Surveillance Audit Report

2010-2014 Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Standard

September 8, 2011

A. Wisconsin DNR County Forest System   **FRS #: 1Y941**

B. Scope:
☐ No Change   ☒ Changed

SFI Program implementation and other related activities covered by the SFI Standard 2005-2009.   The SFI Certification Number is NSF-SFIS-1Y941. Categories included in the DNR Lands forest certification review include:

- Northern and Southern State Forests
- State Parks
- State Recreation Trails
- State Wildlife Areas
- State Fisheries Areas
- State Natural Areas
- Natural Resource Protection and Management Areas
- Lower Wisconsin Riverway
- State Wild Rivers
- State Owned Islands
- Stewardship Demonstration Forests

The following DNR properties (about 130,599 acres) are explicitly excluded from the certification project:

- Agricultural fields (due to potential GMO issue)
- Stream Bank Protection Areas (eased lands not under DNR management)
- Forest Legacy Easements (eased lands not under DNR management)
- States Fish Hatcheries and Rearing Ponds (intensive non-forest use)
- State Forest Nurseries (intensive non-forest use)
- Nonpoint Pollution Control Easements (eased lands not under DNR management)
- Poynette Game Farm and McKenzie Environmental Center (intensive non-forest use)
- Boat Access Sites (intensive non-forest use)
- Fire Tower Sites (intensive non-forest use)
- Radio Tower Sites (intensive non-forest use)
- Ranger Stations (intensive non-forest use)
- Administrative Offices and Storage Buildings (intensive non-forest use)

C. NSF Audit Team:

Lead Auditor: Mike Ferrucci   Auditors: JoAnn Hanowski, Dave Wager (SCS Lead)

D. Audit Dates: August 14-18, 2011

E. Reference Documentation:

2010-2014 SFI Standard®

WDNR SFI Documentation: Various

F. Audit Results: Based on the results at this visit, the auditor concluded

☐ Acceptable with no nonconformances; or

☒ Acceptable with minor nonconformances to be corrected before the next scheduled audit visit;

☐ Not acceptable with one or two major nonconformances - corrective action required;

☐ Several major nonconformances - certification may be canceled without immediate action

G. Changes to Operations or to the SFI Standard:

Are there any significant changes in operations, procedures, specifications, FRS, etc. from the previous visit?   ☐ Yes ☒ No   If yes, provide brief description of the changes:

H. Other Issues Reviewed:

☒Yes   ☐No   Public report from previous audit(s) is posted on SFB web site.

☒Yes   ☐No ☐N.A.   SFI and other relevant logos or labels are utilized correctly.
                                                                  If no, document on CAR forms.

☒ **Yes**   ☐**No**   The program is a Multi-site Organization:
Multi-Site Organization: A n organization having an identified central function (hereafter referred to as a central office — but not necessarily the headquarters of the organization) at which certain activities are planned, controlled or managed and a network of local offices or branches (sites) at which such activities are fully or partially carried out.
Source: SFI Requirements, Section 9, Appendix: Audits of Multi-Site Organizations
☐ IAF-MD1 or ☒ The alternate approach outlined in SFI Requirements, Section 9, Appendix 1 was assessed by NSF's Lead Auditor during the certification audit.
☒ **Yes**☐**No**   Concerns/ issues are listed in the checklist (to be reviewed by NSF Forestry Program Manager)

I. Corrective Action Requests:

☐ Corrective Action Plan is not required.

☒ Corrective Action Plan is required within sixty days of this visit (for Minor Nonconformances).   CARs will be verified during the next Surveillance Audit.

☐ Corrective Action Plan is required within thirty days of this visit (for Major Nonconformances). The auditor will make arrangements to verify the corrective action has been effectively implemented.

Your Corrective Action Plans should be provided through your NSF On-line Interface. Any questions should be directed to Tyrek A. Morgan 734-827-6869 tmorgan@nsf-isr.org.

At the conclusion of this Surveillance Audit visit, the following CARs remain open:
MAJOR(S): 0 MINOR(S): 3   Opportunities For Improvement (OFIs) identified: 3

J. Future Audit Schedule:

Follow-up or Surveillance Audits are required by the 2010-2014 Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard ®. The next Surveillance Audit is scheduled for August 8-10, 2012. The assigned lead auditor will contact you 2-3 months prior to this date to reconfirm and begin preparations. Recertification must be completed before January, 2013.

Multi-site sampling: There are land management types: state forests, state parks, state wildlife areas, state natural areas, recreation areas, and scattered parcels. The sampling plan requires audits of the central function and 4 of 6 land management types (aka "sites") each year for Surveillance Audits and 5 of 6 sites for recertification.

Appendices:

Appendix I: Surveillance Notification Letter and Audit Schedule

Appendix II: Public Surveillance Audit Report

Appendix III: Audit Matrix

Appendix IV: Site Visit Notes and Participants

Appendix V: SFI Reporting Form (if needed)

Appendix I

Surveillance Notification Letter and Audit Schedule

August 9, 2011

Ken Symes
Forest Certification Coordinator
Forestry Division Effectiveness and Outreach Section
Bureau of Forestry Business Services
WI Department of Natural Resources
PO Box 7921, Madison, WI 53707-7921

Re: Confirmation of SFI Standard Surveillance Audit

Dear Ken:

The NSF audit team is scheduled to conduct the Surveillance Audit of Wisconsin's State Lands on August 14-18, 2011. This is a partial review of your SFI Program to confirm that it continues to be in conformance with the SFI Standard and that continual improvement is being made. The scope statement is listed on the next page.

The audit team will consist of Mike Ferrucci, NSF-ISR Lead Auditor, Dave Wager, SCS Lead auditor, and JoAnn Hanowski, Team Auditor. During the audit we will follow the audit protocols described in the NSF procedures. The audit team will also conduct an FSC audit. Details of that process are available from SCS.

During the audit the team will:
1. Review progress on achieving SFI objectives and performance measures and the results of the management review of your SFI Program;

2. Review selected components of your SFI program;

3. Verify effective implementation of any corrective action plans from the previous NSF audit;

4. Review logo and/or label use;

5. Confirm public availability of public reports; and

6. Evaluate the effectiveness of planned activities aimed at continual improvement of your SFI Program.

7. Evaluate the multi-site requirements.

The enclosed tentative list outlines the topics I expect to review this year. We will obtain evidence regarding your program via review of documents, interviews, and observations made during field visits. We will start the process of document review immediately following the opening meeting on Sunday night (see schedule).

The schedule was previously developed jointly; it can be adapted on-site to accommodate any special circumstances. As during the certification audit please provide lunch for the audit team each day. If you have any questions about this audit, please call me at 203-887-9248.

Best Regards,

Mike Ferrucci, Lead Auditor, NSF-ISR, Ltd.

Scope:

SFI Program implementation and other related activities covered by the SFI Standard 2005-2009. The SFI Certification Number is NSF-SFIS-1Y941. Categories included in the DNR Lands forest certification review include:

- Northern and Southern State Forests
- State Parks
- State Recreation Trails
- State Wildlife Areas
- State Fisheries Areas
- State Natural Areas
- Natural Resource Protection and Management Areas
- Lower Wisconsin Riverway
- State Wild Rivers
- State Owned Islands
- Stewardship Demonstration Forests

The following DNR properties (about 130,599 acres) are explicitly excluded from the certification project:

- Agricultural fields (due to potential GMO issue)
- Stream Bank Protection Areas (eased lands not under DNR management)
- Forest Legacy Easements (eased lands not under DNR management)
- States Fish Hatcheries and Rearing Ponds (intensive non-forest use)
- State Forest Nurseries (intensive non-forest use)
- Nonpoint Pollution Control Easements (eased lands not under DNR management)
- Poynette Game Farm and McKenzie Environmental Center (intensive non-forest use)
- Boat Access Sites (intensive non-forest use)
- Fire Tower Sites (intensive non-forest use)
- Radio Tower Sites (intensive non-forest use)
- Ranger Stations (intensive non-forest use)
- Administrative Offices and Storage Buildings (intensive non-forest use)

Detailed Agenda for Sunday August 14

6 pm Opening Meeting/Agenda Review
- Review changes to the Facility Record Sheet (contact information, billing information, etc.)
- Discuss changes/improvements to the SFI Program, changes in operations, or changes in scope since the certification audit
- Review NSF SFI Audit Procedures
- Discuss field site visit provisions and other logistical issues
- Verify implementation of the corrective action plans from the previous NSF audit
- Review SFI Survey forms and confirm public report is available to public
- Review minutes of Management meetings
- Review Logo or Label use issues
- Multi-site requirements review

6:30 pm SFI Program Focus Areas – documentation:

Objectives 1 to 7: Requirements for Land Management
1.1	Sustainable Long-Term Harvest Levels
4.1	Conservation of Biodiversity
4.2	Application of Research & Science to Cons. Biodiversity.
5.1	Visual Quality of Harvests
5.2	Clear-cut Size, Shape, Placement
5.3	"Green Up" or Alternative Methods
5.4	Support Recreational Opportunities for the Public
6.1	Identification & Management of Special Sites

Objectives 14 to 20   Requirements for All Program Participants
14.1	Forestry Law/Reg. Compliance System
14.2	Social Law Compliance (including ILO)
15.1	Support or Funding for Research
15.2	Develop or Use Regional Analyses
15.3	Broaden Awareness of Climate Change Impacts
16.1	Training of Contractors and Personnel
16.2	Improved Wood Producer Professionalism
17.1	Cooperative Efforts for Sustainable Forestry
17.2	Outreach, Education, Involvement
17.3	Inconsistent Practices or Concerns
18.1	Public Lands Planning Involvement
18.2	Public Lands Conferring with Native Peoples
19.1	Summary Audit Report (following audits)
19.2	Annual Reporting to SFI, Inc.
20.1	Management Review System

Summary of 2010 Findings

Minor Non-conformance

Indicator 2.3.4 requires "Post-harvest conditions conducive to maintaining site productivity (e.g., limited rutting, retained down woody debris, minimized skid trails)."

Minor Non-conformance SFI-2010-01: An improperly located main skid trail in the Hoffman Hills SRA Tract #1-09 has led to erosion and sedimentation.

Transitional Minor Non-conformance

The SFI 2010-2014 Standard, Indicator 15.3.2 requires "Program Participants are knowledgeable about climate change impacts on wildlife, wildlife habitats and conservation of biological diversity through international, national, regional or local programs."

Transitional Minor Non-conformance SFI-2010-2: Available information is being monitored, but not all managers are knowledgeable about climate change impacts for the forests they manage. There is no plan for meeting this requirement by 12.31.10 as required by the SFI Transition Guidelines.

7 pm FSC Program Focus Areas (provided by SCS):

WDNR All Lands Forest Certification Audit

DRAFT -- 2011 FSC & SFI Audit Schedule
August 14 (Sunday) – August 18 (Thursday)

August 14<u>th</u> (Sunday)

Location: Wausau

What: Certification Kick-off and CAR Report review
Time: 6:00 pm
Who: Auditors and Integrated Certification Implementation Team
Materials: 2010 CAR Progress Report & Audit Schedule
Overnight Location: Best Western Midway
ICIT: Teague, Ken, Alan (?), Paul(?), Kate(?)

