration of available resources.	C	WDNR works closely with other federal, county, tribal and other jurisdictions to handle unauthorized activities. For example, after more than 6000 marijuana plants were located on the Flambeau River State Forest, Rusk County Sheriff's Office Wisconsin Department of Justice, Wisconsin DNR, and Ladysmith Police Dept cooperated on actions correct the situation.
*C1.6. Forest managers shall demonstrate a long-term commitment to adhere to the FSC Principles and Criteria.	C	
1.6.a. The forest owner or manager demonstrates a long-term commitment to adhere to the FSC Principles and Criteria and FSC	C	Land and Forestry Divisions have implemented Manual Code 2406.1 by Division Administrator

<p>and FSC-US policies, including the FSC-US Land Sales Policy, and has a publicly available statement of commitment to manage the FMU in conformance with FSC standards and policies.</p>		<p>directive. The code clarifies the Department’s commitment to FSC forest management certification</p>
<p>1.6.b. If the certificate holder does not certify their entire holdings, then they document, in brief, the reasons for seeking partial certification referencing FSC-POL-20-002 (or subsequent policy revisions), the location of other managed forest units, the natural resources found on the holdings being excluded from certification, and the management activities planned for the holdings being excluded from certification.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The WDNR maintains FSC certification for all state managed lands except for approximately 30,000 acres of agricultural, leased lands outside of DNR management and non-forest lands. The reasons for not seeking FSC certification on these agricultural lands have been documented.</p>
<p>1.6.c. The forest owner or manager notifies the Certifying Body of significant changes in ownership and/or significant changes in management planning within 90 days of such change.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>It is the role of WDNR Certification Coordinator to inform SCS of these changes.</p>
<p>P2 Long-term tenure and use rights to the land and forest resources shall be clearly defined, documented and legally established.</p>		
<p>*C2.3. Appropriate mechanisms shall be employed to resolve disputes over tenure claims and use rights. The circumstances and status of any outstanding disputes will be explicitly considered in the certification evaluation. Disputes of substantial magnitude involving a significant number of interests will normally disqualify an operation from being certified.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>2.3.a. If <i>disputes</i> arise regarding tenure claims or use rights then the forest owner or manager initially attempts to resolve them through open communication, negotiation, and/or mediation. If</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>There are no significant disputes over tenure and use rights. DNR, through an array of open communication mechanisms such as “Friends of ...” groups, maintains very active and</p>

<p>these good-faith efforts fail, then federal, state, and/or local laws are employed to resolve such disputes.</p>		<p>collaborative interaction with interested individuals and organizations, thereby enhancing the likelihood of early resolution of any concerns. Property managers work very hard to maintain good relationships with community stakeholders. Evidence was found of established and maintained stakeholder relations that assist in addressing and preventing disputes. Efforts include consultation before harvests occur and continued conversations as management activities are implemented.</p> <p>The WDNR attempts to resolve disputes through direct communication with the involved party. If disputes do arise, they will be handled through the State Natural Resources Board.</p>
<p>2.3.b. The forest owner or manager documents any significant disputes over tenure and use rights.</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>There are no significant disputes over tenure and use rights. Should such disputes arise they are to be handled through the State Natural Resources Board.</p>
<p>P3 The legal and customary rights of indigenous peoples to own, use and manage their lands, territories, and resources shall be recognized and respected.</p>		
<p>*C3.2. Forest management shall not threaten or diminish, either directly or indirectly, the resources or tenure rights of indigenous peoples.</p>		
<p>3.2.a. During management planning, the forest owner or manager consults with American Indian groups that have legal rights or other binding agreements to the FMU to avoid harming their resources or rights.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The WDNR maintains ongoing consultation with Tribal groups and organizations in relation to management activities. Consultation includes the requirements of the settlement associated with the Voight case as well as other interested parties and groups. Tribes are consulted when developing property Master Plans.</p>
<p>3.2.b. Demonstrable actions are taken so that forest management does not adversely affect tribal resources. When applicable, evidence of, and measures for, protecting tribal resources are</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Collectively, management planning and project implementation on DNR-managed properties assures a high degree of assurance that adverse impacts to tribal resources and sites will be avoided. The State</p>

<p>incorporated in the management plan.</p>		<p>Archaeologist is active in identifying cultural resources, training land managers in their identification, and advising on the appropriate protections. Land managers demonstrated a working knowledge of resources and their identification and an understanding of the appropriate protections including consultation with the State Archaeologist. Gathering rights are being protected and used. All foresters interviewed during the 2011 audit had undergone training in identifying and protecting archeological sites.</p>
<p>P4 Forest management operations shall maintain or enhance the long-term social and economic well-being of forest workers and local communities.</p>		
<p>*C4.2. Forest management should meet or exceed all applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of employees and their families.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>4.2.a. The forest owner or manager meets or exceeds all applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of employees and their families (also see Criterion 1.1).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Written policies such as Manual Codes are supplemented by training (regular training for all employees, with emphasis for supervisors) and by notices at all work locations. DNR employee attention to safety was observed throughout the 2011 audit, e.g., use of hard hats on active timber sales, wearing of seatbelts, and cautious driving of well maintained vehicles.</p>
<p>4.2.b. The forest owner or manager and their employees and contractors demonstrate a safe work environment. Contracts or other written agreements include safety requirements.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The audit team observed DNR taking numerous measures to ensure a safe work environment for their employees and contractors. For example, the use of chemical pesticides requires a licensed applicator and follows a written prescription; the use of prescribed fire is only permitted when sufficiently trained staff and necessary equipment are on site; personal protective equipment is worn by DNR employees and contractors.</p> <p>Standard contracts for DNR timber sales include written safety requirements. See Clause 35(b) of the standard timber sale contract (Pg 63-10 of the DNR Timber Sale Handbook):</p>

