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

State of Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources

SCS-FM/COC-00070N

101 Webster Street
P.O. Box 7921
Madison WI 53707
United States of America
Mark Heyde
www.dnr.wi.gov

CERTIFIED	EXPIRATION
31 December 2013	30 December 2018

DATE OF FIELD AUDIT
18-21 August 2014
DATE OF LAST UPDATE
8 December 2014

SCS Contact:
Brendan Grady | Director
Forest Management Certification
+1.510.452.8000
bgrady@scsglobalservices.com

SCSglobal SERVICES
Setting the standard for sustainability™

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

Foreword

Cycle in annual surveillance audits			
☒ 1st annual audit	☐ 2nd annual audit	☐ 3rd annual audit	☐ 4th annual audit
Name of Forest Management Enterprise (FME) and abbreviation used in this report:			
State of Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR)			

All certificates issued by SCS under the aegis of the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) require annual audits to ascertain ongoing conformance with the requirements and standards of certification. A public summary of the initial evaluation is available on the FSC Certificate Database http://info.fsc.org/.

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

- A focused assessment of the status of any outstanding conditions or Corrective Action Requests (CARs; see discussion in section 4.0 for those CARs and their disposition as a result of this annual audit);
- Follow-up inquiry into any issues that may have arisen since the award of certification or prior to this audit; and
- As necessary given the breadth of coverage associated with the first two components, an additional focus on selected topics or issues, the selection of which is not known to the certificate holder prior to the audit.

Organization of the Report

This report of the results of our evaluation is divided into two sections. Section A provides the public summary and background information that is required by the Forest Stewardship Council. This section is made available to the general public and is intended to provide an overview of the evaluation process, the management programs and policies applied to the forest, and the results of the evaluation. Section A will be posted on the FSC Certificate Database (http://info.fsc.org/) no less than 90 days after completion of the on-site audit. Section B contains more detailed results and information for the use by the FME.

Table of Contents

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY

1. General Information

1.1 Annual Audit Team

Auditor Name:	Brendan Grady	**Auditor role**:	Lead Auditor, FSC
Qualifications:	Mr. Grady is the Director, Forest Management Certification for SCS. In that role, he provides daily management and quality control for the program. He participated as a team member and lead auditor in forest certification audits throughout the United States, Europe, and Asia. Brendan has a B.S. in Forestry from the University of California, Berkeley, and a Juris Doctorate from the University of Washington School of Law. Brendan is a member of the State Bar of California, and was an attorney in private practice focusing on environmental law before taking his current role at SCS.		
Auditor Name:	Norman Boatwright	**Auditor role**:	Team Auditor, FSC; Lead Auditor, SFI
Qualifications:	Norman Boatwright is the president of Boatwright Consulting Services, LLC located in Florence, South Carolina. BCS handles typical forestry consulting, SFI, ATF and FSC Audits, Phase I Environmental Site Assessments, Forest Soil Mapping, Wetland Delineation, and other Biological Services. Norman has over twenty-nine years' experience in intensive forest management, eighteen years' experience in environmental services and ten years' experience in forest certification auditing. He has conducted Phase I Assessments on over three hundred and fifty projects covering 3,000,000 acres, Endangered Species Assessments on timberland across the South, and managed soil mapping projects on over 1.3 million acres. From 1985-1991, he was Division Manager at Canal Forest Resources, Inc. and was responsible for all forest management activities on about 90,000 acres of timberland in eastern South Carolina. Duties included budgeting and implementing land and timber sales, site preparation, planting, best management practices, road construction, etc. From 1991-1999, he was manager of Canal Environmental Services which offered the following services: Phase I Environmental Site Assessments, Wetland Delineation and Permitting and Endangered Species Surveys. From 1999-2012 he was the Environmental Services Manager, Milliken Forestry Company. Norman has extensive experience auditing SFI, procurement and land management organizations and American Tree Farm Group Certification Programs. He is also a Lead Auditor for Chain of Custody Audits under SFI, PEFC, and FSC		
Auditor Name:	JoAnn Hanowski	**Auditor role**:	Wildlife biologist/ assistant FSC/SFI auditor
Qualifications:	JoAnn M. Hanowski was a senior research fellow at the University of Minnesota-Duluth's Natural Resources Research Institute. She has considerable expertise evaluating the effects of forest management on wildlife habitat, and is currently working on research projects involving the response of birds to various forest management practices in stream and seasonal pond buffers and the development of indicators of forest and water health and sustainability in Minnesota and across the Great Lakes. She was a member of the forest bird technical team for the original GEIS		

	and participated on the wildlife technical team that wrote forest management guidelines for Minnesota. She is a participant in a 14-year project for monitoring avian populations on the Chequamegon National Forest. She was a member of the riparian science technical committee that is investigating the effectiveness of Minnesota's current guidelines for forest management in riparian systems. She has published 64 peer- reviewed journal articles and over 75 reports in her 21 year tenure with the University of Minnesota. JoAnn has served as a forest certification auditor throughout the U.S. since 2005, when she participated in the largest forest certification project ever conducted in the United States, the joint FSC/SFI certification of Minnesota's state lands.