<div style="border:1px solid black; text-align:center;">Kick off & CAR Review Team</div>

August 15<u>th</u> (Monday) – Team #1

Auditors: Ferrucci
ICIT Team: Paul, Ken

Visit #1: 8:00 to 10:00 (30 minute drive from Wausau)

Property Name/Link: Council Grounds State Park
Property Type: Parks
Property Acres: 508
Meeting Location: HQ
Contact: Property Supervisor: Dawn Bishop (715-536-8773)
Forestry: Bill Millis and Rich Lavalley

Visit #2: 11:00 to 1:00 (60 minute drive)

Property Name/Link: Little Wolf Fishery Area
Property Type: Fish
Property Acres: 2,172
Meeting Location: Town of Harrison, T25N-R11E SW SE, Parking area on the East side of Ness Rd.
Contact: Fisheries: Al Niebur (715-853-8076)
Wildlife Management: Jake Fries (920-420-0384)
Forestry: Lyle Eiden (Portage), Mike Schuessler - 715 258-8432 (Waupaca)

LUNCH: 1:00 to 1:45

Visit #3 2:15 to 4:15 (30 minute drive)

Property Name/Link: Paul J. Olson Wildlife Area
Property Type: Wildlife
Property Acres: 2,995
Meeting Location: 4710 Cr-M, Rudolph, WI - Mapquest - Paul Olson parking lot http://mapq.st/qgKS6F
Contact: Wildlife Management: Lesa Kardash – 715-340-5034
Forestry: Kris Wimme

Overnight: Stevens Point Comfort Suites

August 15th (Monday) – Team #2

Auditor: Wager
ICIT Team: Teague, Alan

Visit #1: 8:00 to 10:00 (30 minute drive from Wausau)

Property Name/Link: [Plover River Fishery Area](#)
Property Type: Fish
Property Acres: 1,434
Location: Marathon County
Contact: Fish: Tom Meronek (715-410-4222)
                        Lands: Armund Bartz
                        Forestry: Chad Keranen

Visit #2: 11:00 to 1:00 (60 minute drive)

Property Name/Link: [Navarino Wildlife Area](#)
Property Type: Wildlife
Property Acres: 13,617
Meeting Location: Navarino Nature Center, 5646 Lindsten Road, Schioton
Contact: Wildlife Management: Kay Brockman-Mederas 715-853-2952
                        Forestry: Eric Roers

LUNCH: 1:00 to 1:45

Visit #3 2:45 to 4:45 (60 minute drive)

Property Name/Link: [High Cliff State Park](#)
Property Type: Parks
Property Acres: 1,187
Location: HQ
Contact: Superintendent: Carolyn Morgen (920-989-1106)
                        Forestry: Frank Kirschling

Overnight: Appleton Paper Valley Radisson

August 16th (Tuesday) – Team #1

Auditors: Ferrucci
ICIT Team: Paul, Ken, Kate(?)

Visit #1: 8:00 to 10:00 (30 minute drive from Stevens Point)

Property Name/Link: [Big Roche Cri Fishery Area](#)
Property Type: Fish
Property Acres: 493
Location: Adams/Waushara
Contact: Fish: Justine Hasz (715-459-1283)
                        Forestry: Austin Felts

Visit #2: 10:45 to 12:45 (45 minute drive)

Property Name/Link:	Comstock Bog-Meadow
Property Type:	State Natural Area
Property Acres:	537
Location:	Parking lot off Hwy 22 about 1.25 miles north of Cty Hwy J.
Contact:	Matt Wappler, Mark Martin

LUNCH: 12:45 to 1:30

Visit #3 2:15 to 4:15 (45 minute drive)

Property Name/Link:	Rocky Run Fishery Area
Property Type:	Wildlife/Fish
Property Acres:	735
Meeting Location:	Meet at the parking lot on the east end of the property off of Hwy 22
Contact:	Fisheries: Dave Rowe
	Wildlife Management: Sara Kehrli (608-220-3474)
	Fish: Dave Rowe (608 635-5143)
	Facilities and Land: Brian Hefty (608-576-1403), Mike Ring (608-575-3946), Ed Jepsen (608-335-8847), Kate Fitzgerald
	Forestry: Jim Bernett

Overnight: Madison Inn on the Park

August 16th (Tuesday) – Team #2

Auditors: Wager
ICIT Team: Alan, Teague

Visit #1: 8:00 to 10:00 (45 minute drive from Appleton)

Property Name/Link:	Eldorado Wildlife Area
Property Type:	Wildlife
Property Acres:	6,381
Meeting Location:	Heinrich Road is 6.5 miles west of the Junction of Hwy. 41 and Hwy 23 or 1.4 miles east of the Junction of Cty. Trk. C and Hwy 23. Follow Heinrich Rd east until you come to the parking lot.
Contact:	Wildlife Management: Mark Randall – 920-420-8771
	Forestry: Tom Vanden Elzen

Visit #2: 10:45 to 12:45 (45 minute drive)

Property Name/Link:	Horicon Marsh Wildlife Area
Property Type:	Wildlife
Property Acres:	
Meeting Location:	Horicon International Education Center, N7728 Hwy 28, Horicon
Contact:	Wildlife Management: Brenda Kelly – 920-960-0795
	Forestry: Randy Stampfl

LUNCH: 12:45 to 1:30

Visit #3 2:15 to 4:15 (45 minute drive)

Property Name/Link: Waterloo Wildlife Area
Property Type: Wildlife
Property Acres: 4,000 acres
Meeting Location: Coming from MSN exit I-94 north onto Hwy 89(Lake Mills, Waterloo exit). Go north on Hwy 89 ~4.5 miles and turn right (east) onto Lenius Lane which dead ends in parking lot.

Contact: Wildlife Management: Charlie Kilian – 920-988-2996
Forestry: Randy Stampfl

Overnight: Madison Inn on the Park

August 17th (Wednesday) – Team #1

Auditors: Ferrucci
ICIT Team: Ken

Visit #1: 8:00 to 10:00 (30 minute drive)

Property Name/Link: Brooklyn Wildlife Area
Property Type: Wildlife
Property Acres: 3,540
Meeting Location: Main parking lot off CTY Highway DD east of Belleville

Contact: Wildlife Management: Mike Foy – 608-575-6904
Forestry: Corey Secher

Visit #2: 10:45 to 12:45 (45 minute drive)

Property Name/Link: Yellowstone State Park
Property Type: Parks
Property Acres: 1,000
Meeting Location: HQ
Contact: Park Manager: John Arther (608-523-4427)
Forestry: Matt Singer

LUNCH: 12:45 to 1:30

Final Stop Madison: 2:00 pm
What: Preliminary Exit Briefing with ICIT Team members and DNR staff
Time: 3:00pm – 5:00pm
Where: Madison, GEFII, Room 413
Who: Auditors, ICIT, DNR staff
Overnight: Madison Inn on the Park

August 17th (Wednesday) – Team #2

Auditors: Wager
ICIT Team: Teague, Alan

Visit #1: 8:00 to 10:00 (45 minute drive)

Property Name/Link: [Blue Mound State Park](#)
Property Type: Parks
Property Acres: 1,153
Meeting Location: HQ
Contact: Park Manager: Kevin Swenson (608-437-5711)

Visit #2: 10:30 to 12:30 (30 minute drive)

Property Name/Link: [Cross Plains State Park/Ice Age Complex](#)
Property Type: Parks
Property Acres:
Meeting Location: We can meet at the NPS property on Old Sauk Pass Road. There is gate / NPS Kiosk, house and barn in this area.

Contact: Park Manager: Rene Lee (608-831-3001) Forestry: Steve Holaday

LUNCH: 12:30 to 1:15

Final Stop Madison: 2:00 pm
What: **Preliminary Exit Briefing with ICIT Team members and DNR staff**
Time: 3:00pm – 5:00pm
Where: Madison, GEFII, Room 413
Who: Auditors, ICIT, DNR staff
Overnight: Madison Inn on the Park

August 18th (Thursday)

What: **WDNR All lands Forest Certification Exit Report (Leadership Briefing)**
Time: 8:00am – 11:00am
Where: Madison, GEFII, Room 413
Who: Auditors, ICIT, DNR staff, Section Chiefs, Bureau Directors and Division Administrators
Purpose: Preliminary Findings from the field audit and status of CARS

Contacts:

Mike Ferrucci	203-887-9248		
JoAnn Hanowski			
Dave Wager			
Teague Prichard	608-628-5606 (cell)	Ken Symes	262-353-2949 (cell)
Kristin Lambert	414-322-7755 (cell)	Kate Fitzgerald	608-212-4855 (cellRandy Hoffman
Jeff Prey	608-520-3368 (cell)	Alan Crossley	608-575-2291 (cell)
Craig Anderson		Paul Cunningham	

Appendix II

Wisconsin DNR State Lands
2011 SFI Summary Surveillance Audit Report

The SFI Program of the Wisconsin DNR has achieved continuing conformance with the SFI Standard®, 2010-2014 Edition, according to the NSF-ISR SFIS Certification Audit Process. This report describes the second annual follow-up Surveillance Audit designed to focus on changes in the standard, changes in operations, the management review system, and efforts at continuous improvement. In addition, a subset of SFI requirements were selected for detailed review.

The Wisconsin State Forests have been certified to the Sustainable Forestry Initiative® (SFI) Standard, 2005-2009 Edition (SFIS) since May 5, 2004 (SFI certificate #NSF-SFIS-1Y941).   In 2009 the scope of the Wisconsin SFI Program was expanded, and the program was recertified including programs for management of several categories of state lands beyond state forests, including parks, wildlife lands, and other categories of generally forested lands. DNR land included in the project includes approximately 1.5 million acres as shown below. Excised acreage includes predominantly special purpose lands (such as fish hatcheries, tree nurseries, communications towers, and administrative sites) and land under easement where DNR does not have land management authority.

Wisconsin DNR Lands – based on a May 2008 DNR real estate snapshot

	Fee and Leased Land (acres)	Outside Certification Scope	SFI Certified Land
State Forests (Certified in 2004)	553,736	36,002	517,734
"Other" DNR Land (Parks, Wildlife Areas, Etc.)	1,118,050	94,597	1,023,453
All DNR Land	1,671,786	130,599	1,541,187

An Overview of Forest Management on Wisconsin State Forests

Adapted from: Wisconsin DNR Web Site: http://dnr.wi.gov/org/land/forestry/StateForests/sf-timber.htm

"Wisconsin DNR lands are managed for multiple-use objectives. Along with non-timber objectives, the DNR lands are used to demonstrate various forest practices to the public, while meeting a variety of habitat objectives. Resource managers within the Department of Natural Resources use these objectives in conjunction with other demands to manage each state forest as a healthy ecosystem. Each year about 1 % of the land under DNR ownership is actively managed according to a 2007 report to the Wisconsin Legislature. In the last three years, an average of 14,985 acres were established for harvest per year. Of

this, two-thirds of the harvests occur on State Forests (which constitute 1/3 of the DNR land base). Reflecting a greater focus on non-timber objectives, other DNR land such as wildlife areas and state parks (with 2/3 of the land base) produce 1/3 of the average annual harvest acreage.

Of the area harvested over 70% of the management prescriptions are thinnings, which reduce the density of stems to accelerate growth of the remaining trees and vertical structural diversity within the stand harvested. Approximately 30 % of the stands actively managed each year are harvested using regeneration techniques. After harvest these stands are either replanted or regenerate naturally and will continue to grow and produce forests and wood products for future generations. These regenerating forests also provide important habitat for species associated with young forests such as the snowshoe hare and woodcock.

Harvested stands are either regenerated naturally or are planted with seedlings. The determination of which method to use is based on the ability of the site to regenerate naturally and the ability of the desired species to regenerate on a particular site. For example, if a site experiences hot and dry conditions planting may be the best alternative. This is most common for the pine species, especially jack pine.

Even-aged and uneven-aged management schemes are the harvest systems employed on Wisconsin DNR's land. Even-aged management includes clearcuts, clearcuts with reserves, seed tree methods, shelterwood cuttings, and intermediate thinnings. Uneven-aged management includes both individual and group selection techniques. Each of these systems and techniques are designed in conjunction with a particular tree species or community of trees. For example, uneven-aged single tree and group selection techniques are used in northern hardwoods, hemlock-hardwood, and swamp hardwood stands. In contrast, even-aged clearcuts are used in pine (red, white, and jack), paper birch, aspen, oak, northern hardwoods, scrub oak, aspen, fir-spruce, and black spruce stands. The selection of a management system and specific technique depends on many factors including tree composition, age of the stand, location, accessibility, and most importantly the long-term objectives for the stand under consideration."

An Overview of Forest Management on Wisconsin State Park Lands

Source: Managing Forests on Wisconsin State Park Lands

"Overall Management Priorities
Sustaining healthy forests is a vital role of WSPS properties, and the key to sustaining healthy forests is pro-active management. To ensure that management practices are consistent with the goals and objectives of the WSPS, several management priorities have been established but may vary depending on site characteristics:

• **Aesthetics**: Protect scenic views and allow forest cover to provide settings for solitude and privacy.