		“OSHA Compliance, Danger trees. The Purchaser is responsible to comply with, and assure compliance by all employees or subcontractors with, all Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA) requirements for the health and safety of Purchaser's employees, including provisions relating to danger trees”
4.2.c. The forest owner or manager hires well-qualified service providers to safely implement the management plan.	C	Timber sale contracts include training requirements (FISTA, the SFI-approved logger training program). Master Logger training is encouraged (not required) on public land timber sales.
*C4.4. Management planning and operations shall incorporate the results of evaluations of social impact. Consultations shall be maintained with people and groups (both men and women) directly affected by management operations.	C	
4.4.a. The forest owner or manager understands the likely social impacts of management activities, and incorporates this understanding into management planning and operations. Social impacts include effects on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Archeological sites and sites of cultural, historical and community significance (on and off the FMU); • Public resources, including air, water and food (hunting, fishing, collecting); • Aesthetics; • Community goals for forest and natural resource use and protection such as employment, subsistence, recreation and health; • Community economic opportunities; • Other people who may be affected by management operations. A summary is available to the CB.	NC	A Non-conformance is issued because a summary of the social impact assessment activities, as defined in Indicator 4.4.a., has not been made available to SCS. CAR 2011.2

<p>4.4.b. The forest owner or manager seeks and considers input in management planning from people who would likely be affected by management activities.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>DNR engages in a full and robust array of both formal and informal stakeholder interactions, dialogue and consultation. All property managers are actively involved in keeping the public informed and work well with “friends” groups. The Master Plan development process that is currently underway is an example of efforts to incorporate social impact into planning- http://dnr.wi.gov/master_planning/. The Master Plan Handbook defines public participation requirements and were observed to be followed on properties with Master Plans</p>
<p>4.4.c. People who are subject to direct adverse effects of management operations are apprised of relevant activities in advance of the action so that they may express concern.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>DNR engages in a full and robust array of both formal and informal stakeholder interactions, dialogue and consultation. All property managers are actively involved in keeping the public informed and work well with “friends” groups. Notices of timber sales are published far in advance of the start of timber sales. Some state properties or groups of properties are making the summary of notes of Integrated Property Planning Meetings available to the public.</p>
<p>4.4.d. For public forests, consultation shall include the following components:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clearly defined and accessible methods for public participation are provided in both long and short-term planning processes, including harvest plans and operational plans; 2. Public notification is sufficient to allow interested stakeholders the chance to learn of upcoming opportunities for public review and/or comment on the proposed management; 3. An accessible and affordable appeals process to planning decisions is available. <p>Planning decisions incorporate the results of public consultation. All draft and final planning documents, and their supporting data, are made</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Public notifications of planning activities and of public comment opportunities are robust and included in the Master Planning process. NR 44.04 details process for Master Plan development and public involvement.</p> <p>Final planning decisions, such as finalization of Master Plans, are clearly taken pursuant to statutory authorization and they involve extensive public input as well as in-depth analysis. Land management planning and operational management decisions are undertaken by a large and diverse staff of professional employees who collectively are acting in the public interest. As a state agency subject to a state administrative procedures act, there is an appeal process that is available.</p>

readily available to the public.		
C4.5. Appropriate mechanisms shall be employed for resolving grievances and for providing fair compensation in the case of loss or damage affecting the legal or customary rights, property, resources, or livelihoods of local peoples. Measures shall be taken to avoid such loss or damage.	C	
4.5.a. The forest owner or manager does not engage in negligent activities that cause damage to other people.	C	Audit team did not observe any evidence of negligent activities by DNR causing damage to other people.
4.5.b. The forest owner or manager provides a known and accessible means for interested stakeholders to voice grievances and have them resolved. If significant disputes arise related to resolving grievances and/or providing fair compensation, the forest owner or manager follows appropriate dispute resolution procedures. At a minimum, the forest owner or manager maintains open communications, responds to grievances in a timely manner, demonstrates ongoing good faith efforts to resolve the grievances, and maintains records of legal suites and claims.	C	DNR field personnel have a long tradition of maintaining open dialogue with a wide array of interest groups as well as individuals. DNR employees seek to resolve any issues that may arise through open communication and that litigation is pursued or resorted only in extremely rare circumstances. As a state agency subject to a state administrative procedures act, there is an appeal process that is available.
4.5.c. Fair compensation or reasonable mitigation is provided to local people, communities or adjacent landowners for substantiated damage or loss of income caused by the landowner or manager.	NA	Management of the State Lands has not caused damage or loss of income to local people, communities, or adjacent landowners. Rather, the state lands provide income opportunities (not loss) by supplying timber, recreation, research, and other opportunities. Payments in lieu of taxes (PILOT) are made to local communities to offset the land being out of the County tax base.
P5 Forest management operations shall encourage the efficient use of the forest's multiple products and services to ensure economic viability and a wide range of environmental and social benefits.		
*C5.5. Forest management operations shall recognize, maintain, and, where appropriate,	C	