1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation

A. Number of days spent on-site assessing the applicant:	4
B. Number of auditors participating in on-site evaluation:	3
C. Additional days spent on preparation, stakeholder consultation, and post-site follow-up:	3
D. Total number of person days used in evaluation:	**15**

1.3 Standards Employed

1.3.1. Applicable FSC-Accredited Standards

Title	Version	Date of Finalization
FSC-US Forest Management Standard	1.0	8 July 2010
All standards employed are available on the websites of FSC International (www.fsc.org), the FSC-US (www.fscus.org) or the SCS Standards page (www.scsglobalservices.com/certification-standards-and-program-documents). Standards are also available, upon request, from SCS Global Services (www.SCSglobalServices.com).		

2 Annual Audit Dates and Activities

2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities

Date: August 18, 2014	
FMU / Location / sites visited	**Activities / notes**
DNR Hayward Service Center (Grady and Boatwright)	Opening Meeting; Review of previous findings; staff interviews; document review
Site 1:Benson Creek Fisheries Area (Hanowksi)	Harvest 5801-158 A marked sale in a red oak stand. This is an intermediate thin from below harvest that will be completed in summer. The goal is to maintain oak on the site. Talked about marking wildlife trees.
Site 2: Beverly Lake Fisheries Sale 5804-155 (Hanowksi)	Thirteen acre intermediate thinning in a hardwood stand. Long term goal is to maintain the stand in a mixed hardwood condition. Large oak trees were left as legacy trees on the site.
Site 3: Eddy Creek Fisheries Sale 5804-154 (Hanowksi)	Aspen regeneration harvest with scattered retention of oak and pine. The majority of the retention was left in three retention islands and in a stream buffer. Some aspen was cut in stream buffer to manage against beaver in these trout streams.

Chippewa Flowage (Whole Audit Team)	
Site 1: Harvest 5818-139	Marked northern hardwood intermediate cut and aspen clearcut with reserves. This is a thin from below harvest that is complete. Little damage to residuals and good stocking. Sold in 2009.
Site 2: Harvest 5818-157	Adjacent to Site 1. 3 sale types: Aspen clearcut with residual oak, intermediate thin of an oak stand and seed tree cut in a natural red pine stand. 200' buffer along creek, little damage to residuals and good stocking.
Site 3: Harvest 5818-157	Aspen regen with oak and pine retention. Not cut. Sale occurs along a county paved road and aesthetics were discussed in the Timber Sale Noting and Cutting Report.
Site 4: Boat Landing on Crane Lake	Landing with floating dock, plenty of parking including handicap.
Date: August 19, 2014	
FMU / Location / sites visited	**Activities / notes**
Hanowski Audit Team – Flambeau River State Forest	
Site 1 Sale 5873-725	Site regenerated after 1977 windstorm and sale consisted of a northern hardwood thinning a red pine harvest and aspen regeneration. An aesthetic buffer was left along the road and there were aesthetic considerations along Connors Lake. Looked at a rehabilitated stream crossing. Good BMP implementation.
Site 2. Loopy Hills Ski Trail	DNR manages, maintains, and grooms this 22 mile ski trail. Special harvest considerations were applied along the ski trail corridor (no clearcut harvesting).
Site 3. Tract 1-13	Sale was within the quarter mile scenic river corridor, the Loopy Hills Ski trail and ATV trail pass through the sale. A goshawk nest found on the site resulted in over 30 acres being removed from the sale. DNR personnel found and reported nest to NHI. Harvest prescription was a thinning in a northern hardwood (sale marked but not harvested).
Site 4. ATV Trail	Drove on ATV trail for over 10 miles. DNR maintains this trail and has improved the trail with crowning and ditching.
Site 5. Kimberly Clark WA	Currently operating on an IFMP. Primary management is for sharp-tailed grouse (open landscape) with burning and herbicide treatments.
Sale 1-11	An aspen regeneration harvest on the edge of the WA. Retention trees were oak, elm, conifers and W painted trees as well as an RMZ along Price Creek and a hardwood inclusion.
Site 6. Sale 5873-719	This sale was within the scenic river corridor. Prior to the 2010 Master Plan, no harvest was allowed within the corridor. The Master Plan allows harvesting in the corridor that focuses on maintaining large and long-lived tree species. This sale included a hardwood select, a small aspen regeneration and a white pine thinning.
Site 7. Forest access road.	Road construction to meet Master Plan goal for sustainable forest