• **Recreation:** Sustain large canopy cover and shade in picnic areas, campgrounds, along nature trails, and high use areas.

• **Habitat:** Provide habitat for a wide variety of wildlife and plants, including endangered and threatened species.

• **Forest Health**: Allow for regeneration of the forest through quality forest management and seek opportunities that enhance or maintain the overall health and vigor of the forest ecosystem.

• **Pest management**: Manage invasive plant and animal species, pests, diseases, and nuisance wildlife through prevention, control, and eradication activities.

• **Education and research**: Provide opportunities for interpretation, education, and scientific research.

• **Water quality**: Sustain and enhance local watersheds and water resources including erosion control along waterways, trails, and other property features."

An Overview of Forest Management on Wisconsin Wildlife Areas

Source: to be provided by Wisconsin DNR.

SFIS Surveillance Audit Process

The surveillance audit was performed by NSF-ISR on August 14-18, 2011 by an audit team headed by Mike Ferrucci, Lead Auditor. The team included JoAnn Hanowski and Dave Wager, who also served as the FSC Lead Auditor. Audit team members fulfill the qualification criteria for conducting SFIS Certification Audits of "Section 9. SFI 2010-2014 Audit Procedures and Auditor Qualifications and Accreditation" contained in Requirements for the SFI 2010-2014 Program: Standards, Rules for Label Use, Procedures, and Guidance. The Wisconsin DNR's management representative is Ken Symes, Forest Certification Coordinator, Wisconsin DNR - Division of Forestry.

The objective of the audit was to assess conformance of the firm's SFI Program to the requirements of the Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Standard, 2010-2014 Edition. The audit served to upgrade the certificate to the revised SFI Standard. The audit was conducted in conjunction with an FSC audit covering the same lands and organization and by the same audit team. The two processes (SFI and FSC) shared teams and reviewed much of the same evidence, but each program had a different team leader and audit objectives. This report is intended to describe the SFI portion of the evaluation only (more information about the FSC portion of the evaluation is available from WDNR).

The Indicators and Performance Measures of the SFI 2010-2014 Standard were utilized without modification or substitution. As with the initial certification, SFI Performance Measures and indicators involving wood procurement (Objectives 8-13) were outside of the scope of the Wisconsin DNR's SFI program and were excluded from the scope of the SFI Certification Audit.

The audit was governed by an audit plan and by NSF audit protocols designed to enable the audit team determine conformance with the applicable SFI requirements. 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 lead auditor for review. The selection of field sites for inspection was based upon the risk of environmental impact, special features, and other criteria outlined in the NSF-ISR SFI-SOP.

During the audit the audit team reviewed a sample of the available written documentation as objective evidence of SFIS Conformance. The lead auditor also selected and interviewed stakeholders such as contract loggers, landowners and other interested parties, and interviewed employees within the organization to confirm that the SFI Standard was understood and actively implemented.

The possible findings for specific SFI requirements included Full Conformance, Major Non-conformance, Minor Non-conformance, Opportunities for Improvement, and Practices that exceeded the Basic Requirements of the SFIS.

Overview of Audit Findings

Wisconsin DNR's SFI Program was found to be in overall conformance with the SFIS Standard.

The 2010 Findings were resolved as described in the following two paragraphs:

> SFI Indicator 2.3.4 requires "Post-harvest conditions conducive to maintaining site productivity (e.g. limited rutting, retained down woody debris, minimized skid trails)." An improperly located main skid trail in the Hoffman Hills SRA Tract #1-09 had led to erosion and sedimentation. This area was repaired and restored. Closed Minor Non-conformance 2010-01 based on review of documentation of remedial actions, including photographs.

> SFI Indicator 15.3.2 requires that "Program Participants are knowledgeable about climate change impacts on wildlife, wildlife habitats and conservation of biological diversity through international, national, regional or local programs." Closed Transitional Minor Non-conformance 2010-02 as field personnel demonstrated awareness of climate change projections for their areas and the probable consequences for vegetation and for wildlife and wildlife habitats.

There was one new SFI 2010-2014 Standard Minor Non-conformance:

> 4.1.5 Program for assessment, conducted either individually or collaboratively, of forest cover types, age or size classes, and habitats at the individual ownership level and, where credible data are available, across the landscape, and take into account findings in planning and management activities. Minor Non-conformance 2011-01: For lands not covered by either a NR 44-compliant master plan or a landscape focused plan (e.g. Central Wisconsin Grasslands Management Plan) there is no demonstrated program for the assessment of forest cover types, age or size classes, and habitats at relevant spatial scales for the properties in the scope, or to take into account this information in multidisciplinary planning or management activities.

There are two Minor Non-conformances regarding the ISO-requirements for eligibility for multi-site sampling:

Internal auditing sufficient to assess overall conformance with the SFI 2010-2014 Standard was not demonstrated for issues managed centrally. Further, evidence was not provided of a systematic approach to internally-generated findings.

The following three "Opportunities for Improvement" were provided:

- SFI Indicator 2.2.6 Use of management practices appropriate to the situation, for example … There is an opportunity to improve the consistent use of record-keeping systems designed to track pesticide use.

- SFI Indicator 3.1.4 states: "Monitoring of overall best management practices implementation." There is an opportunity to improve the use of the system to document road conditions and planning to address these.

- SFI Indicator 4.1.7 requires "Participation in programs and demonstration of activities as appropriate to limit the introduction, impact and spread of invasive exotic plants and animals that directly threaten or are likely to threaten native plant and animal communities." There is an opportunity to improve efforts to limit the impact and spread of invasive exotic plants in parks.

These opportunities for improvement are provided to help identify areas where improvements could be made or where the audit team may focus during future audits.

The next audit is scheduled for August, 2012. This will be a recertification audit, covering the entire SFI Standard.

General Description of Evidence of Conformity

NSF's audit team used a variety of evidence to determine conformance. A general description of this evidence is provided below, organized by SFI Objective.

Objective 1. Forest Management Planning - To broaden the implementation of sustainable forestry by ensuring long-term forest productivity and yield based on the use of the best scientific information available.

Summary of Evidence – Property master plans serve as management plans for the larger (Tier 1 and Tier 2) parcels. The smaller parcels are covered by agency-specific planning guidance documents, with parcel specific objectives found on-line. The entire ownership is covered by detailed forestry protocols and manuals as well as associated RECON inventory data and WisFIRS inventory analysis and harvest scheduling software.

Objective 2. Forest Productivity - To ensure long-term forest productivity, carbon storage and conservation of forest resources through prompt reforestation, soil conservation, afforestation and other measures.

Summary of Evidence – Field observations and records associated with each timber harvest (2460 form and associated narratives) were used to confirm practices. Wisconsin DNR has programs for reforestation, for protection against insects, diseases, and wildfire, and for careful management of activities which could potentially impact soil and long-term productivity.

Objective 3. Protection and Maintenance of Water Resources - To protect water quality in streams, lakes and other water bodies.

Summary of Evidence – Field observations of a range of sites were the key evidence. Auditors visited the portions of many field sites that were closes to water resources, based on a field sample that was oriented heavily towards such sites.

Objective 4. Conservation of Biological Diversity including Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value To manage the quality and distribution of wildlife habitats and contribute to the conservation of biological diversity by developing and implementing stand- and landscape-level measures that promote habitat diversity and the conservation of forest plants and animals, including aquatic species.

Summary of Evidence – Field observations, written plans and policies, use of college-trained field biologists, availability of specialists, and regular staff involvement in conferences and workshops that cover scientific advances were the evidence used to assess the requirements involved biodiversity conservation. The close support and cooperation of various agencies, including those responsible for wildlife, fisheries, recreation, and endangered resources, were another key factor in the assessment.

Objective 5. Management of Visual Quality and Recreational Benefits - To manage the visual impact of forest operations and provide recreational opportunities for the public.

Summary of Evidence – Field observations of completed operations and policies/procedures for visual quality were assessed during the evaluation. Further maps of recreation sites,

combined with field visits, helped confirm a strong recreation program. Recreational use and esthetics were priority concerns where appropriate.

Objective 6. Protection of Special Sites - To manage lands that are ecologically, geologically, or culturally important in a manner that takes into account their unique qualities.
Summary of Evidence – Field observations of completed operations, records of special sites, training records, and written protection plans were all assessed during the evaluation. The strong program of Scientific Natural Areas contributed to the conclusions.

Objective 7. Efficient Use of Forest Resources - To promote the efficient use of forest resources.
Summary of Evidence – Field observations of completed operations, contract clauses, harvest inspection reports, and discussions with supervising field foresters and with loggers provided the key evidence. There was limited opportunity to review this indicator on harvest sites in the 2011 Surveillance Audit. On those few sites were harvests had been completed the indicator was being met through reasonable utilization, harvest inspections, and lump-sum sales.

Objective 14. Legal and Regulatory Compliance -
Compliance with applicable federal, provincial, state and local laws and regulations.
Summary of Evidence – Field reviews of ongoing and completed operations were the most critical evidence.

Objective 15. Forestry Research, Science, and Technology - To support forestry research, science, and technology, upon which sustainable forest management decisions are based.
Summary of Evidence – Financial records were confirmed, and some field research sites were visited.

Objective 16. Training and Education -To improve the implementation of sustainable forestry practices through appropriate training and education programs.
Summary of Evidence – Training records of selected personnel, records associated with harvest sites audited, and logger and stakeholder interviews were the key evidence for this objective.

Objective 17. Community Involvement in the Practice of Sustainable Forestry -
To broaden the practice of sustainable forestry by encouraging the public and forestry community to participate in the commitment to sustainable forestry, and publicly report progress.
Summary of Evidence – Recently completed property master plans were sufficient to assess the requirements. These plans describe a comprehensive public input process, comments received, and changes to plans in response to those comments where feasible. Further, the Wisconsin DNR answers to the Wisconsin Natural Resources Board, providing regular opportunities for citizen input and a long-term and very knowledgeable governing board of citizens as well.

Objective 18: Public Land Management Responsibilities -
To support and implement sustainable forest management on public lands.

Summary of Evidence – Interviews and review of documents were used to confirm the requirements. Interviewees included members of "friends" groups for state parks.

Objective 19. Communications and Public Reporting - To broaden the practice of sustainable forestry by documenting progress and opportunities for improvement.

Summary of Evidence – Reports filed with SFI Inc. and the SFI Inc. website provided the key evidence.

Objective 20. Management Review and Continual Improvement - To promote continual improvement in the practice of sustainable forestry, and to monitor, measure, and report performance in achieving the commitment to sustainable forestry.

Summary of Evidence – Records of program reviews, agendas and notes from management review meetings, and interviews with personnel from all involved levels in the organization were assessed. The Forest Leadership Team of the Forestry Division and the Land Leadership Team of the Lands Division are the critical components of management review; minutes of meetings supplemented by interviews served to confirm compliance.

Relevance of Forestry Certification

Third-party certification provides assurance that forests are being managed under the principles of sustainable forestry, which are described in the Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard as:

1. Sustainable Forestry
To practice sustainable forestry to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs by practicing a land stewardship ethic that integrates reforestation and the managing, growing, nurturing and harvesting of trees for useful products and ecosystem services such as the conservation of soil, air and water quality, carbon, biological diversity, wildlife and aquatic habitats, recreation, and aesthetics.

2. Forest Productivity and Health
To provide for regeneration after harvest and maintain the productive capacity of the forest land base, and to protect and maintain long-term forest and soil productivity. In addition, to protect forests from economically or environmentally undesirable levels of wildfire, pests, diseases, invasive exotic plants and animals and other damaging agents and thus maintain and improve long-term forest health and productivity.

3. Protection of Water Resources
To protect water bodies and riparian zones, and to conform with best management practices to protect water quality.

4. Protection of Biological Diversity
To manage forests in ways that protect and promote biological diversity, including animal and plant species, wildlife habitats, and ecological or natural community types.

5. Aesthetics and Recreation
To manage the visual impacts of forest operations, and to provide recreational opportunities for the public.