<p>enhance the value of forest services and resources such as watersheds and fisheries.</p>		
<p>5.5.a. In developing and implementing activities on the FMU, the forest owner or manager identifies, defines and implements appropriate measures for maintaining and/or enhancing forest services and resources that serve public values, including municipal watersheds, fisheries, carbon storage and sequestration, recreation and tourism.</p>	C	<p>Master Plans for each property describes the maintenance and enhancement of resources that serve public values, such as watersheds, fisheries, uncut reserves, recreation and tourism. See completed Master Plans for details http://dnr.wi.gov/master_planning/completed_archi ve/parks_trails/</p>
<p>5.5.b The forest owner or manager uses the information from Indicator 5.5.a to implement appropriate measures for maintaining and/or enhancing these services and resources.</p>	C	<p>Master Plans for each forest describes the maintenance and enhancement of resources that serve public values, such as watersheds, fisheries, uncut reserves, recreation and tourism. Notes of audit field stops (Section 1.2 of this report) provide numerous examples of such efforts.</p>
<p>*C5.6. The rate of harvest of forest products shall not exceed levels which can be permanently sustained.</p>		
<p>5.6.a. In FMUs where products are being harvested, the landowner or manager calculates the sustained yield harvest level for each sustained yield planning unit, and provides clear rationale for determining the size and layout of the planning unit. The sustained yield harvest level calculation is documented in the Management Plan.</p> <p>The sustained yield harvest level calculation for each planning unit is based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • documented growth rates for particular sites, and/or acreage of forest types, age-classes and species distributions; • mortality and decay and other factors that affect net growth; • areas reserved from harvest or subject to harvest restrictions to meet other management goals; 	C	<p>Harvest levels are regulated using area control with a fine based inventory. Levels are set based on specific property objectives and inventory (growth rates, age class, species distributions, etc). WDNR’s harvest levels are well below what can be permanently sustained because significant portion of the land are classified as passively managed, extended rotation classifications, or other restrictions.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • silvicultural practices that will be employed on the FMU; • management objectives and desired future conditions. <p>The calculation is made by considering the effects of repeated prescribed harvests on the product/species and its ecosystem, as well as planned management treatments and projections of subsequent regrowth beyond single rotation and multiple re-entries.</p>		
<p>5.6.b. Average annual harvest levels, over rolling periods of no more than 10 years, do not exceed the calculated sustained yield harvest level.</p>	C	<p>WDNR uses area based control. WisFIRS (Wisconsin Forest Inventory & Reporting System) is used to manage the forest inventory data and to develop inventory reports, as well as to describe and track timber harvests. Harvest scheduling in WisFIRS ensures that areas treated does not exceed sustained yield levels over a 10 year period.</p>
<p>5.6.c. Rates and methods of timber harvest lead to achieving desired conditions, and improve or maintain health and quality across the FMU. Overstocked stands and stands that have been depleted or rendered to be below productive potential due to natural events, past management, or lack of management, are returned to desired stocking levels and composition at the earliest practicable time as justified in management objectives.</p>	C	<p>Through WisFIRS and use of the prescriptions in the Silvicultural Handbook, WDNR is moving the forest to a desired conditions and improving/maintaining health. There remains considerable backlog on state lands of stands to be harvested as projected by WisFIRS. However, harvest levels over the past three years have been increased to more nearly match growth and harvest plans in response to directives from the state legislature and reallocation of resources (Act 166). An effort is underway to accurately identify all “deferred” acres; this is important because many of the properties administered within the Lands Division may have a clear forestry prescription indicated, but may not have sufficiently clear planning direction to allow the prescription to proceed at this time.</p>
<p>5.6.d. For NTFPs, calculation of quantitative sustained yield harvest levels is required only in cases where products are harvested in significant commercial operations or where traditional or customary use rights may be impacted by such</p>	NA	<p>Significant commercial operations of NTFP’s are not occurring.</p>

<p>harvests. In other situations, the forest owner or manager utilizes available information, and new information that can be reasonably gathered, to set harvesting levels that will not result in a depletion of the non-timber growing stocks or other adverse effects to the forest ecosystem.</p>		
<p>P6 Forest management shall conserve biological diversity and its associated values, water resources, soils, and unique and fragile ecosystems and landscapes, and, by so doing, maintain the ecological functions and the integrity of the forest.</p>		
<p>*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.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>6.1.a. Using the results of <i>credible scientific analysis, best available information</i> (including relevant databases), and local knowledge and experience, an assessment of conditions on the FMU is completed and includes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Forest community types and development, size class and/or successional stages, and associated <i>natural disturbance regimes</i>; 2) <i>Rare, Threatened and Endangered (RTE) species</i> and <i>rare ecological communities</i> (including plant communities); 3) Other habitats and species of management concern; 4) Water resources and associated riparian habitats and hydrologic functions; 5) <i>Soil resources</i>; and 6) <i>Historic conditions</i> on the FMU related to forest community types and development, size class and/or successional stages, and a broad comparison 	<p>C</p>	<p>Items 1-6 are covered through numerous sources including BMP's for Water Quality, 2460 Timber Sale forms, Natural Heritage Inventory review, Wildlife Actions Plan and related Conservation Opportunity Areas, WisFIRS reports, Ecological Landscapes Handbook, and other tools. The Integrated Property Planning Meetings provide the opportunity to discuss the conditions of the FMU in the context of planned management activities.</p> <p>Master Plans that are being developed for each property or group of properties also cover items 1-6.</p>