	roads. Good construction and ditching and erosion control devices. The forest has also developed 60 miles of hunter walking trails.
Site 8. Sale 5873-701	A hardwood thinning site. A portion of the sale was treated with harvested in a row configuration. Strips of trees were harvested and the rows of trees were thinned. This was done to protect advance regeneration in the rows. Walked through a patch of hemlock and discussed hemlock regeneration efforts.
Site 9. Sale 5873-723	A 108 acre northern hardwood thinning sale along an ATV and ski trail. This site is in the river corridor management area and was affected by a 2001 wind storm. Left a 20 foot buffer along the ski trail.
Site 10: Sale 5873-744	A multi-species harvest area- select cut of northern hardwoods, aspen regeneration, tamarack patch cuts, and a small shelterwood. Looked at tamarack patches and discussed loss of tamarack on the forest and methods to insure regeneration. Lots of regeneration after the 2013 harvest.
Boatwright Audit Team	
Brule River State Forest Site 1 Harvest 1674-554	Shelterwood cut to promote oak regen. Good stocking with little damage to residual trees. Ephemeral pools painted out and Ski trail free of debris.
Site 2 Harvest 1674-515	Red pine thin and intermediate hardwood cut. Good oak and maple regen. Good stocking with little damage to residuals.
Site 3 Harvest 1674-547	Aspen and jack pine stands regen clearcut. Jack pine scarified. Good green tree retention.
Site 4 Harvest 1674-???? (Vapa Road Sale)	Oak, aspen and birch regen cut with seed trees. Good pine and oak single retention with no damage to residuals.
Site 5 Vapa Road Pines (unscheduled stop)	Special place: mature old red pine with a mixed hardwood understory.
Site 6 Harvest 1674-547	Red pine 3rd thin with good stocking and little damage to residuals.
Site 7 Motts Pine Barren (unscheduled stop)	Jack pine stand clearcut and burned several times. Has converted to prairie grasses.
Site 8 Harvest 1674-521	Red pine 2nd thin and jack pine regen clearcut. Good stocking and little residual stand damage.
Site 9 Harvest 1674-???? (Hillside Combo)	Multiple harvest types: red pine intermediate thin, regen harvest to promote white birch establishment and scrub oak regen cut leaving the residual pine.
Site 10 Harvest 1674-5565	Not cut yet. Aspen and ash to be regenerated using clearcut with green tree retention. Northern hardwood has a marked shelterwood

	cut.
Site 11 Harvest 1674-???? (Superior Birch)	Not cut yet. White birch regen cut with marked green tree retention.
Amnicon Falls State Park Site 1 Harvest 1674-2	Aspen regen cut with reserves. Winter harvested some group retention and good single tree oak retention. Small suppressed ash were also left for retention and were dying out.
Site 2 Harvest 1674-3	Aspen regen cut with reserves. Winter harvested with good large group retention consisting of wetland areas with large upland buffers. Intermittent stream crossing looked fine.
Grady Audit Team	
Crex Meadows Wildlife Area	Premier birding area, management focused on upland areas to be converted to early successional habitat. Many harvests dealing with salvage from major windstorm in 2011. Contains embedded state natural area – Crex Sand Prairie, prescribed burned every 7-9 years. Annual bird surveys conducted comparing usage in burned areas to blowdown areas.
Site #1 Sale # 780-210	Barrens management area, goal was to restore site to jack pine – oak barrens type. exempt from green tree management requirements
Site #2 Sale # 780212	Salvage sale of jack pine from blowdown. Operational difficulties due to small postage size property and high demand for loggers to cope with salvage from the wind event. Discussed Karner blue butterfly management.
Governor Knowles State Forest	State forest 55 miles long bordering the St. Croix River. Immediate buffer zone along the river is owned by the federal government based on St. Croix's designation as a national scenic riverway. Heavy recreation use, Harvesting equipment was on-site but not being actively used. Inspected equipment. Review of skid trails in harvest areas, BMP review.
Site #3 Sale # 260	Completed sale with several sections including clearcut of Oak/Aspen area, clearcut with reserves. Adjacent to embedded SNA. Discussed SNA protection measures,
Site #4 Sale #263	Prepared sale, red pine thinning. Unmarked sale, row thinning will be used. Tract is adjacent to county road, discussed aesthetic management.
Danbury Wildlife Area Site #5 sale #0717-111	Aspen clearcut and red pine thinning following windstorm. Review of regeneration methods. Tract is part of property that will be traded to county forest as part of a land deal to consolidate state ownership in a nearby wildlife area.
Amsterdam Slough Wildlife Area Site #6 Sale AM 1-13	Even aged harvest in Hardwood stand. Goal is oak regeneration to stay ahead of red maple occupying the site. Access road showed minor rutting but it did not meet the BMP definitions of excessive rutting. Active eagle nest neighboring the sale resulting in operational restrictions.