6. Protection of Special Sites
To manage forests and lands of special significance (ecologically, geologically or culturally important) in a manner that protects their integrity and takes into account their unique qualities.

7. Responsible Fiber Sourcing Practices in North America
To use and promote among other forest landowners sustainable forestry practices that are both scientifically credible and economically, environmentally and socially responsible.

8. Avoidance of Controversial Sources including Illegal Logging in Offshore Fiber Sourcing
To avoid wood fiber from illegally logged forests when procuring fiber outside of North America, and to avoid sourcing fiber from countries without effective social laws.

9. Legal Compliance
To comply with applicable federal, provincial, state, and local forestry and related environmental laws, statutes, and regulations.

10. Research
To support advances in sustainable forest management through forestry research, science and technology.

11. Training and Education

To improve the practice of sustainable forestry through training and education programs.

12. Public Involvement
To broaden the practice of sustainable forestry on public lands through community involvement.

13. Transparency
To broaden the understanding of forest certification to the SFI 2010-2014 Standard by documenting certification audits and making the findings publicly available.

14. Continual Improvement
To continually improve the practice of forest management, and to monitor, measure and report performance in achieving the commitment to sustainable forestry.

Source: Sustainable Forestry Initiative® (SFI) Standard, 2010-2014 Edition

For Additional Information Contact:

Mike Ferrucci
SFI Program Manager, NSF-ISR
26 Commerce Drive
North Branford, CT 06471
203-887-9248
mferrucci@iforest.com

Ken Symes, Forest Certification Coordinator
Forestry Division Effectiveness and Outreach Sect.
Bureau of Forestry Business Services
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
608-267-0547
kenneth.symes@dnr.state.wi.us

Appendix III

Audit Matrix

Findings and Instructions:

C	Conformance
Exr	Exceeds the Requirements
Maj	Major Non-conformance
Min	Minor Non-conformance
OFI	Opportunity for Improvement (can also be in Conformance)
NA	Not Applicable
Likely Gap *	Likely Gap Against 2010-2014 SFIS*
Likely Conf. *	Likely Conformance With 2010-2014 SFIS*
	* formerly used for transition issues; Gap columns retained for use during Baseline Audits.
Auditor	Optional; may be used for audit planning.
10, 11	Date Codes, for example: 11= July 2011; 12=Aug. 2012
Other	Words in *italics* are defined in the standard.

Objective 1. Forest Management Planning

To broaden the implementation of *sustainable forestry* by ensuring *long-term* forest *productivity* and yield based on the use of the *best scientific information* available.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
1.1	***Program Participants* shall ensure that forest management plans include *long-term* harvest levels that are sustainable and consistent with appropriate *growth-and-yield model*s.**	MF	11						
Notes	Area control and fine-grained inventory and reporting systems ensure that harvest levels are sustainable long-term.								

	2010-2014 Requirement (Performance Measures bold)	Audit or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
1.1.1	Forest management planning at a level appropriate to the size and scale of the operation, including: a. a long-term resources analysis; b. a periodic or ongoing forest inventory; c. a land classification system; d. soils inventory and maps, where available; e. access to growth-and-yield modeling capabilities; f. up-to-date maps or a geographic information system; g. recommended sustainable harvest levels for areas available for harvest; and h. a review of non-timber issues (e.g. recreation, tourism, pilot projects and economic incentive programs to promote water protection, carbon storage, bioenergy feedstock production, or biological diversity conservation, or to address climate-induced ecosystem change).	MF	11						

Notes	OFI 2010-01 addressing the lack of detail regarding land management objectives for individual properties was addressed in part by interviews which revealed efforts to improve web-based objectives for wildlife areas. Management plans exist in many formats and configurations. The most comprehensive plans are modern Master Plans; these include all of the required elements of SFI Indicator 1.1.1 and much more, generally in a single document for a property of group of properties. Some plans focus on a species or habitat (e.g. Central Wisconsin Grasslands Management Plan) and also cover the requirements in one document, supplemented by the GIS.. Otherwise the collection of policies, manual codes, and statewide plans (Wisconsin Wildlife Action Plan) collectively cover the planning requirements. Some individual property plans are over 30 years old (for example "Council Grounds State Park Master Plan 8.22.1979"). The objectives, allowed uses, and general land allocations within these older plans are mostly still relevant, but recommended actions are often outdated. As needed these plans are amended (larger changes) or have plan variances (lesser changes). Vegetation management and other project-type actions are guided by narrowly-focused, contemporary planning documents. The web site for the Paul J. Olson Wildlife Area has a property description, management objectives, maps. "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. The planning bureau of Wisconsin DNR's Lands Division provided an update on the status of master planning; considerable progress has been made since the expanded certification in 2009: "Since 2009, 25 property plans were completed (11 master planning processes) and 54 properties are currently active." There is a 15-year schedule to complete master plans (three 5-year groupings).								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
1.1.2	Documentation of annual harvest trends in relation to the sustainable forest management plan in a manner appropriate to document past and future activities.	MF	11						

Notes	Each harvest is documented on a Form 2460-001 "Timber Sale Notice and Cutting Report" and this information is compiled into a database. WisFIRS allows managers to easily develop reports and graphs by cover type or other sorts, at the stand, compartment, or forest level, or statewide. Master plan monitoring involves any property which has a modern master plan that has been in place for at least one year. Confirmed that each state forest (except those undergoing updates to their Master Plans which included Governor Knowles SF) and properties or property groups under the Lands Division prepares an annual monitoring report which compares accomplishments to objectives, forest-wide, at the management area level, and for other resource management issues. Harvesting accomplishments are included. Monitoring reports are available on the WDNR web site. http://dnr.wi.gov/master_planning/lfmonitoring.html 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). The direction is to set up for sale 90 to 110 percent of the acres designated for sale. 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.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***

1.1.3	A forest inventory system and a method to calculate growth and yield.	MF	11						

Notes	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.
	Confirmed minutes of selected Integrated Property Management t. Wildlife areas, fisheries areas, isolated forest tracts, and recreational lands are covered in the same meetings.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
1.1.4	Periodic updates of forest inventory and recalculation of planned harvests to account for changes in growth due to productivity increases or decreases (e.g. improved data, long-term drought, fertilization, climate change, forest land ownership changes, etc.).	MF	11						

Notes	RECON inventory updates have been a very high priority, with pressure from the Wisconsin legislature. The results go into a state-wide database (WisFIRs) used to develop harvest schedules (see 1.1.2 above).
	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.
	15-year harvest schedules (re-run each year) document planned future activities for parcels larger than 400 acres. For smaller properties the "foresters' call" or year of next activity is used to develop a treatment schedule. Both types of harvest schedules are presented to an IDT each year at the annual property meeting.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
1.1.5	Documentation of forest practices (e.g., planting, fertilization, and thinning) consistent with assumptions in harvest plans.	MF	11						

Notes	There is no allowable cut effect; assumptions include basal area growth rates for northern hardwood stands managed using the selection system, age to maturity following Aspen and Jack Pine clearcuts, thinning intervals for Red pine, and time needed for other regenerated stands to require the next treatment. Thinning and planting would be the "driving" treatments; these are well documented. When there is a delay in thinning (uncommon) or other anticipated treatment the overall harvest schedules are adjusted when the 15-year harvest schedule is re-run each year.

Objective 2. Forest Productivity.

To ensure *long-term* forest *productivity*, carbon storage, and *conservation* of forest resources through prompt *reforestation*, soil *conservation*, *afforestation* and other measures.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
2.1	**Program Participants shall promptly reforest after final harvest.**	MF	11						
Notes	See indicators.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
2.1.1	Designation of all harvest areas for either natural regeneration or by planting.	MF	11						
Notes	Documented in the 2460 Narrative for all harvests.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
2.1.2	Reforestation, unless delayed for site-specific environmental or forest health considerations or legal requirements, through planting within two years or two planting seasons, or by planned natural regeneration methods within five years.	MF	11						
Notes	No regeneration delays were observed.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
2.1.3	Clear criteria to judge adequate regeneration and appropriate actions to correct understocked areas and achieve acceptable species composition and stocking rates for both planting and natural regeneration.	MF	11						

	Notes	Silviculture handbook.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
2.1.4	Minimized plantings of exotic tree species, and research documentation that exotic tree species, planted operationally, pose minimal risk.	MF	11						
Notes	No recently planted exotic tree species were observed.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
2.1.5	Protection of desirable or planned advanced natural regeneration during harvest.	MF	11						
Notes	Limited opportunity to review completed harvests in 2011 audit.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
2.1.6	Planting programs that consider potential ecological impacts of a different species or species mix from that which was harvested.								
Notes	Not reviewed during 2011 Surveillance Audit.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
2.1.7	Afforestation programs that consider potential ecological impacts of the selection and planting of tree species in non-forested landscapes.		NA						
Notes	N.A. Trees are not planted in non-forested landscapes.								

2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	C	EXR	Maj	Min	OFI	Likely Gap *	Likely Conf. *
2.2	**Program Participants shall minimize chemical use required to achieve management objectives while protecting employees, neighbors, the public and the environment, including wildlife and aquatic habitats.**	MF	11						
Notes	Most chemical use involves efforts to control aggressive, invasive exotic plants. Documentation of one example of chemical use at the Comstock Bog SNA was provided. Garlic Mustard was pulled, with limited (0.10 acres) treated using 204D.								

2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	C	EXR	Maj	Min	OFI	Likely Gap *	Likely Conf. *
2.2.1	Minimized chemical use required to achieve management objectives.								
Notes	Not reviewed during 2011 Surveillance Audit.								

2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	C	EXR	Maj	Min	OFI	Likely Gap *	Likely Conf. *
2.2.2	Use of least-toxic and narrowest-spectrum pesticides necessary to achieve management objectives.								
Notes	Not reviewed during 2011 Surveillance Audit.								

2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	C	EXR	Maj	Min	OFI	Likely Gap *	Likely Conf. *
2.2.3	Use of pesticides registered for the intended use and applied in accordance with label requirements.	MF	11						
Notes	Managers and workers who use chemicals to control invasive plants who were interviewed indicated that the label requirements are followed. The auditors did not observe any chemicals being applied.								

2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	C	EXR	Maj	Min	OFI	Likely Gap *	Likely Conf. *

2.2.4	Use of integrated pest management where feasible.	MF	11						

Notes	Confirmed through interviews and documentation: chemicals are used infrequently and only for specific reasons.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
2.2.5	Supervision of forest chemical applications by state- or provincial-trained or certified applicators.	MF	11						

Notes	Supervision by trained personnel.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
2.2.6	Use of management practices appropriate to the situation, for example: a. notification of adjoining landowners or nearby residents concerning applications and chemicals used; b. appropriate multilingual signs or oral warnings; c. control of public road access during and immediately after applications; d. designation of streamside and other needed buffer strips; e. use of positive shutoff and minimal-drift spray valves; f. aerial application of forest chemicals parallel to buffer zones to minimize drift; g. monitoring of water quality or safeguards to ensure proper equipment use and protection of streams, lakes and other water bodies; h. appropriate storage of chemicals; i. filing of required state or provincial reports; and/or j. use of methods to ensure protection of threatened and endangered species.	MF	11				11		

Notes	There is an opportunity to improve the consistent use of record-keeping systems designed to track pesticide use. One state employee did not follow all of the procedures for recording use of herbicides.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	C	EXR	Maj	Min	OFI	Likely Gap *	Likely Conf. *
2.3	**Program Participants shall implement forest management practices to protect and maintain forest and soil productivity.**	MF	11						
Notes	See indicators.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	C	EXR	Maj	Min	OFI	Likely Gap *	Likely Conf. *
2.3.1	Use of soils maps where available.	MF	11						
Notes	Maps in GIS include soils; soils types used in planning projects and harvests.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	C	EXR	Maj	Min	OFI	Likely Gap *	Likely Conf. *
2.3.2	Process to identify soils vulnerable to compaction, and use of appropriate methods to avoid excessive soil disturbance.	MF	11						
Notes	Confirmed by field observations.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	C	EXR	Maj	Min	OFI	Likely Gap *	Likely Conf. *
2.3.3	Use of erosion control measures to *minimize* the loss of soil and site *productivity*.	MF	11						
Notes	Confirmed by field observations.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	C	EXR	Maj	Min	OFI	Likely Gap *	Likely Conf. *

| 2.3.4 | Post-harvest conditions conducive to maintaining site productivity (e.g. limited rutting, retained down woody debris, minimized skid trails). | MF | 11 | | | | | | |

Notes	Closed Minor Non-conformance 2010-01 based on review of documentation of remedial actions, including photographs.
	Confirmed by field observations good results post-harvest.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
2.3.5	Retention of vigorous trees during partial harvesting, consistent with scientific silvicultural standards for the area.	MF	11						

Notes	There was limited opportunity to review this indicator on harvest sites in the 2011 Surveillance Audit. Where partial harvests were completed, or marked harvests observed, the indicator was being met.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
2.3.6	Criteria that address harvesting and site preparation to protect soil productivity.	MF	11						

Notes	Consistent criteria defining excessive rutting and soil disturbance is found in contracts for all harvests.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
2.3.7	Road construction and skidding layout to minimize impacts to soil productivity and water quality.								