of historic and current conditions.		
<p>6.1.b. Prior to commencing site-disturbing activities, the forest owner or manager assesses and documents the potential short and long-term impacts of planned management activities on elements 1-5 listed in Criterion 6.1.a.</p> <p>The assessment must incorporate the best available information, drawing from scientific literature and experts. The impact assessment will at minimum include identifying resources that may be impacted by management (e.g., streams, habitats of management concern, soil nutrients). Additional detail (i.e., detailed description or quantification of impacts) will vary depending on the uniqueness of the resource, potential risks, and steps that will be taken to avoid and minimize risks.</p>	NC	As described under 6.1.a, there are numerous tools available to property managers that are used to document potential impacts of planned managements activities. The majority of the requirements under 6.1.a are being factored into planned harvests. However, the audit team identified a gap for the requirement that prior to commencing site-disturbing activities, the forest owner or manager assesses and documents impacts of planned management activities on Forest community types and development, size class and/or successional stages, and associated natural disturbance regimes . The gap only applies to properties conducting harvests that do not have a recently updated Master Plan. See CAR 2011.3
<p>6.1.c. Using the findings of the impact assessment (Indicator 6.1.b), management approaches and field prescriptions are developed and implemented that: 1) avoid or minimize negative short-term and long-term impacts; and, 2) maintain and/or enhance the long-term ecological viability of the forest.</p>	C	As described above the required impact assessment described is being completed with the exception of community types and development, size class/or successional stages. An observation is issued to ensure that future management approaches/prescriptions incorporate the results of this missing analysis. Observation 2011.4
<p>6.1.d. On public lands, assessments developed in Indicator 6.1.a and management approaches developed in Indicator 6.1.c are made available to the public in draft form for review and comment prior to finalization. Final assessments are also made available.</p>	C	Assessment are memorialized in the Master Plans- which go through extensive review and comment prior to finalization.
<p>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</p>	C	

<p>of forest management and the uniqueness of the affected resources. Inappropriate hunting, fishing, trapping, and collecting shall be controlled.</p>		
<p>6.2.a. If there is a likely presence of RTE species as identified in Indicator 6.1.a then either a field survey to verify the species' presence or absence is conducted prior to site-disturbing management activities, or management occurs with the assumption that potential RTE species are present.</p> <p>Surveys are conducted by biologists with the appropriate expertise in the species of interest and with appropriate qualifications to conduct the surveys. If a species is determined to be present, its location should be reported to the manager of the appropriate database.</p>	C	<p>We observed that foresters routinely use the NHI data to determine presence and location of rare features in a stand that has been identified for timber management, chemical pesticide treatment, prescribed fire, and/or other disturbing activities. 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. 2011 audit revealed several examples of modifications made to project plans to protect sensitive species and their habitats. Biotic inventories are conducted prior to Master Plan developments on state forests. DNR has an array of species experts that are available for consultation.</p>
<p>6.2.b. When RTE species are present or assumed to be present, modifications in management are made in order to maintain, restore or enhance the extent, quality and viability of the species and their habitats. Conservation zones and/or protected areas are established for RTE species, including those S3 species that are considered rare, where they are necessary to maintain or improve the short and long-term viability of the species. Conservation measures are based on relevant science, guidelines and/or consultation with relevant, independent experts as necessary to achieve the conservation goal of the Indicator.</p>	C	<p>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. More localized protection of RTE species in actively managed stands occurs through exclusion zone buffers, such as those for goshawks and eagles. See field notes under section 2.1 for examples.</p>
<p>6.2.c. For medium and large public forests (e.g. state forests), forest management plans and operations are designed to meet species' recovery goals, as well as landscape level biodiversity conservation goals.</p>	C	<p>This is accomplished through the Wildlife Action Plan and the Conservation Opportunity Areas (COA's). During the 2011 audit foresters demonstrated good understanding of relevant COA's for their properties.</p>

<p>6.2.d. Within the capacity of the forest owner or manager, hunting, fishing, trapping, collecting and other activities are controlled to avoid the risk of impacts to vulnerable species and communities (See Criterion 1.5).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The WDNR relies primarily on DNR wardens for control of hunting, fishing, trapping, collecting and other impacts to RT&E species. Records from and interviews with WDNR staff show an adequate level of cooperation.</p>
<p>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.</p>		
<p>6.3.a.1. The forest owner or manager maintains, enhances, and/or restores under-represented successional stages in the FMU that would naturally occur on the types of sites found on the FMU. Where old growth of different community types that would naturally occur on the forest are under-represented in the landscape relative to natural conditions, a portion of the forest is managed to enhance and/or restore old growth characteristics.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>WDNR is aware of the under-represented successional stages on the landscape, and have demonstrated efforts to maintain, enhance, and or restore these communities. DNR’s planning and guidance documents covering this requirements include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Silvicultural Handbook -Ecological Landscapes Handbook - Old Growth and Old Forest Handbook
<p>6.3.a.2. When a rare ecological community is present, modifications are made in both the management plan and its implementation in order to maintain, restore or enhance the viability of the community. Based on the vulnerability of the existing community, conservation zones and/or protected areas are established where warranted.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Through SNA establishment and other efforts, WDNR identifies rare ecological communities for protection and for management and/or restoration as needed.</p>
<p>6.3.a.3. When they are present, management maintains the area, structure, composition, and processes of all Type 1 and Type 2 old growth. Type 1 and 2 old growth are also protected and buffered as necessary with conservation zones, unless an alternative plan is developed that provides greater</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>WDNR management in accordance with the Old Growth and Old Forests Handbook ensures protection of old growth.</p>

<p>overall protection of old growth values.</p> <p>Type 1 Old Growth is protected from harvesting and road construction. Type 1 old growth is also protected from other timber management activities, except as needed to maintain the ecological values associated with the stand, including old growth attributes (e.g., remove exotic species, conduct controlled burning, and thinning from below in dry forest types when and where restoration is appropriate).</p> <p>Type 2 Old Growth is protected from harvesting to the extent necessary to maintain the area, structures, and functions of the stand. Timber harvest in Type 2 old growth must maintain old growth structures, functions, and components including individual trees that function as refugia (see Indicator 6.3.g).</p> <p>On public lands, old growth is protected from harvesting, as well as from other timber management activities, except if needed to maintain the values associated with the stand (e.g., remove exotic species, conduct controlled burning, and thinning from below in forest types when and where restoration is appropriate).</p> <p>On American Indian lands, timber harvest may be permitted in Type 1 and Type 2 old growth in recognition of their sovereignty and unique ownership. Timber harvest is permitted in situations where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Old growth forests comprise a significant portion of the tribal ownership. 2. A history of forest stewardship by the tribe exists. 3. High Conservation Value Forest attributes are maintained. 4. Old-growth structures are maintained. 5. Conservation zones representative of old growth stands are established. 6. Landscape level considerations are 		
--	--	--