Date: August 20, 2014	
FMU / Location / sites visited	**Activities / notes**
Hanowski Audit Team	
Site 1: Underwood WMA 2635-198	This marked sale in a hemlock/yellow birch stand is within a COA for the American marten. The goal is to regenerate hemlock and yellow birch by thinning the overstory to about 100 BA.
Site 2: 2635-206	This site was marked by a contractor. It was an even-aged hardwood stand and the goal is to manage toward an uneven-aged condition. Good hemlock regeneration on the site.
Site 3: Little Turtle Flowage	This flowage was acquired from Iron County in 2003 via a land swap. There are trumpeter swans, wild rice and a 23 km ski trail that is groomed by a local club. The ski club manages a warming building on the south end of the trail.
Site 4. Tract 02-10 sale 185	This 56 acre site was harvested in 2013 and the goal is to convert the site over time to a longer lived species mix and with more conifer. Green tree retention included red and white pine, hemlock and oak. There were aesthetic concerns with harvest along the road.
Site 5. Tract 1-14 (deadhorse lake)	This marked sale included two areas with aspen regen and a white pine thinning. Wetlands on the site were red-lined and buffered by 30feet of no harvest. In addition, to the prescriptive species retention, staff will mark 5 leave tree aspen/acre.
Site 6. Tract 06-11 Sale 194	This was an active sale in a marked for removal northern hardwood stand. Site notes examined on site included the presale meeting and three site visits since harvest was started.
Hay Creek Wildlife Management Area Site 7. Tract 1-1B	This stand was a marked hardwood thinning and a portion where aspen regeneration was to be completed. The goal is to maintain hardwoods and longer lived conifer species, especially cedar.
Site 8. Culver replacement	Multiple road wash-outs required that a new culvert was installed on Hay Creek. Good placement of culvert in terms of height to allow fish passage.
Site 9. Flowage control device on Hay Creek.	This dike and water control device is maintained for integrity by managing beaver activity and by controlling woody vegetation on the dike with herbicide. Wild rice harvest in the flowage is controlled by local tribes.
Site 10. Tract 1-12	This was a 9 acre hardwood thinning and 32 acre aspen regeneration harvest. An RMZ was maintained along an adjacent stream and was excluded from the sale. Retention in the aspen areas was primarily conifer species.
Site 11. Tract 2-13	Three parcels totaling 56 acres have been marked and sold and will require winter harvest. The goal is to promote aspen regeneration and to retain conifers on the site as leave trees.
Site 12. 3-9	Four parcels were included in this 2009-10 harvest (one hardwood thinning and three even-aged aspen). The regeneration in the gaps that we looked at was good.
Site 13. 3-12	This stand was a 44 acre aspen regeneration active harvest site. One

	patch of mature aspen was reserved on there was an RMZ along Hay Lake. Green tree retention on the site was primarily fir, spruce, cedar and pine.
Boatwright Audit Team	
Site 1 White River Fishery Area	Nice parking area near the White River headwaters. Artesian well that is well used. Working with the fishery folks to replace the road culvert that is affecting flow.
Site 2 Harvest 410-04	Red pine marked thin with no issues. Good stocking and little damage to residuals, red and white pine, hemlock and oak. There were aesthetic concerns with harvest along the road.
Site 3 Prairie	Old hay field converted to prairie by disking and planting seed. The site will be used as a seed source to assist landowners in establishing prairies. Species include: tall and little blue stem, yellow cone flower, golden rod, milkweed, bergamot and black eyed susan.
Site 4 Harvest 410-05	2 harvest types: 1) aspen regen cut with no snag retention and 2) aspen clearcut. This site will be converted to prairie grass.
South Shore Lake Superior Fish & Wildlife Area Site 5 Harvest 400-01-13	1 acre northern hardwood clearcut to accommodate the Big Rock Road riprap project.
Site 6 Sioux River	This river is a tributary of Lake Superior. Site has a parking lot, signage and trail for fisherman as well as a snowmobile trail maintained by the County club.
Site 7 Harvest 238-205	Many different types of sales in a very wet area with no activity. The area we visited was a 2 acre young white spruce stand that will be converted into a handicap accessible parking lot. The sale includes having the logger cut out several trails that will be made handicap accessible.
Site 8 Harvest 243-192	Red pine 2nd thin with no issues. Good stocking with little damage to residual trees.
Site 9 Copper Falls State Park	Nice state park with ample parking, buildings constructed by the CCC and many trails.
Grady Audit Team	
Beaver Brook Wildlife Area Site # 1, Sale 6601	Sale contained several harvest units, Oak selection harvest, oak shelterwood final removal, and pine thinning. Retention in harvest units focused on large wolf trees. Oak release was primary management goal. Harvest area contained wetland area, marked out with 15' buffer. Discussed Beaver Brook property expansion, use of ATV trail through the property.
Clam River Fishery Area Site #2 -	Trout habitat restoration project. Brushing for angler access, instream structures added.
Sand Creek Fishery Area	Culvert inspection, discussion of culvert maintenance and