Notes	There was limited opportunity to review this indicator on harvest sites in the 2011 Surveillance Audit.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***

2.4	Program Participants shall manage so as to protect forests from damaging agents, such as environmentally or economically undesirable wildfire, pests, diseases and invasive exotic plants and animals, to maintain and improve long-term forest health, productivity and economic viability.	MF	11						
Notes	See indicators.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
2.4.1	Program to protect forests from damaging agents.	MF	11						
Notes	Property managers are aware of forest pest issues. Protections are employed where feasible; stocking control is the primary tool.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
2.4.2	Management to promote healthy and productive forest conditions to minimize susceptibility to damaging agents.	MF	11						
Notes	Confirmed by field observations.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
2.4.3	Participation in, and support of, fire and pest prevention and control programs.	MF	11						
Notes	Audit team confirmed a strong program for fire control, including the use of prescribed burning and an extensive system of training.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
2.5	Program Participants that deploy improved planting stock, including varietal seedlings, shall use sound scientific methods.								
Notes	Not reviewed during 2011 Surveillance Audit.								

Objective 3. Protection and Maintenance of Water Resources

To protect water quality in rivers, streams, lakes, and other water bodies.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
3.1	**Program Participants shall meet or exceed all applicable federal, provincial, state and local water quality laws, and meet or exceed best management practices developed under Canadian or U.S. Environmental Protection Agency–approved water quality programs.**	MF	11						
Notes	See indicators.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
3.1.1	Program to implement state or provincial best management practices during all phases of management activities.	MF	11						
Notes	Foresters and loggers are trained; foresters layout and inspect all jobs.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
3.1.2	Contract provisions that specify conformance to best management practices.	MF	11						
Notes	BMP requirements were found in all timber sale contracts.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
3.1.3	Plans that address wet-weather events (e.g. forest inventory systems, wet-weather tracts, definitions of acceptable operating conditions).	MF	11						

	Notes	Provisions include loggers who know when to stop working, foresters' ability to halt operations, and the guidelines for excessive rutting.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
3.1.4	Monitoring of overall best management practices implementation.	MF	11				11		

	Notes	There is an opportunity to improve the use of the system to document road conditions and planning to address these.
		BMP monitoring is part of regular harvest inspections and all timber sale closeout inspections. These inspections are well-documented in Form 2460-000 Timber Sale Contractor Checklist pre-Sale Meeting; Form 2460-02 Harvest Inspection Report.
		Formal Road BMP monitoring is not done for roads not associated with timber harvests. The auditors observed some minor erosion on some state lands' roads. Managers do not consistently record road maintenance issues observed.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
3.2	**Program Participants shall have or develop, implement and document riparian protection measures based on soil type, terrain, vegetation, ecological function, harvesting system and other applicable factors.**	MF	11						
Notes	See indicators.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
3.2.1	Program addressing management and protection of rivers, streams, lakes, and other water bodies and riparian zones.	MF	11						

	Notes	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.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***

3.2.2	Mapping of rivers, streams, lakes, and other water bodies as specified in state or provincial best management practices and, where appropriate, identification on the ground.	MF	11						
Notes	The required features are shown in harvest maps and in the GIS								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
3.2.3	Implementation of plans to manage or protect rivers, streams, lakes, and other water bodies.	MF	11						
Notes	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.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
3.2.4	Identification and protection of non-forested wetlands, including bogs, fens and marshes, and vernal pools of ecological significance.	MF	11						
Notes	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.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
3.2.5	Where regulations or best management practices do not currently exist to protect riparian areas, use of experts to identify appropriate protection measures.		NA						
Notes	NA, as such regulations and best management practices do exist.								

Objective 4. Conservation of Biological Diversity including Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value.
To manage the quality and distribution of wildlife habitats and contribute to the conservation of biological diversity by developing and implementing stand- and landscape-level measures that promote a diversity of types of habitat and successional stages, and conservation of forest plants and animals, including aquatic species.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
4.1	**Program Participants shall have programs to promote biological diversity at stand- and landscape-levels.**								
Notes	See indicator notes.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
4.1.1	Program to promote the conservation of native biological diversity, including species, wildlife habitats and ecological community types.	JH, MF	11						
Notes	The State continues to make progress in the implementation of the Wildlife Action Plan, identification of and designation SNA's , old-growth forest and HCVF habitats and forests. The 2011 audit team observed on many sites, the active management of prairie, open wetland and grassland habitats. A SNA on the Plover River Fisheries property will be managed for old growth characteristics.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
4.1.2	Program to protect threatened and endangered species.	JH, MF	11						
Notes	Wisconsin DNR has a program that protects endangered, threatened and special concern species from the planning phase (Master Plans) to implementation of management activities (timber sales and other land management activities). Field observations from 2011 indicated a more prevalent recognition and consideration in planning for species of greatest conservation need. The 2011 audit confirmed that checks of NHI database is part of sale planning.								
	Interview with Christina Isenring, Contractor for NHI Program: heritage data backlog issue, can only do work that is funded.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***

4.1.3	Program to locate and protect known sites associated with viable occurrences of critically imperiled and imperiled species and communities also known as Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value. Plans for protection may be developed independently or collaboratively, and may include Program Participant management, cooperation with other stakeholders, or use of easements, conservation land sales, exchanges, or other conservation strategies.	JH	11						
Notes	A site visit to Horicon Marsh indicated that planning is begin done in collaboration with the federal government who owns the north half of this marsh complex. At High Cliff State Park, plans are underway to link planning on an SNA forest with adjacent County land.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
4.1.4	Development and implementation of criteria, as guided by regionally appropriate best scientific information, to retain stand-level wildlife habitat elements such as snags, stumps, mast trees, down woody debris, den trees and nest trees.	JH, MF	11						
Notes	Gov. Knowles has increased attention to this issue. Good retention in units reviewed during the audit. 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.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
4.1.5	Program for assessment, conducted either individually or collaboratively, of forest cover types, age or size classes, and habitats at the individual ownership level and, where credible data are available, across the landscape, and take into account findings in planning and management activities.	JH, DW, MF				11			

Notes	Minor Non-conformance 2011-01: For lands not covered by either a modern master plan or a landscape focused plan (e.g. Central Wisconsin Grasslands Management Plan) there is no demonstrated program for the assessment of forest cover types, age or size classes, and habitats at relevant spatial scales for the properties in the scope, or to take into account this information in multidisciplinary planning or management activities.								
	Wisconsin DNR has assessed regional forest cover and age/size classes and used this information to formulate Master Plans for individual forests and properties. Conservation Opportunity Areas identified in the State Wildlife Action Plan are recognized and used by the DNR to coordinate and plan management on a landscape scale. The Ecosystem Management and Planning Team is currently working to complete the Ecological Landscapes Handbook. The new Handbook will contain 18 chapters: one for each of the 16 Ecological Landscapes, an Introductory chapter, and another chapter with background information. These chapters will be posted here as they become available. Many additional changes are planned for these Web pages in the coming months.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
4.1.6	Support of and participation in plans or programs for the conservation of old-growth forests in the region of ownership.	MF	11						
Notes	WisFIRs has provisions for identifying, tracking, and protecting different types of old growth. Old-growth and Old Forests Handbook (2480.5) describes approach. It includes definitions, ecological background, and approaches to protection and management.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
4.1.7	Participation in programs and demonstration of activities as appropriate to limit the introduction, impact and spread of invasive exotic plants and animals that directly threaten or are likely to threaten native plant and animal communities.	JH, DW, MF	11				11		
Notes	There is an opportunity to improve efforts to limit the impact and spread of invasive exotic plants in parks.								
	DNR has State guidelines that limit the introduction and spread of both aquatic and terrestrial invasive species in forest stands, along waterways and trails. Appropriate actions to remove invasive species with pesticides are employed as well as actions to prevent the spread of invasive species (cleaning equipment etc.) DNR also uses fire and mowing to prevent the spread of invasive species.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
4.1.8	Program to incorporate the role of prescribed or natural fire where appropriate.	JH, MF	11						

	Notes	The DNR prescribes and uses fire to manage fire dependent habitats (primarily barrens) to maintain open conditions and also in forests where fire is required to enhance forest regeneration. The 2011 audit team visited several open grassland/prairie habitats where fire is used to maintain the open character of these habitats.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	C	EXR	Maj	Min	OFI	Likely Gap *	Likely Conf. *
4.2	**Program Participants shall apply knowledge gained through research, science, technology and field experience to manage wildlife habitat and contribute to the conservation of biological diversity.**	JH, MF	11						
Notes	The Ecosystem Management and Planning Team is currently working to complete the Ecological Landscapes Handbook. The new Handbook will contain 18 chapters: one for each of the 16 Ecological Landscapes, an Introductory chapter, and another chapter with background information. This work is based on research and current science available in the region.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	C	EXR	Maj	Min	OFI	Likely Gap *	Likely Conf. *
4.2.1	Collection of information on Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value and other biodiversity-related data through forest inventory processes, mapping or participation in external programs, such as NatureServe, state or provincial heritage programs, or other credible systems. Such participation may include providing non-proprietary scientific information, time and assistance by staff, or in-kind or direct financial support.	JH, MF	11						
Notes	NHI data are catalogued and employees are encouraged to participate by reporting locations of ETS to the State.								
	State personnel provide locations and identification of both forests and habitats of exceptional conservation value. New SNA's are being identified and are often purchased by the State.								
	The DNR participates in Important Bird Area programs.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	C	EXR	Maj	Min	OFI	Likely Gap *	Likely Conf. *
4.2.2	A methodology to incorporate research results and field applications of biodiversity and ecosystem research into forest management decisions.	JH, MF	11						
Notes	The new Ecological Landscapes Handbook contains up-to-date research results and regional information that will be used in future forest management goals and decisions.								

Objective 5. Management of Visual Quality and Recreational Benefits.
To manage the visual impact of forest operations and provide recreational opportunities for the public.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
5.1	**Program Participants shall manage the impact of harvesting on visual quality.**	MF	11						
Notes	See indicators.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
5.1.1	Program to address visual quality management.	MF	11						
Notes	Confirmed by field observations and discussions with foresters. For state parks, the document Managing Forests on Wisconsin State Park Lands provides three levels of visual sensitivity to be applied to forested lands: most sensitive, moderately sensitive, and least sensitive. Management practices and visual management tools for each level are provided in the Silviculture and Aesthetics Manual. Thus far harvesting on Wisconsin State Park Lands has been limited in extent.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
5.1.2	Incorporation of aesthetic considerations in harvesting, road, landing design and management, and other management activities where visual impacts are a concern.	MF	11						
Notes	Aesthetic considerations are incorporated in harvesting, road, landing design and management, and other management activities.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
5.2	**Program Participants shall manage the size, shape and placement of clearcut harvests.**	MF	11						
Notes	See indicators.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***

5.2.1	Average size of clearcut harvest areas does not exceed 120 acres (50 hectares), except when necessary to meet regulatory requirements or to respond to forest health emergencies or other natural catastrophes.	MF	11						
Notes	Confirmed by field observations that most clearcuts are quite small; records indicate an average of 18.95 acres.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
5.2.2	Documentation through internal records of clearcut size and the process for calculating average size.	MF	11						
Notes	18.95 acres 2010.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
5.3	**Program Participants shall adopt a green-up requirement or alternative methods that provide for visual quality.**								
Notes	Not reviewed during 2011 Surveillance Audit.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
5.4	**Program Participants shall support and promote recreational opportunities for the public.**	MF		11					
Notes	Exceeds the SFI Standard: The recreational and educational programs and facilities on state forests are very well designed and maintained, with recreational use given a high priority.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
5.4.1	Provide recreational opportunities for the public, where consistent with forest management objectives.	MF		11					
Notes	The trails, campgrounds, and visitor facilities on these lands are very well designed and generally well maintained. Funding cuts, however, are continuing to take a toll, particularly on efforts to restore or protect vegetation at the most popular recreation areas. Managers report limited or no ability to conduct vegetation management practices.								