<p>addressed.</p> <p>7. Rare species are protected.</p>		
<p>6.3.b. To the extent feasible within the size of the ownership, particularly on larger ownerships (generally tens of thousands or more acres), management maintains, enhances, or restores habitat conditions suitable for well-distributed populations of animal species that are characteristic of forest ecosystems within the landscape.</p>	C	<p>The WDNR accomplishes this through a network of special management areas including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SNA's - Wildlife Management Areas - Old Growth Forests
<p>6.3.c. Management maintains, enhances and/or restores the plant and wildlife habitat of Riparian Management Zones (RMZs) to provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) habitat for aquatic species that breed in surrounding uplands; b) habitat for predominantly terrestrial species that breed in adjacent aquatic habitats; c) habitat for species that use riparian areas for feeding, cover, and travel; d) habitat for plant species associated with riparian areas; and, e) stream shading and inputs of wood and leaf litter into the adjacent aquatic ecosystem. 	C	<p>Trained foresters plan all projects; those with sensitive water-quality issues are reviewed by fisheries personnel and other specialists as needed. Water quality considerations including lakes or rivers potentially affected by the harvest are documented for each proposed harvest on a Form 2460-001 "Timber Sale Notice and Cutting Report" and this information is reflected in the harvesting requirements. Confirmed by reviews of completed and planned timber harvests that this program continues to operate effectively.</p> <p>Confirmed by field observations. Fisheries areas often have larger buffers than required by BMPs. Cold-water trout streams received particular attention. Fisheries Bureau implements an extensive program for habitat protection and restoration</p> <p>During this audit there were several sites devoted to protection of non-forested wetlands of ecological significance. One excellent example is the Comstock Bog SNA, where the focus is on the protection of the bog.</p>
<p>Stand-scale Indicators</p> <p>6.3.d Management practices maintain or enhance plant species composition, distribution and frequency of occurrence similar to those that would naturally occur on the site.</p>	C	<p>We observed that considerable effort is being made to regenerate oak (red, white and burr). Management practices promote underrepresented communities. Deer continue to have an impact in the regeneration of certain tree and plant species especially in specific areas.</p>

<p>6.3.e. When planting is required, a local source of known provenance is used when available and when the local source is equivalent in terms of quality, price and productivity. The use of non-local sources shall be justified, such as in situations where other management objectives (e.g. disease resistance or adapting to climate change) are best served by non-local sources. Native species suited to the site are normally selected for regeneration.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The State nursery provides local source of known provenance seeds and seedlings for planting.</p>
<p>6.3.f. Management maintains, enhances, or restores habitat components and associated stand structures, in abundance and distribution that could be expected from naturally occurring processes. These components include:</p> <p>a) large live trees, live trees with decay or declining health, snags, and well-distributed coarse down and dead woody material. Legacy trees where present are not harvested; and</p> <p>b) vertical and horizontal complexity.</p> <p>Trees selected for retention are generally representative of the dominant species found on the site.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>In all harvest units viewed during the 2011 audit we observed good levels of retentions. The new state-wide silvicultural guidelines for retaining structural diversity in even-aged management systems have been implemented and foresters attended state-wide training to gain understanding and application of the new green tree retention standards. A site on Naverino Wildlife Refuge that was set up after the new guidelines went into effect showed compliance with the new standard.</p> <p>See also Obs 2010.7</p>
<p>6.3.g.1 In the Southeast, Appalachia, Ozark-Ouachita, Mississippi Alluvial Valley, and Pacific Coast Regions, when even-aged systems are employed, and during salvage harvests, live trees and other native vegetation are retained within the harvest unit as described in Appendix C for the applicable region.</p> <p>In the Lake States Northeast, Rocky Mountain and Southwest Regions, when even-aged silvicultural systems are employed, and during salvage harvests, live trees and other native vegetation are retained within the harvest unit in a proportion and configuration that is consistent with the characteristic natural disturbance regime unless</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The new state-wide silvicultural guidelines for retaining structural diversity in even-aged management systems have been implemented and foresters attended state-wide training to gain understanding and application of the new green tree retention standards.</p>

<p>retention at a lower level is necessary for the purposes of restoration or rehabilitation. See Appendix C for additional regional requirements and guidance.</p>		
<p>6.3.g.2 Under very limited situations, the landowner or manager has the option to develop a qualified plan to allow minor departure from the opening size limits described in Indicator 6.3.g.1. A qualified plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is developed by qualified experts in ecological and/or related fields (wildlife biology, hydrology, landscape ecology, forestry/silviculture). 2. Is based on the totality of the best available information including peer-reviewed science regarding natural disturbance regimes for the FMU. 3. Is spatially and temporally explicit and includes maps of proposed openings or areas. 4. Demonstrates that the variations will result in equal or greater benefit to wildlife, water quality, and other values compared to the normal opening size limits, including for sensitive and rare species. 5. Is reviewed by independent experts in wildlife biology, hydrology, and landscape ecology, to confirm the preceding findings. 	NA	There were no departures from opening size limits.
<p>6.3.h. The forest owner or manager assesses the risk of, prioritizes, and, as warranted, develops and implements a strategy to prevent or control invasive species, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. a method to determine the extent of invasive species and the degree of threat to native species and ecosystems; 	NC	<p>Audit team finds DNR has not developed an invasive species program consistent with the requirements of 6.3.h.:</p> <p>Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Actions being taken to address invasive spp problems at Blue Mound, Yellowstone, and