Site #3	monitoring programs.
McKenzie Creek Wildlife Area	Variety of forest types throughout the property. Large component of aspen. Harvests focus on young forest initiative. Heavy use of the property for deer hunting. Contains Sphagnum lake bog embedded state natural area (Tula Lake)
Site #4 – Sale 196	Clearcut aspen harvest. Reviewed retention guidelines. Unit included alder lowland which was buffered out. Ice Age Trail runs through harvest unit, no buffer was left because of risk of overmature aspen falling into the trail.
Interstate Park	Wisconsin's oldest state park, bordering the Dalles of the St. Croix River. Visitation fairly low, primarily weekend day use from twin cities. Timber harvesting had not occurred on the park since 1980. A master plan variance was required in order to allow a harvest. This will likely be the last harvest before a new master plan is approved.
Site #5 – Sale 4935-1	Harvest in several sections, one to create a forestry interpretive trail to show examples of harvesting. Another area focused on creating pockets in the canopy to regenerate sugar maple, balance the use of the property as a park with the need to regenerate an over-mature stand. Regeneration in the forest is challenge due to intense deer browse.
Site #6	Bedrock Glade State Natural Area, embedded within Interstate Park. Management practices focus on invasive species control to promote the oak grass system characteristic of the SNA
Loon Lake Wildlife Area	Rolling topography, difficult for farming which allowed this are to remain forested and eventually acquired by the state. Primary use is hunting for a variety of game species. Forest management goals are to maintain all age classes and habitat types across the property.
Site #7 – Sale #170	Marked stand, not yet harvested. Highly diverse timber types in a small area, with oak shelterwood, aspen regeneration, and hardwood selection units. Existing stand was naturally regenerated from grazed land in the 50s.
Date: August 21, 2014	
FMU / Location / sites visited	**Activities / notes**
Minong Ranger Station and Totogatic Wild River (Entire Audit Team)	Recently acquired properties bordering the Totogatic River. 150' easement along the river prohibiting any harvesting except habitat improvement and invasive species removal.
Site 1 Harvest 6618-5-13	Jack pine regen clearcut. No timber had been cut and the area has been scarified.
DNR Hayward Service Center	Staff Interviews; Closing Meeting

2.2 Evaluation of Management Systems

SCS deploys interdisciplinary teams with expertise in forestry, social sciences, natural resource economics, and other relevant fields to assess an FME's conformance to FSC standards and policies. Evaluation methods include document and record review, implementing sampling strategies to visit a broad number of forest cover and harvest prescription types, observation of implementation of management plans and policies in the field, and stakeholder analysis. When there is more than one team member, team members may review parts of the standards based on their background and expertise. On the final day of an evaluation, team members convene to deliberate the findings of the assessment jointly. This involves an analysis of all relevant field observations, stakeholder comments, and reviewed documents and records. Where consensus between team members cannot be achieved due to lack of evidence, conflicting evidence or differences of interpretation of the standards, the team is instructed to report these in the certification decision section and/or in observations.

3. Changes in Management Practices

No major changes occurred at the level of DNR leadership. Significant updates from the different divisions in the DNR include:

Fisheries: continued easement acquisition to facilitate public access for angling; review of adaptation strategies for brook trout in response to climate warning.

Parks: completion of several master plans.

Wildlife: rollout of revised deer management strategy moving from a system of deer management units based on similar habitat to county boundaries; creation of the Wisconsin Young Forest Initiative focused on promoting early successional habitat in the state.

Natural Heritage: development of additional rare species guidance documents; training of over 300 forestry professionals on using the NHI systems.

Lands and Facilities: 11 ongoing master planning processes.

Forestry: Reforestation Team is summarizing monitoring results of artificial regeneration over the past seven year; working on updates to silvicultural handbook