Objective 6. Protection of Special Sites.

To manage lands that are ecologically, geologically or culturally important in a manner that takes into account their unique qualities.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
6.1	**Program Participants shall identify special sites and manage them in a manner appropriate for their unique features.**	JH		11					
Notes	See indicators.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
6.1.1	Use of information such as existing natural heritage data, expert advice or stakeholder consultation in identifying or selecting special sites for protection.	JH		11					
Notes	NHI is used to identify and protect habitat for special species. IBA's have been designated to identify critical bird habitat. The WAP identifies COA for species of greatest conservation need.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
6.1.2	Appropriate mapping, cataloging and management of identified special sites.	JH		11					
Notes	Indian burial mounds at High Cliff State Park are being managed in accordance with tribal input. Plans are underway to remove vegetation from on top of the mounds and to move the hiking trail away from the mounds.								

Objective 7. Efficient Use of Forest Resources.

To promote the efficient use of forest resources.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
7.1	**Program Participants shall employ appropriate forest harvesting technology and in-woods manufacturing processes and practices to minimize waste and ensure efficient utilization of harvested trees, where consistent with other SFI Standard objectives.**	MF	11						
Notes	See indicators.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
7.1.1	Program or monitoring system to ensure efficient utilization, which may include provisions to ensure: a. management of harvest residue (e.g. slash, limbs, tops) considers economic, social and environmental factors (e.g. organic and nutrient value to future forests) and other utilization needs; b. training or incentives to encourage loggers to enhance utilization; c. cooperation with mill managers for better utilization of species and low-grade material; d. exploration of markets for underutilized species and low-grade wood and alternative markets (e.g. bioenergy markets); or e. periodic inspections and reports noting utilization and product separation.	MF	11						
Notes	There was limited opportunity to review this indicator on harvest sites in the 2011 Surveillance Audit. On those few sites were harvests had been completed the indicator was being met through reasonable utilization, harvest inspections, and lump-sum sales. In southern Wisconsin limited markets for wood other than sawtimber have limited manager's ability to implement desired vegetation management.								

Objectives 8 – 13 are not applicable.

Objective 14. Legal and Regulatory Compliance.

Compliance with applicable federal, provincial, state and local laws and regulations.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
14.1	**Program Participants shall take appropriate steps to comply with applicable federal, provincial, state and local forestry and related social and environmental laws and regulations.**	MF	11						
Notes	See indicators.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
14.1.1	Access to relevant laws and regulations in appropriate locations.	MF	11						
Notes	Laws and regulations are available to all managers on line.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
14.1.2	System to achieve compliance with applicable federal, provincial, state or local laws and regulations.	MF	11						
Notes	WDNR has a full time lawyer who reviews laws, contracts, policies, etc. Confirmed by analysis and observations of supervisory structure of Wisconsin DNR. Trained and highly experience supervisors are responsible for ensuring laws and regulations are understood and implemented. A rigorous process exists for setting up all timber harvests and significant projects, reviewing them internally, and documenting their approval at all levels within the organization. This documentation was reviewed by the auditors for a sample of projects.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
14.1.3	Demonstration of commitment to legal compliance through available regulatory action information.	MF	11						
Notes	Senior managers for the Division of Lands and for the Division of Forestry report no regulatory compliance issues over the past several years.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	C	EXR	Maj	Min	OFI	Likely Gap *	Likely Conf. *
14.2	**Program Participants shall take appropriate steps to comply with all applicable social laws at the federal, provincial, state and local levels in the country in which the Program Participant operates.**	MF	11						
Notes	No issues uncovered by audit team.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	C	EXR	Maj	Min	OFI	Likely Gap *	Likely Conf. *
14.2.1	Written policy demonstrating commitment to comply with social laws, such as those covering civil rights, equal employment opportunities, anti-discrimination and anti-harassment measures, workers' compensation, indigenous peoples' rights, workers' and communities' right to know, prevailing wages, workers' right to organize, and occupational health and safety.	MF	11						
Notes	Written policies are supplemented by training (regular training for all employees, with emphasis for supervisors) and by notices at all work locations.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	C	EXR	Maj	Min	OFI	Likely Gap *	Likely Conf. *
14.2.2	Forestry enterprises will respect the rights of workers and labor representatives in a manner that encompasses the intent of the International Labor Organization (ILO) core conventions.	MF	11						
Notes	If there are any ILO-related complaints NSF must pass these along to SFI Inc. None were reported.								

Objective 15. Forestry Research, Science, and Technology.

To support forestry research, science, and technology, upon which sustainable forest management decisions are based.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
15.1	**Program Participants shall individually and/or through cooperative efforts involving SFI Implementation Committees, associations or other partners provide in-kind support or funding for forest research to improve forest health, productivity, and sustainable management of forest resources, and the environmental benefits and performance of forest products.**	MF		11					
Notes	See indicators.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***

15.1.1	Financial or in-kind support of research to address questions of relevance in the region of operations. The research shall include some of the following issues:
	    a. forest health, productivity, and ecosystem functions;
	    b. chemical efficiency, use rate and integrated pest management;
	    c. water quality and/or effectiveness of best management practices including effectiveness of water quality and best management practices for protecting the quality, diversity and distributions of fish and wildlife habitats;
	    d. wildlife management at stand- and landscape-levels;
	    e. conservation of biological diversity;
	    f. ecological impacts of bioenergy feedstock removals on productivity, wildlife habitat, water quality and other ecosystem functions;
	    g. climate change research for both adaptation and mitigation;
	    h. social issues;
	    i. forest operations efficiencies and economics;
	    j. energy efficiency;
	    k. life cycle assessment;
	    l. avoidance of illegal logging; and
	    m. avoidance of controversial sources.
		MF		11					

Notes	Wisconsin DNR has demonstrated exemplary support for research. WDNR funds research on a broad range of issues including the indicators listed above. Funding is both internal and external. Information from the 2010 SFI Progress Report shows funding as follows: Forest health and productivity – $376,547 (internal) and $263,690 (external) Water quality – $61,493 (internal) and $56,444 (external) Wildlife & Fish – $85,411 (internal) and $101,081 (external) Landscape / Ecosystem mgt. and biodiversity – $57,533 (internal) and $118,898 (external) Lands covered by the certificate are available for research. For example research at Krueger Pines SNA was one of John Curtis's original plant ecology lab survey sites. "In the early 2000s, under the direction of Don Waller and Tom Rooney most of these sites were re-surveyed to analyze changes over a 50-year period. This data was part of the analysis that went into the publication Rooney, T.P., S.M. Wiegmann, D.A. Rogers, and D.M. Waller, 2004. Biotic impoverishment and homogenization in unfragmented forest understory communities. Conservation Biology 18:787-798." Source Randy Hoffman, Conservation Biologist, Bureau of Endangered Resources, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
15.1.2	Research on genetically engineered trees via forest tree biotechnology shall adhere to all applicable federal, state, and provincial regulations and international protocols.		NA						
Notes	NA, no genetic engineering.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
15.2	**Program Participants shall individually <u>and/or</u> through cooperative efforts involving SFI Implementation Committees, associations or other partners develop or use state, provincial or regional analyses in support of their sustainable forestry programs.**	MF	11						
Notes	See indicator.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***

| 15.2.1 | Participation, individually and/or through cooperative efforts involving SFI Implementation Committees and/or associations at the national, state, provincial or regional level, in the development or use of some of the following:
a. regeneration assessments; b. growth and drain assessments; c. best management practices implementation and conformance; d. biodiversity conservation information for family forest owners; and e. social, cultural or economic benefit assessments. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| Notes | WDNR provides continual FIA assessments by landowner category (drain, regeneration, growth, cover type, economic assessments) through its Utilization & Marketing section. Item d met by Wisconsin Extension. | | | | | | | | |

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
15.3	**Program Participants shall individually and/or through cooperative efforts involving SFI Implementation Committees, associations or other partners broaden the awareness of climate change impacts on forests, wildlife and biological diversity.**	MF	11						
Notes	See indicators.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
15.3.1	Where available, monitor information generated from regional climate models on long-term forest health, productivity and economic viability.	MF	11						
Notes	The monitoring of information about climate change and impacts is assigned to Wisconsin DNR central office staff. Information has been provided to field personnel.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
15.3.2	Program Participants are knowledgeable about climate change impacts on wildlife, wildlife habitats and conservation of biological diversity through international, national, regional or local programs.	MF	11						
Notes	Confirmed by interviews with field personnel.								

Objective 16. Training and Education.

To improve the implementation of sustainable forestry practices through appropriate training and education programs.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
16.1	**Program Participants shall require appropriate training of personnel and contractors so that they are competent to fulfill their responsibilities under the SFI 2010-2014 Standard.**	MF	11						
Notes	See indicators.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
16.1.1	Written statement of commitment to the SFI 2010-2014 Standard communicated throughout the organization, particularly to facility and woodland managers, fiber sourcing staff and field foresters.	MF	11						
Notes	Commitment at the state level was by means of a proclamation issued by former Gov. Doyle.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
16.1.2	Assignment and understanding of roles and responsibilities for achieving SFI 2010-2014 Standard objectives.	MF	11						
Notes	Every state employee involved in the audit clearly understood their responsibilities.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
16.1.3	Staff education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities.	MF		11					
Notes	WDNR shows exemplary performance in staff education and training requirements. Foresters and biologists with university degrees are employed to plan, conduct, and/or oversee the work. Employees interviewed demonstrated remarkable depth and breadth of knowledge.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***

16.1.4	Contractor education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities.							
Notes	Not reviewed during 2011 Surveillance Audit.							