<p>6. implementation of management practices that minimize the risk of invasive establishment, growth, and spread;</p> <p>7. eradication or control of established invasive populations when feasible: and,</p> <p>8. monitoring of control measures and management practices to assess their effectiveness in preventing or controlling invasive species.</p>		<p>Cross Plains were found to be insufficient to meet the requirements for 6.3.h.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Although DNR is making considerable efforts to control invasive plants on Wildlife Areas - most of the properties visited in 2011 were unable to demonstrate systematic efforts to determine the extent (e.g., inventory of invasives) and have planned strategy for prioritizing and treating invasives. <p>Background: Finding is mostly driven by observations on State Parks where in some cases we observed minimal or no efforts to identify, prioritize, and treat invasives- despite moderate levels of infestation on a property.</p> <p>CAR 2011.5</p>
<p>6.3.i. In applicable situations, the forest owner or manager identifies and applies site-specific fuels management practices, based on: (1) natural fire regimes, (2) risk of wildfire, (3) potential economic losses, (4) public safety, and (5) applicable laws and regulations.</p>	C	<p>Observed excellent utilization at site visits, and did not see any non-conformances with fuel loading.</p>
<p>6.9. The use of exotic species shall be carefully controlled and actively monitored to avoid adverse ecological impacts.</p>	C	
<p>6.9.a. The use of <i>exotic species</i> is contingent on the availability of credible scientific data indicating that any such species is non-invasive and its application does not pose a risk to native biodiversity.</p>	C	<p>Exotic species are not used for commercial purposes on state lands.</p>
<p>6.9.b. If exotic species are used, their provenance and the location of their use are documented, and their ecological effects are actively monitored.</p>	C	<p>Not used</p>
<p>6.9.c. The forest owner or manager shall take timely action to curtail or significantly reduce any adverse impacts resulting from their use of exotic species</p>	C	<p>Not used.</p>

<p>C6.10. Forest conversion to plantations or non-forest land uses shall not occur, except in circumstances where conversion:</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Conversions to non-forested areas is very limited in size, and primarily restricted to prairie restoration and large grassland management areas for specific desired habitat conditions (ie. sharptail grouse).</p>
<p>P7 A management plan -- appropriate to the scale and intensity of the operations -- shall be written, implemented, and kept up to date. The long-term objectives of management, and the means of achieving them, shall be clearly stated.</p>		
<p>*C7.1. The management plan and supporting documents shall provide:</p> <p>a) Management objectives. b) description of the forest resources to be managed, environmental limitations, land use and ownership status, socio-economic conditions, and a profile of adjacent lands.</p> <p>c) Description of silvicultural and/or other management system, based on the ecology of the forest in question and information gathered through resource inventories. d) Rationale for rate of annual harvest and species selection. e) Provisions for monitoring of forest growth and dynamics. f) Environmental safeguards based on environmental assessments. g) Plans for the identification and protection of rare, threatened and endangered species.</p> <p>h) Maps describing the forest resource base including protected areas, planned management activities and land ownership.</p> <p>i) Description and justification of harvesting techniques and equipment to be used.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>7.1.a. The management plan identifies the</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Rights are clearly established and identified in the</p>