4. Results of the Evaluation

4.1 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations

	Finding Number: 2013.1
Select one: ☐ **Major CAR** ☐ **Minor CAR** ☒ **Observation**	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	☐ Pre-condition to certification ☐ 3 months from Issuance of Final Report ☒ Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) ☐ Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC US 6.6.b
Background: Herbicides are used extensively by numerous DNR employees and contractors for a wide variety of applications, most often for control of invasive species. Interviews and review of documents showed that programs are in place to assure that laws and regulations are followed and that chemicals are applied safely. But, there is inconsistent evidence that the Department has made an effort to minimize the use of chemicals and to apply them at the least damaging formulation. Written strategies that justify the use of chemicals also are inconsistent across the Department.	
Observation: The Department of Natural Resources should take additional actions to assure that written strategies guide the minimal and consistent use of chemicals across the agency.	
FME response *(including any evidence submitted)*	The Department's pesticide use team has drafted a revision of the pesticide policies and procedures (i.e. manual code) with the input of program staff and managers to meet the varying needs of the programs, assure consistent planning, approval, and use, to assure that the least damaging formulations are used and to minimize chemical use vs. other alternatives. The revised manual code is in final review for adoption and publication. MC4230 1 REVISION 3-21-14 Master pesti Existing pesticide use policies address the minimization of chemicals and the consideration of alternatives: DNR Pesticide Use revised.docx *Note: Internal hyperlinks have been disabled*
SCS review	DNR's actions are sufficient to close this finding. However, since the policy was not finalized and put in practice yet, the audit team was unable to evaluate its practical effects. Pesticide use should be revisited in future audits to evaluate the effect of the change in policy.
Status of OBS:	☒ Closed ☐ Upgraded to Major ☐ *Other decision (refer to description above)*

	Finding Number: 2013.2
Select one: ☐ **Major CAR** ☒ **Minor CAR** ☐ **Observation**	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	☐ Pre-condition to certification ☐ 3 months from Issuance of Final Report ☒ Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) ☐ Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC US 6.6.d
Non-conformance: Written requests for use of chemicals are required, but the format of the request does not always address site-specific hazards, environmental risks, precautions to minimize risks, and maps of treatment areas.	
Corrective Action Request: The Department of Natural Resources must assure that written prescriptions for use of chemicals address the required elements of this indicator.	
FME response *(including any evidence submitted)*	The Department's pesticide use team has drafted a revision of the pesticide policies and procedures with the input of program staff and managers to meet the varying needs of the programs and to assure consistent planning including site-specific hazards, environmental risks, precautions to minimize risks, and maps of treatment areas. The revised manual code is in final review for adoption and publication. MC4230 1 REVISION 3-21-14 Master pesti The pesticide use team is charged with implementation of the new manual code after final approval including the design of new operational policies and staff training for implementation prior to the 2015 field season. New operational policies will clarify the mapping requirements. Existing pesticide use guidelines address site specific hazards, environmental risks, precautions to minimize risks, and minimization of chemical use. DNR Pesticide Use revised.docx *Note: Internal hyperlinks have been disabled*
SCS review	DNR's actions are sufficient to close this finding. However, since the policy was not finalized and put in practice yet, the audit team was unable to evaluate its practical effects. Pesticide use should be revisited in future audits to evaluate the effect of the change in policy.
Status of CAR:	☒ Closed ☐ Upgraded to Major ☐ *Other decision (refer to description above)*

	Finding Number: 2013.3
Select one: ☐ **Major CAR** ☒ **Minor CAR** ☐ **Observation**	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	☐ Pre-condition to certification ☐ 3 months from Issuance of Final Report ☒ Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) ☐ Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC US 6.7.a
Non-conformance: An auditor observed an on-going, minor leak of hydraulic fluid from a piece of harvesting equipment. There was no spill kit on site. Two mechanics arrived with a spill kit at least 40 minutes after the auditor arrived. Wisconsin BMP Manual clearly specifies that, for spills of fuels and lubricants used in forest operations, spill and containment kits will be on site	
Corrective Action Request: The Department of Natural Resources must take steps to assure that employees and contractors have the equipment necessary to respond to hazardous spills.	
FME response *(including any evidence submitted)*	The Department took steps to clarify the requirements for hazardous spill response. In a June 6, 2014 ForesTREEporter article staff were reminded that for logging operations, the purchaser is responsible for complying with Wisconsin's Forestry BMPs for Water Quality as a condition of the Timber Sale Contract - Form 2400-005. As such, contractors must maintain a spill containment and clean-up kit at the timber sale site and this issue should be addressed during the pre-sale meeting and documented on the Timber Sale Contractor Pre-Sale Meeting Checklist - Form 2460-009 and the Harvest Inspection Record - Form 2460-002, both of which have fields related to spills. The pre-sale meeting checklist form was modified to explicitly reference spill kits.
SCS review	The new checklist was reviewed. No issues related to spills were observed during this audit, although the opportunity to view active operations was limited. This CAR can be closed, but the issue should be reviewed during future surveillance audits.
Status of CAR:	☒ Closed ☐ Upgraded to Major ☐ *Other decision (refer to description above)*

	Finding Number: 2013.4
Select one: ☐ **Major CAR** ☒ **Minor CAR** ☐ **Observation**	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	☐ Pre-condition to certification ☐ 3 months from Issuance of Final Report ☒ Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) ☐ Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC US 8.3.a
Non-conformance: A timber sale prospectus sheet from May 2013 demonstrated improper use of the FSC trademark requirements, in particular the out-of-date FSC claim language (FSC Pure rather than	