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
16.1.5	Forestry enterprises shall have a program for the use of certified logging professionals (where available) and qualified logging professionals.	MF	11						
Notes	Contracts include training requirements (FISTA, the SFI-approved logger training program).								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
16.2	**Program Participants shall work individually and/or with SFI Implementation Committees, logging or forestry associations, or appropriate agencies or others in the forestry community to foster improvement in the professionalism of wood producers.**	MF	11						
Notes	See indicators.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***

16.2.1	Participation in or support of SFI Implementation Committees to establish criteria and identify delivery mechanisms for wood producers' training courses that address:
	    a. awareness of sustainable forestry principles and the
	    SFI program;
	    b. best management practices, including streamside
	    management and road construction, maintenance
	    and retirement;
	    c. reforestation, invasive exotic plants and animals, forest
	    resource conservation, aesthetics, and special sites;
	    d. awareness of responsibilities under the U.S.
	    Endangered Species Act, the Canadian Species at Risk
	    Act, and other measures to protect wildlife habitat
	    (e.g. Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value);
	    e. logging safety;
	    f. U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration
	    (OSHA) and Canadian Centre for Occupational Health
	    and Safety (COHS) regulations, wage and hour rules,
	    and other provincial, state and local employment laws;
	    g. transportation issues;
	    h. business management;
	    i. public policy and outreach; and
	    j. awareness of emerging technologies.
		MF	11						

Notes	Financial support for SIC includes funding for Master Logger scholarships, direct funding for Tree Farm (up to $5000 annually), payment in kind for FISTA training (primarily Carmen Wagner's time in conducting BMP training).
	The SIC strongly supports the FISTA training program and other landowner outreach and informational efforts. FISTA sponsors a host of safety and resource training programs annually. WDNR has participated directly in a number of 2010 FISTA training sessions (e.g. BMPs for Water Quality – 7 sessions, 4 BMPs for Invasives, 2 Biomass harvesting sessions). BMP courses are part of the core curriculum for logging contractor training. SIC also has supported landowner outreach – WI Tree Farm Committee and Wisconsin Family Forests ($37,500 in 2010) and Informational Resources – Trees for Tomorrow and LEAF (Learning, Experiences and Activities in Forestry) - $34,975 in 2010. SIC financed Logger Training & Education - $137,850 in 2010. WDNR & WCFA are active participants and contributors to SIC decisions through their membership in the SIC.
	The Wisconsin SIC supports education and logger training through grant funding. WDNR Certification Specialist Ken Symes is on the SIC, and County Forest Specialist Jeff Barkley is a backup participant. The Forest Industry Safety Training Alliance (FISTA) is both a supporter and a benefactor of the SIC. Over 60% of the SIC's annual budget supports education and logger training. This training infuses BMPs into most of the classes. As an example, in 2010, WDNR Forest Hydrologist Carmen Hardin presented 7 FISTA BMP's for Water Quality training sessions. In addition, she conducted two, 3-day stream crossing training sessions and another 13 BMP training sessions to consultant foresters and Managed Forest law owner (private landowners) groups.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***

16.2.2	Participation in or support of SFI Implementation Committees to establish criteria for recognition of logger certification programs, where they exist, that include: a. completion of SFI Implementation Committee recognized logger training programs and meeting continuing education requirements of the training program; b. independent in-the-forest verification of conformance with the logger certification program standards; c. compliance with all applicable laws and regulations including responsibilities under the U.S. Endangered Species Act, the Canadian Species at Risk Act and other measures to protect wildlife habitat; d. use of best management practices to protect water quality; e. logging safety; f. compliance with acceptable silviculture and utilization standards; g. aesthetic management techniques employed where applicable; and h. adherence to a management or harvest plan that is site specific and agreed to by the forest landowner.	MF	11						
Notes	Master Logger training is encouraged (not required) on public land timber sales. The Wisconsin SIC acknowledges and supports a Master Logger Certification program with $5000 funding annually. Bob Mather, WDNR Forest Management Bureau Director serves on the Master Logger Certifying Board. WDNR also provides annual funding for a Master Logger Certification Scholarship program to help offset the cost of loggers seeking Master Logger certification. Scholarship funding for this program in 2011 amounts to $31,080 to date. The WI. Master Logger program requires a 3rd part assessment of logger's performance. Periodic monitoring audits are conducted to ensure that the above indicators are met.								

Objective 17. Community Involvement in the Practice of Sustainable Forestry.

To broaden the practice of sustainable forestry by encouraging the public and forestry community to participate in the commitment to sustainable forestry, and publicly report progress.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	C	EXR	Maj	Min	OFI	Likely Gap *	Likely Conf. *
17.1	Program Participants shall support and promote efforts by consulting foresters, state, provincial and federal agencies, state or local groups, professional societies, conservation organizations, indigenous peoples and governments, community groups, sporting organizations, labor, universities, extension agencies, the American Tree Farm System® and/or other landowner cooperative programs to apply principles of sustainable forest management.	MF	11						
Notes	See indicators.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	C	EXR	Maj	Min	OFI	Likely Gap *	Likely Conf. *
17.1.1	Support, including financial, for efforts of SFI Implementation Committees.	MF	11						
Notes	WDNR contributes to the SIC through time and participation. Participation by Ken Symes, WDNR Forest Certification Specialist is on the SIC. In addition, Bob Mather, WDNR Forest Management Bureau Director, is part of the Inconsistent Practices review coordinated by SIC and serves on the Master Logger Certifying Board. WDNR's participation and MLC Scholarship support are valued at approximately $60,000 annually. WDNR partners in many of the efforts supported by the SIC including Wisconsin Tree Farm system, Wisconsin Family Forests, and LEAF.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	C	EXR	Maj	Min	OFI	Likely Gap *	Likely Conf. *
17.1.2	Support for the development of educational materials for use with forest landowners (e.g. information packets, websites, newsletters, workshops, tours, etc.).	MF	11						
Notes	From SFI Reporting form: "SFI Implementation Committee Support: Funding provided in 2010 for SFI program implementation activities at the state or provincial level (include all funding your organization provided in 2010 to SFI Implementation Committees and others for logger training and education and all other SFI program implementation activities at the state or provincial level): Support for U.S. SFI Implementation Committees (USD) $60,000								

2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	C	EXR	Maj	Min	OFI	Likely Gap *	Likely Conf. *
17.1.3 Support for the development of regional, state or provincial information materials that provide forest landowners with practical approaches for addressing special sites and biological diversity issues, such as invasive exotic plants and animals, specific wildlife habitat, Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value, and threatened and endangered species.	MF	11						
Notes This support is provided through WiDNR Extension.								

2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	C	EXR	Maj	Min	OFI	Likely Gap *	Likely Conf. *
17.1.4 Participation in efforts to support or promote conservation of managed forests through voluntary market-based incentive programs such as current-use taxation programs, Forest Legacy Program or conservation easements.	MF	11						
Notes Wisconsin DNR has an active program to purchase development rights of working forests, or to buy fee forestland to support working forestry. Wisconsin DNR Managed Forest Law Program (MFL) is certified under American Tree Farm.								

2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	C	EXR	Maj	Min	OFI	Likely Gap *	Likely Conf. *
17.1.5 Program Participants are knowledgeable about credible regional conservation planning and priority-setting efforts that include a broad range of stakeholders and have a program to take into account the results of these efforts in planning.	MF	11						
Notes Interviews and review of documents show good awareness. The Wisconsin Wildlife Action Plan is widely utilized to place resource management efforts into context, and to guide landscape-level decisions. The program to "take into account" is the work of the BER Regional Ecologists.								

2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	C	EXR	Maj	Min	OFI	Likely Gap *	Likely Conf. *
17.2 **Program Participants shall support and promote, at the state, provincial or other appropriate levels, mechanisms for public outreach, education and involvement related to sustainable forest management.**	MF	11						

	Notes	See indicator.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
17.2.1	Periodic educational opportunities promoting sustainable forestry, such as a. field tours, seminars, websites, webinars or workshops; b. educational trips; c. self-guided forest management trails; d. publication of articles, educational pamphlets or newsletters; or e. support for state, provincial, and local forestry organizations and soil and water conservation districts.	MF	11						
Notes	Wisconsin DNR has an extensive program of outreach and landowner education. Confirmed by looking at the various web pages that provide information and which promote workshops, conferences, etc. One audit team briefly visited an ongoing workshop at the Yellowstone Wildlife Area. The topic was the use of goats to help manage understory vegetation as part of ecological restoration towards grassland/savannah cover types.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
17.3	**Program Participants shall establish, at the state, provincial, or other appropriate levels, procedures to address concerns raised by loggers, consulting foresters, employees, <u>unions</u>, the public or other Program Participants regarding practices that appear inconsistent with the SFI Standard principles and objectives.**	MF	11						
Notes	See indicators.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
17.3.1	Support for SFI Implementation Committees (e.g. toll free numbers and other efforts) to address concerns about apparent nonconforming practices.	MF	11						
Notes	Bob Mather, WDNR Forest Management Bureau Director, is part of the Inconsistent Practices review coordinated by SIC.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
17.3.2	Process to receive and respond to public inquiries. SFI Implementation Committees shall submit data annually to SFI Inc. regarding concerns received and responses.	MF	11						
Notes	Accomplished through Wisconsin SFI Implementation Committee.								

Objective 18. Public Land Management Responsibilities.

To promote and implement sustainable forest management on public lands.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	C	EXR	Maj	Min	OFI	Likely Gap *	Likely Conf. *
18.1	**Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall participate in the development of public land planning and management processes.**	MF		11					
Notes	Public input opportunities during master planning are superb. Planning decisions made during plan variance processes are less accessible. Rocky Run Fishery Area visited by one audit team; "a new master plan is being developed for this property as well as 17 other state fish and wildlife properties and associated state natural areas…" http://dnr.wi.gov/master_planning/columbia/ "Public Input : We held a public open house on Tuesday, June 7 initiating the Columbia County Planning Group master plan process. Please see the meeting summary under the planning documents tab for more details. Your input is welcome throughout the process, but one additional formal 30-day comment period will be provided this fall during draft master plan review. Responses to comments received during formal comment periods will be posted on this web page and sent electronically to commenters." Approach: open house meetings for a property, or group of properties, where the results from the Integrated Team meetings are presented to the public. The primary purpose of these meetings is to give stakeholders the ability to be informed and comment on the tactical on-the-ground management decisions that will be taking place on state properties in the upcoming year. Objectives for these meetings include: Provide the public with information on property management; and Give the public an opportunity to ask questions and provide input on management activities.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	C	EXR	Maj	Min	OFI	Likely Gap *	Likely Conf. *
18.1.1	Involvement in public land planning and management activities with appropriate governmental entities and the public.	MF		11					
Notes	See Performance Measure 18.1 above.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	C	EXR	Maj	Min	OFI	Likely Gap *	Likely Conf. *
18.1.2	Appropriate contact with local stakeholders over forest management issues through state, provincial, federal or independent collaboration.	MF		11					
Notes	See Performance Measure 18.1 above. Spoke with Mr. G.O. of Friends of Council Grounds; he confirmed the group's good working relationships with the managers at the park.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
18.2	**Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall confer with affected indigenous peoples.**	MF	11						
Notes	See indicator.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
18.2.1	Program that includes communicating with affected indigenous peoples to enable Program Participants to: a. understand and respect traditional forest-related knowledge; b. identify and protect spiritually, historically, or culturally important sites; and c. address the use of non-timber forest products of value to indigenous peoples in areas where Program Participants have management responsibilities on public lands.	MF	11						
Notes	WDNR Secretary's Office meets with tribal leaders every year, generally in association with some issue or resource question. Jim Warren is Forestry's Tribal Liaison, with assigned liaison personnel for each tribe.								

Objective 19. Communications and Public Reporting.
To broaden the practice of sustainable forestry by documenting progress and opportunities for improvement.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	C	EXR	Maj	Min	OFI	Likely Gap *	Likely Conf. *
19.1	**A Certified Program Participant shall provide a summary audit report, prepared by the certification body, to SFI Inc. after the successful completion of a certification, recertification or surveillance audit to the SFI 2010-2014 Standard.**	MF	11						
Notes	See indicator.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	C	EXR	Maj	Min	OFI	Likely Gap *	Likely Conf. *
19.1.1	The summary audit report submitted by the *Program Participant* (one copy must be in English), shall include, at a minimum, a. a description of the audit process, *objectives* and scope; b. a description of substitute *indicators,* if any, used in the audit and a rationale for each; c. the name of *Program Participant* that was audited, including its SFI representative; d. a general description of the *Program Participant*'s forestland and manufacturing operations included in the audit; e. the name of the *certification body* and *lead auditor* (names of the *audit team* members, including *technical experts* may be included at the discretion of the *audit team* and *Program Participant*); f. the dates the certification was conducted and completed; g. a summary of the findings, including general descriptions of evidence of conformity and any nonconformities and corrective action plans to address them, opportunities for improvement, and exceptional practices; and h. the certification decision.	MF	11						
Notes	Summary report of 2010 Surveillance Audit has all of the minimum requirements. NSF's Lead Auditor will prepare a similar report for 2011 SA.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	C	EXR	Maj	Min	OFI	Likely Gap *	Likely Conf. *
19.2	**Program Participants shall report annually to SFI Inc. on their conformance with the SFI 2010-2014 Standard.**	MF	11						

	Notes	See indicators.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
19.2.1	Prompt response to the SFI annual progress report.	MF	11						
Notes	Confirmed with SFI, Inc.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
19.2.2	Recordkeeping for all the categories of information needed for SFI annual progress reports.								
Notes	Not reviewed during 2011 Surveillance Audit.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
19.2.3	Maintenance of copies of past reports to document progress and improvements to demonstrate conformance to the SFI 2010-2014 Standard.	MF	11						
Notes	2010 Progress Report Forms provided by Wisconsin DNR when requested by audit team; others are available.								