ownership and legal status of the FMU and its resources, including rights held by the owner and rights held by others.		management plans and other related documents.
7.1.b. The management plan describes the history of land use and past management, current forest types and associated development, size class and/or successional stages, and natural disturbance regimes that affect the FMU (see Indicator 6.1.a).	C	This requirement is best addressed for properties with updated master plans. Through the Ecological Landscapes Handbook, Wildlife Action Plan, WisFIRS, 2460 "Timber Sale Notice and Cutting Report", Silvicultural Handbook, older master plans, and other information, this requirement is marginally addressed properties without an updated master plan.
7.1.c. The management plan describes: a) current conditions of the timber and non-timber forest resources being managed; b) desired future conditions; c) historical ecological conditions; and d) applicable management objectives and activities to move the FMU toward desired future conditions.	C	This requirement is best addressed for properties with updated master plans. Through the Ecological Landscapes Handbook, Wildlife Action Plan, WisFIRS, 2460 "Timber Sale Notice and Cutting Report", Silvicultural Handbook, older master plans, and other information, this requirement is marginally addressed properties without an updated master plan.
7.1.d. The management plan includes a description of the landscape within which the FMU is located and describes how landscape-scale habitat elements described in Criterion 6.3 will be addressed.	C	This requirement is best addressed for properties with updated master plans. Through the Ecological Landscapes Handbook, Wildlife Action Plan, WisFIRS, 2460 "Timber Sale Notice and Cutting Report", Silvicultural Handbook, older master plans, and other information, this requirement is marginally addressed properties without an updated master plan.
7.1.e. The management plan includes a description of the following resources and outlines activities to conserve and/or protect: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• rare, threatened, or endangered species and natural communities (see Criterion 6.2);• plant species and community diversity and wildlife habitats (see Criterion 6.3);• water resources (see Criterion 6.5);• soil resources (see Criterion 6.3);	C	This requirement is best addressed for properties with updated master plans. Through the Natural Heritage Inventory, Ecological Landscapes Handbook, Wildlife Action Plan, WisFIRS, 2460 "Timber Sale Notice and Cutting Report", Silvicultural Handbook, older master plans, and other information, this requirement is marginally addressed properties without an updated master plan.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Representative Sample Areas (see Criterion 6.4); • High Conservation Value Forests (see Principle 9); • Other special management areas. 		
<p>7.1.f. If invasive species are present, the management plan describes invasive species conditions, applicable management objectives, and how they will be controlled (see Indicator 6.3.j).</p>	C	<p>Observed varying levels of information about invasive species for specific properties. WDNR has implemented a set of state-wide BMPs for invasive species management that address elements of 6.3.j.</p> <p>There is an opportunity to improve coverage of invasive species in management planning documents, particularly for properties that do not have an updated master plan or a stand-alone invasive species management plan. Observation 2011.6</p>
<p>7.1.g. The management plan describes insects and diseases, current or anticipated outbreaks on forest conditions and management goals, and how insects and diseases will be managed (see Criteria 6.6 and 6.8).</p>	C	<p>WDNR has a number of documents, reports, and surveys that address insect and disease outbreaks and how to manage them including Master Plans, WisFIRS reports, Silvicultural Handbook, forest health reports, and the 2460 “Timber Sale Notice and Cutting Report”.</p>
<p>7.1.h. If chemicals are used, the plan describes what is being used, applications, and how the management system conforms with Criterion 6.6.</p>	C	<p>Chemical use is through Pesticide Use Forms.</p>
<p>7.1.i. If biological controls are used, the management plan describes what is being used, applications, and how the management system conforms with Criterion 6.8.</p>	C	<p>Biological controls are used for purple loosestrife and spotted knapweed. Use of biological control agents is addressed in several documents including the Purple Loosestrife Biological Control Manual and Invasives Best Management Practices.</p>
<p>7.1.j. The management plan incorporates the results of the evaluation of social impacts, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • traditional cultural resources and rights of use (see Criterion 2.1); • potential conflicts with customary uses and use rights (see Criteria 2.2, 2.3, 3.2); • management of ceremonial, archeological, and historic sites (see Criteria 3.3 and 4.5); 	C	<p>NR 44.04 details process for Master Plan development and public involvement assuring evaluation of social impacts are incorporated. See also C. 4.4.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • management of aesthetic values (see Indicator 4.4.a); • public access to and use of the forest, and other recreation issues; • local and regional socioeconomic conditions and economic opportunities, including creation and/or maintenance of quality jobs (see Indicators 4.1.b and 4.4.a), local purchasing opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.e), and participation in local development opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.g). 		
7.1.k. The management plan describes the general purpose, condition and maintenance needs of the transportation network (see Indicator 6.5.e).	C	Master Plans include limited information on roads and trails. See Observation 2011.8.
7.1.l. The management plan describes the silvicultural and other management systems used and how they will sustain, over the long term, forest ecosystems present on the FMU.	C	Described in Master Plan and Silvicultural Handbook.
7.1.m. The management plan describes how species selection and harvest rate calculations were developed to meet the requirements of Criterion 5.6.	C	Detailed in each Master Plan within the Summary Chart (Chapter 3) and listed by area. See Brule River Master Plan.
7.1.n. The management plan includes a description of monitoring procedures necessary to address the requirements of Criterion 8.2.	C	Monitoring of the Master Plan objectives and implementation is well addressed. See http://dnr.wi.gov/master_planning/monitoring.html
7.1.o. The management plan includes maps describing the resource base, the characteristics of general management zones, special management areas, and protected areas at a level of detail to achieve management objectives and protect sensitive sites.	C	Comprehensive GIS system used on all forests.
7.1.p. The management plan describes and justifies the types and sizes of harvesting machinery and techniques employed on the FMU to minimize or limit impacts to the resource.	C	Justified on 2460.
7.1.q. Plans for harvesting and other significant site-disturbing management activities required to carry	C	Master Plan and 2460

<p>out the management plan are prepared prior to implementation. Plans clearly describe the activity, the relationship to objectives, outcomes, any necessary environmental safeguards, health and safety measures, and include maps of adequate detail.</p>		
<p>7.1.r. The management plan describes the stakeholder consultation process.</p>	C	Detailed in NR 44.04
<p>P8 Monitoring shall be conducted -- appropriate to the scale and intensity of forest management -- to assess the condition of the forest, yields of forest products, chain of custody, management activities and their social and environmental impacts.</p> <p><i>Applicability Note: On small and medium-sized forests (see Glossary), an informal, qualitative assessment may be appropriate. Formal, quantitative monitoring is required on large forests and/or intensively managed forests.</i></p>		
<p>C8.1. The frequency and intensity of monitoring should be determined by the scale and intensity of forest management operations, as well as, the relative complexity and fragility of the affected environment. Monitoring procedures should be consistent and replicable over time to allow comparison of results and assessment of change.</p>	c	
<p>8.1.a. Consistent with the scale and intensity of management, the forest owner or manager develops and consistently implements a regular, comprehensive, and replicable written monitoring protocol.</p>	C	<p>A regular and comprehensive monitoring protocol has been implemented. The core of the monitoring program is RECON inventory updates. WDNR has made great progress in the last three years at updating this inventory. The results go into a state-wide database (WisFIRs) used to develop harvest schedules.</p> <p>Report from WISFIRs for Little Wolf Fishery Area showed that inventory and reconnaissance data was less than 10 years old for 89% of the acres. All foresters have a priority goal to update the inventory on at least 20% of their older inventory data (defined as more than 20 years old) each year so that the inventory data are up-to-date within 5 years; many foresters are moving to update the data more rapidly.</p>