100%). The language on the prospectus also misidentified the certified land base as the "LWSR" rather than the Wisconsin DNR. The FSC logo was also used without required format.	
Corrective Action Request: The Department of Natural Resources must seek approval from SCS prior to logo and trademark use.	
FME response *(including any evidence submitted)*	Standard language and guidance for word marks and logos was developed, approved by SCS and communicated to foresters and property managers. See the article in the ForesTREEporter, the Division of Forestry's newsletter from July 17, 2014 : **Referencing forest certification on state timber sales** By Mark Heyde, Forest Certification Coordinator POLICY Read this PDF for **important information** on how to reference the certification programs in your timber sale prospectus and contract and how to properly use their word marks and logos. StateLandsCertificati on ForesTREEporter.
SCS review	DNR received approval from SCS (and SFI) for their logo use. New conforming language was reviewed in recently issued bid packages.
Status of CAR:	[x] Closed [ ] Upgraded to Major [ ] *Other decision (refer to description above)*

	Finding Number: 2013.5
Select one: [ ] **Major CAR** [x] **Minor CAR** [ ] **Observation**	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	[ ] Pre-condition to certification [ ] 3 months from Issuance of Final Report [x] Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) [ ] Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	SCS FSC Chain of Custody Indicators for Forest Management Enterprises, Indicator 5.1
Non-conformance: Interviews with field staff showed inconsistent knowledge of the chain of custody requirements, answering that either claim could be used (100% or Pure).	
Corrective Action Request: All relevant FME staff and outsourcers shall be trained in the FME's COC control system and shall demonstrate competence in implementing the FME's COC control system.	
FME response *(including any evidence submitted)*	The DNR Public Lands Handbook correctly documents the COC control system. Forestry Division staff who administer state lands timber sales were trained in the correct claim and COC procedures through a July 17, 2014 ForesTREEporter article: **Forest Certification Chain-of-Custody** **What you need to know: Wisconsin DNR State Lands**

	By Mark Heyde, Forest Certification Coordinator If you are responsible for selling state timber sales or administering state timber sales you need to be familiar with the **Public Forest Lands Handbook (2460.5) Chapter 320** on forest certification and CoC controls. Please take time to review chapter 320 of the handbook. Last year's forest certification audit found that there is confusion about the correct product claim for Forest Stewardship Council® (FSC®)) and Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI®) certified forest products from certified state lands. Here are the correct claims: • FSC 100% • 100% SFI certified One source of confusion is that FSC changed the claim language from "FSC pure" to FSC 100% a few years ago. There may still be some old documentation that states FSC pure, but the correct claim is **FSC 100%**. To enable purchasers of state timber to maintain their chain-of-custody you need to maintain the correct CoC claim and certificate number for sales from certified state lands. The current certificate numbers can always be found on the DNR state lands forest certification Web pages. The key documents are the timber sale contract and haul tickets. A reference may also be included on the timber sale prospectus.
SCS review	In addition to the training provided by DNR, interviews with field staff confirmed that the proper claim is now being used.
Status of CAR:	[x] Closed [ ] Upgraded to Major [ ] *Other decision (refer to description above)*

4.2 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations

	Finding Number: 2014.1
Select one: [ ] **Major CAR** [ ] **Minor CAR** [x] **Observation**	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	[ ] Pre-condition to certification [ ] 3 months from Issuance of Final Report [x] Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) [ ] Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US Forest Management Standard v1.0, 9.4.a

Non-Conformity *(or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations)*: Monitoring of HCVF Areas follow quite different procedures depending on the location of the area. In particular, State Natural Areas (SNA) have been classified as HCVF areas. SNAs that are stand alone undergo direct monitoring using an SNA inspection form, several of which were reviewed during the audit. However SNAs that are embedded within other DNR properties (state forests, for example), are monitored through a different site inspection form as part of routine property inspections.	
Corrective Action Request *(or Observation)*: Systems for monitoring of HCVF should be harmonized in order to better demonstrate that DNR is using a consistent level of scrutiny in its HCVF monitoring.	
FME response *(including any evidence submitted)*	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	☐ Closed ☐ Upgraded to Major ☐ *Other decision (refer to description above)*