Objective 20. Management Review and Continual Improvement.

To promote continual improvement in the practice of sustainable forestry, and to monitor, measure and report performance in achieving the commitment to sustainable forestry.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
20.1	**Program Participants shall establish a management review system to examine findings and progress in implementing the SFI Standard, to make appropriate improvements in programs, and to inform their employees of changes.**	MF	11						
Notes	See indicators.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
20.1.1	System to review commitments, programs and procedures to evaluate effectiveness. Note: For multi-site programs the auditing requirements of Section 9 or the ISO MD-1 requirements must be followed (see Multi-site Checklist); at a minimum internal audits or monitoring that spans all sites and addresses the relevant part of the SFI Standard is expected.	MF	11						
Notes	The various agencies within the scope have established monitoring and reporting protocols that comprise an important foundation for the overall system. For example for the Fisheries Bureau: the 2010 Wisconsin Water Quality Report to Congress, which summarizes the status of rivers, streams, lakes, wetlands etc and the dependent biotic organisms; Expenditures of Inland Water Trout Stamp Revenues FY 2008-2010; Wisconsin 201o Consolidated Assessment and Listing Methodology (CWA 305(b) 314, and 303(d)). The Wildlife Bureau has similar reporting requirements.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
20.1.2	System for collecting, reviewing, and reporting information to management regarding progress in achieving SFI 2010-2014 Standard objectives and performance measures.	MF	11						

	Notes	☒ dnr.wi.gov, search "master planning" the link is on the left side http://dnr.wi.gov/master_planning/lfmonitoring.html
		Master plan monitoring and reporting process is in place, based on a reporting template. This is used for any property which has a modern master plan that has been in place for at least one year. Central office staff receive copies, which are also readily available on the public internet. Integrated Team meetings are held for the range of properties and include employees from across programs. These are internal meetings and do not involve public participation. Objectives for these meetings are: Ensure an integrated approach to managing all properties, Develop an annual work plan for the property(s). There is a document "Annual Property Management Meetings – expectations, discussions, results, reporting" providing direction for how these meetings are to be held. Monitor and report progress on prior work plans and toward implementing master plan recommendations.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit-or	**C**	**EXR**	**Maj**	**Min**	**OFI**	**Likely Gap ***	**Likely Conf. ***
20.1.3	Annual review of progress by management and determination of changes and improvements necessary to continually improve conformance to the SFI 2010-2014 Standard.	MF	11						
Notes	There is a process for review of monitoring reports that involves higher level management. This process is organized around other WDNR goals and initiatives (understandable) but there is no indication of a clear link between these processes and certification.								
	Reviewed "Facilities & Lands Performance Measures" document.								
	Wildlife Bureau: performance metrics including harvest levels								
	Reviewed ICIT meeting minutes of meeting held on January 20, 2011 and April 19, 2011. Certification issues were covered, including changes in the standard and emerging certification issues. The team concluded that certification requirements were met.								

Multi-site Certification – Two Options

A multi-site organization is defined as an organization having an identified central function (hereafter referred to as a central office – but not necessarily the headquarters of the organization) at which certain activities are planned, controlled or managed and a network of local offices or branches (sites) at which such activities are fully or partially carried out.

☐ Organization does **NOT** meet the definition above; the remaining questions do not apply and all remaining portions of the multi-site checklists may be deleted from the report.

Option 1: Alternate Approach to Multi-site Certification Sampling based on the Requirements for the SFI 2010-2014 Program, Section 9, Part 5.1 & Appendix 1

a) What specific activities are planned, controlled or managed at the central office?
Policies, procedures, guidance, and Mater Planning

b) For each activity, provide evidence:
Reviewed during audit; see checklist.

General Eligibility Criteria:

A legal or contractual link shall exist between all sites.
☒ Yes   ☐ No   Evidence   All sites are owned by the State of Wisconsin and their management is under the authority of the Wisconsin DNR. "Sites" are considered, for purposes of this checklist, to be the various categories of lands involved in the certificate, and the agencies responsible for them. The reason is that most decisions are centralized, at the agency level (in Madison). For field sampling purposes the larger ownerships and the grouped parcels (for master planning) are considered to be sites.

The scope and scale of activities carried out by participating sites shall be similar.
☒ Yes   ☐ No   Evidence   Land management for varied goals; vegetation management practices are quite similar for exotic invasive plants (funding levels vary) and identical for commercial harvests. Field observations; see main checklist.

The management system framework shall be consistent across all sites (allowing for site level procedures to reflect variable local factors).
☒ Yes   ☐ No   Evidence   See item above; harvest-related approaches are identical; varied agency goals and legal mandates are accommodated within a consistent framework.

Central Function Requirements:

Provide a commitment on behalf of the whole multi-site organization to establish and maintain practices and procedures in accordance with the requirements of the relevant standard.
☒ Yes   ☐ No   Evidence Commitments are clearly stated and documented in official memo's or orders.

Provide all the sites with information and guidance needed for effective implementation and maintenance of practices and procedures in accordance with the relevant standard.
☒ Yes   ☐ No   Evidence Guidance flows through various channels, with the Forest Certification Implementation Team being the key approach for certification-related issues. The WDNR has a rich set of manuals and procedures. Field units know what they need to do.

Maintain the organizational or contractual connection with all sites covered by the multisite
Organization including the right of the Central Function to exclude any site from participation
In the certification in case of serious non-conformities with the relevant standard.
☒ Yes   ☐ No   Evidence   WDNR has the legal authority to exclude sites/agencies as needed.

Keep a register of all the sites of the multi-site organization, including (for SFI 2010-2014 Standard) the forest
area associated with each participating site.
☒ Yes   ☐ No   Evidence   Scope statement lists land categories included and excluded.

Maintain an internal audit or monitoring program sufficient to provide annual performance data on overall
organizational conformance with the relevant standard.
☐ Yes   ☒ No   Evidence   Monitoring protocols are varied and widespread, with a focus on timber
harvests and vegetation treatments. The program of reviews for certification-issues is far weaker. There is no
formal annual review of the centralized-portion of the program, for example (no checklist or non-conformance
process). **Minor Non-conformance: Internal auditing sufficient to assess overall conformance with the SFI
2010-2014 Standard was not demonstrated for issues managed centrally.**

Maintain an internal audit or monitoring program sufficient to provide periodic performance data on overall
organizational conformance with the relevant standard.
☒ Yes   ☐ No   Evidence   Periodic monitoring, coupled with annual monitoring, appears to meet the
requirements.

Operate a review of the conformity of sites based on results of internal audit and/or monitoring data sufficient to
assess Organizational performance as a whole rather than at the individual site level.
☒ Yes   ☐ No   Evidence   Although the internal audit process needs improvement (covered in Minor
Non-conformances described elsewhere in this report) the overall conformity review appears to meet this
requirement. Enhancements to internal audits and to the establishment of corrective and preventive measures
should result in improved overall management review in the future.

Establish corrective and preventive measures if required and evaluate the effectiveness of
corrective actions taken.
☐ Yes   ☒ No   Evidence   Corrective and preventive measures are currently focused on third-party
audits, with other issues addressed to some degree in various program's reviews and management processes.
**Minor Non-conformance: Evidence was not provided of a systematic approach to internally-generated
findings.**

Establish procedures for inclusion of new sites within the multi-site organization including
an internal assessment of conformity with the standard, implementation of corrective
and preventive measures and a requirement to inform the relevant certification body of
changes in participation prior to including the sites within the scope of the certification.
☒ Yes   ☐ No   Evidence   All appropriate lands are included; when lands are purchased they are added
if they are within a land type included in the certificate. Auditors work with WDNR each year to understand scope.

Individual Site Functions and Responsibilities

Sites implement and maintain the requirements of the relevant standard.
☒ Yes   ☐ No   Evidence   Field reviews and interviews; see main checklist.

Sites respond effectively to all requests from the Central Function or certification body for
relevant data, documentation or other information whether in connection with formal audits or reviews or
otherwise.

☒ Yes ☐No   Evidence   Sites appear to comply with changes in the program driven by third-party audits or other centrally-directed changes. There are concerns about responses to internal reviews, given that the processes are varied and somewhat informal.

Sites provide full co-operation and assistance in respect of the satisfactory completion of internal audits, reviews, monitoring, relevant routine enquiries or corrective actions.
☒ Yes ☐No   Evidence   Sites are compliant and cooperative with centrally-issued directive.

Sites implement relevant corrective and preventive actions established by the central office.
☒ Yes ☐No   Evidence Responses to CARs indicate sites implement CAR plans which stem from third-party audits. Unclear as to responses to internal reviews, given that the processes are varied and somewhat informal.

Option 2: NSF-ISR Multi-site Certification Justification based on MD1: 2007
Option 1 selected; Option 2 N.A.   End of Multi-site Checklists

Appendix IV

Site Visit Notes and Participants

Site Visit Notes and Participants

August 14th (Sunday)

Opening Meeting, Spooner
Participants
Mike Ferrucci, Lead Auditor
JoAnn Hanowski, Auditor
Dave Wager, Auditor
Alan Crossley, Wildlife
Teague Prichard, Forestry
Ken Symes, DNR Forest Certification Coordinator

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

Follow-up Information Requested
☒ Documentation of 2011 Partnership Meeting provided: "Waupaca County State Lands Meeting, January 20, 2011"

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: 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, 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

Follow-up Information Requested
☒ Documentation of training for an experienced forester supervised by Mike Warnke; reviewed record to assess how the managers determine training needs and confirmed system is in place

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 18acres.

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-Mederas, Property Manager
Jed Hopp, Wildlife
James Robaidek, Wildlife

Rob Gropp, Forestry
Alan Crosley, Wildlife
Teague Prichard, Forestry
JoAnn Hanowski, Auditor
Dave Wager, Auditor

<u>Sites</u>
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.

<u>High Cliff State Park</u>

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.

High Cliffs State Park is in the middle of the master plan development process.

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

<u>Sites</u>
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.

Participants
Justine Hasz, Property Manager, Wisconsin DNR Fish Management Biologist
Dale Kufalk Fish Management Technician
Jon Robaidek, Wildlife Biologist
Austin Felts, DNR Forester Adams County
Ken Symes, DNR Forest Certification Coordinator
Rebecca Gass, Section Chief, Effectiveness and Outreach, Division of Forestry
Paul Cunningham, Fisheries, Madison Wisconsin DNR

Sites
1. Tract 01-09: Marked oak regeneration harvest to retain oak and white pine, effort to move forest more towards historic composition with more oak
2. Prairie created about 10 years ago, maintained through periodic prescribed burning.
3. Turkey stamp project

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, Conservtion Biologist, South Central Region, BER, WDNR
Jessica Renley, LTE SNA Crew Leader, South Central Region, BER, WDNR
Sara Kehrli, 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 standy 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

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- Managrass 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

Craig Anderson, Parks Ecologist, DNR
Matthew Singer, WDNR Forestry
John Arthur, Park Manager, WDNR
John Nielsen, DNR Forestry Regional Forestry Leader
Aaron Young, SW Wisconsin Forest and Fire Control Supervisor
Ken Symes, DNR Forest Certification Coordinator

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."

Follow-up Information Requested
☒ Columbia County Integrated Planning Meeting notes
☒ Trail inspection portion of notes from recent biannual property inspections

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.

August 17th (Wednesday)

Auditor: Dave 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

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

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

Thanks for attending this meeting. The audit of state lands is going well from our perspective:
- Good involvement from both divisions and all of the agencies
- Good range of site visits
- This year's focus is on the Lands Division… 3 sites per day per team … allowing more time per site per visit

We propose to change this afternoon's focus - less of an exit briefing – instead an opportunity for our audit team to ask some questions to help us better understand some aspects of your program.

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

Appendix V

SFI Reporting Form (not needed)