		Monitoring of Master Plan implementation has improved greatly in recent years. All monitoring results are published on the DNR website. http://dnr.wi.gov/master_planning/monitoring.html
8.2. Forest management should include the research and data collection needed to monitor, at a minimum, the following indicators: a) yield of all forest products harvested, b) growth rates, regeneration, and condition of the forest, c) composition and observed changes in the flora and fauna, d) environmental and social impacts of harvesting and other operations, and e) cost, productivity, and efficiency of forest management.	C	
8.2.a.1. For all commercially harvested products, an inventory system is maintained. The inventory system includes at a minimum: a) species, b) volumes, c) stocking, d) regeneration, and e) stand and forest composition and structure; and f) timber quality.	C	Topics a-f are monitored through Wisconsin Forest Inventory & Reporting System (WisFIRS).
8.2.a.2. Significant, unanticipated removal or loss or increased vulnerability of forest resources is monitored and recorded. Recorded information shall include date and location of occurrence, description of disturbance, extent and severity of loss, and may be both quantitative and qualitative.	C	Monitored through Wisconsin Forest Inventory & Reporting System (WisFIRS).
8.2.b The forest owner or manager maintains records of harvested timber and NTFPs (volume and product and/or grade). Records must adequately ensure that the requirements under Criterion 5.6 are met.	C	Monitored through Wisconsin Forest Inventory & Reporting System (WisFIRS).
8.2.c. The forest owner or manager periodically obtains data needed to monitor presence on the FMU of:	C	Monitored through Natural Heritage Inventory, WisFIRS, and specific monitoring protocol for SNA's. See http://dnr.wi.gov/org/land/er/forms/1700-

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Rare, threatened and endangered species and/or their <i>habitats</i>; 2) Common and rare plant communities and/or habitat; 3) Location, presence and abundance of invasive species; 4) Condition of protected areas, set-asides and buffer zones; 5) High Conservation Value Forests (see Criterion 9.4). 		021.pdf for details of monitoring of SNA's.
<p>8.2.d.1. Monitoring is conducted to ensure that site specific plans and operations are properly implemented, environmental impacts of site disturbing operations are minimized, and that harvest prescriptions and guidelines are effective.</p>	C	<p>DNR foresters conduct regular harvest inspections and timber sale closeout inspections. Records reviewed during 2011 audit showed inspections occurring 1 to 2 times per week.</p>
<p>8.2.d.2. A monitoring program is in place to assess the condition and environmental impacts of the forest-road system.</p>	C	<p>Monitoring of conditions and impacts of roads occurs informally. See Observation 2011.8.</p>
<p>8.2.d.3. The landowner or manager monitors relevant socio-economic issues (see Indicator 4.4.a), including the social impacts of harvesting, participation in local economic opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.g), the creation and/or maintenance of quality job opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.b), and local purchasing opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.e).</p>	C	<p>See Criterion 4.4.</p>
<p>8.2.d.4. Stakeholder responses to management activities are monitored and recorded as necessary.</p>	C	<p>Stakeholder responses are recorded in different ways, for example meetings with Friends Groups, Master Plan consultation processes, and in meetings with user groups.</p>
<p>8.2.d.5. Where sites of cultural significance exist, the opportunity to jointly monitor sites of cultural significance is offered to tribal representatives (see Principle 3).</p>	C	<p>Such opportunities are offered to tribal representatives through working with the DNR Archeologist.</p>

8.2.e. The forest owner or manager monitors the costs and revenues of management in order to assess productivity and efficiency.	C	All budgets with the DNR are carefully controlled and thus results in monitoring of costs and revenues.
--	---	---

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

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

- a) Forest areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant: concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g., endemism, endangered species, refugia); and/or large landscape level forests, contained within, or containing the management unit, where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance**
- b) Forest areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems**
- c) Forest areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g., watershed protection, erosion control)**
- d) Forest areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g., subsistence, health) and/or critical to local communities’ traditional cultural identity (areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in cooperation with such local communities).**

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

Central Hardwoods:

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

North Woods/Lake States:

- Old growth – (see Glossary) (a)
- Old forests/mixed age stands that include trees >120 years old (a)
- Blocks of contiguous forest, > 500 ac, which host RTEs (b)

- Oak savannas (b)
- Hemlock-dominated forests (b)
- Pine stands of natural origin (b)
- Contiguous blocks, >500 ac, of late successional species, that are managed to create old growth (a)
- Fens, particularly calcareous fens (c)
- Other non-forest communities, e.g., barrens, prairies, distinctive geological land forms, vernal pools (b or c)
- Other sites as defined by GAP analysis, Natural Heritage Inventory, and/or the World Wildlife Fund’s Forest Communities of Highest Conservation Concern (b)

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

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

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

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

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

<p>C9.4. Annual monitoring shall be conducted to assess the effectiveness of the measures employed to maintain or enhance the applicable conservation attributes.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>9.4.a. The forest owner or manager monitors, or participates in a program to annually monitor, the status of the specific HCV attributes, including the effectiveness of the measures employed for their maintenance or enhancement. The monitoring program is designed and implemented consistent with the requirements of Principle 8.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Much of the HCVF on State lands are not actively managed for timber, thus requiring lower intensity monitoring. The following monitoring activities occur on HCVF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State land and forest compartment Recon includes all stands, both actively and passively managed. Recon is updated approximately every 15 years. • A Continuous Forest Inventory system was established in 2006 to continuously monitor forest and non-forest attributes and trends. • Non-forested communities are tracked by informal observation. • Remote aerial images are regularly reviewed, and GIS are maintained. • The SNA program has standardized methods for conducting long-term monitoring of

		ecosystems.
9.4.b. When monitoring results indicate increasing risk to a specific HCV attribute, the forest owner/manager re-evaluates the measures taken to maintain or enhance that attribute, and adjusts the management measures in an effort to reverse the trend.	C	Observed evidence on Waterloo Wildlife Refuge. Bland Rd- Managrass invasive spp outbreak adjacent to SNA. Scheduled to be sprayed this fall.