	Finding Number: 2014.2
Select one: ☐ **Major CAR** ☐ **Minor CAR** ☒ **Observation**	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	☐ Pre-condition to certification ☐ 3 months from Issuance of Final Report ☒ Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) ☐ Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US Forest Management Standard v1.0, 6.3.f
Non-Conformity *(or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations)*: When observing even aged harvest units, retention trees left on site were not always representative of the dominant species in the stand, particularly in the case of aspen dominated stands. A common justification was the poor longevity of aspen would mean that the retention trees would be short lived and not survive until the next rotation. However in some wildlife areas, the expectation was that retention trees would likely become snags or downed trees that provide large wood for wildlife habitat. So in certain cases this justification would not be warranted.	
Corrective Action Request *(or Observation)*: DHR should consider providing written justification for situations in which it opts to not maintain dominant species found on site, particularly in aspen stands.	
FME response *(including any evidence submitted)*	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	☐ Closed ☐ Upgraded to Major ☐ *Other decision (refer to description above)*

	Finding Number: 2014.3
Select one: ☐ **Major CAR** ☐ **Minor CAR** ☒ **Observation**	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	☐ Pre-condition to certification ☐ 3 months from Issuance of Final Report ☒ Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) ☐ Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US Forest Management Standard v1.0, 6.3.a.1
Non-Conformity *(or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations)*: Observations during the audit made it clear that DNR staff have embraced the "young forest initiative" effort to increase the amount of early seral forest. On the other hand, it was unclear how DNR set landscape level goals for maintaining or recruiting older forest throughout their management area. Currently landscape analysis future age and size class distribution of habitats is done through the NR 44 Master Plans. However, not all properties are covered by these plans yet, and areas outside these plans may not receive the same level of attention.	
Corrective Action Request *(or Observation)*: DNR could improve its conformance by evaluating how it is maintaining under-represented successional stages throughout its entire ownership, especially areas not already covered by NR 44 plans.	
FME response *(including any evidence submitted)*	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	☐ Closed ☐ Upgraded to Major ☐ *Other decision (refer to description above)*

5. Stakeholder Comments

In accordance with SCS protocols, consultation with key stakeholders is an integral component of the evaluation process. Stakeholder consultation takes place prior to, concurrent with, and following field evaluations. Distinct purposes of such consultation include:

- To solicit input from affected parties as to the strengths and weaknesses of the FME's management, relative to the standard, and the nature of the interaction between the company and the surrounding communities.
- To solicit input on whether the forest management operation has consulted with stakeholders regarding identifying any high conservation value forests (HCVFs).

Principal stakeholder groups are identified based upon results from past evaluations, lists of stakeholders from the FME under evaluation, and additional stakeholder contacts from other sources (e.g., chair of the regional FSC working group). The following types of groups and individuals were determined to be principal stakeholders in this evaluation:

5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted

Tribal Representatives	

Stakeholder consultation activities are organized to give participants the opportunity to provide comments according to general categories of interest based on the three FSC chambers, as well as the SCS Interim Standard, if one was used. The table below summarizes the major comments received from stakeholders and the assessment team's response. Where a stakeholder comment has triggered a subsequent investigation during the evaluation, the corresponding follow-up action and conclusions from SCS are noted below.

5.2 Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Responses from the Team, Where Applicable

[x] *FME has not received any stakeholder comments from interested parties as a result of stakeholder outreach activities during this annual audit.*	
Stakeholder comments	**SCS Response**
Economic concerns	
Social concerns	
Environmental concerns	

6. Certification Decision

The certificate holder has demonstrated continued overall conformance to the applicable Forest Stewardship Council standards. The SCS annual audit team recommends that the certificate be sustained, subject to subsequent annual audits and the FME's response to any open CARs.	**Yes** [x] **No** [ ]
Comments:	

7. Changes in Certification Scope

Any changes in the scope of the certification since the previous audit are highlighted in yellow in the tables below.

Name and Contact Information

Organization name	State of Wisconsin, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources		
Contact person	Mark Heyde		
Address	101 S. Webster Street P.O. Box 7921 Madison, WI 53707-7921	**Telephone**	608-267-0565
		Fax	608-266-8576
		e-mail	Mark.Heyde@Wisconsin.gov
		Website	dnr.wi.gov

FSC Sales Information

FSC salesperson	Same as above		
Address		**Telephone**	
		Fax	
		e-mail	
		Website	

Scope of Certificate

Certificate Type	☒ Single FMU	☐ Multiple FMU
	☐ Group	
SLIMF (*if applicable*)	☐ Small SLIMF certificate	☐ Low intensity SLIMF certificate
	☐ Group SLIMF certificate	
# Group Members (*if applicable*)		
Number of FMU's in scope of certificate		
Geographic location of non-SLIMF FMU(s)	*Latitude & Longitude:*	
Forest zone	☐ Boreal	☒ Temperate
	☐ Subtropical	☐ Tropical

Total forest area in scope of certificate which is:	**Units: ☐ ha or ☒ ac**
privately managed	
state managed	1,545,703
community managed	

Number of FMUs in scope that are:			
less than 100 ha in area	0	100 - 1000 ha in area	0
1000 - 10 000 ha in area	0	more than 10 000 ha in area	1

Total forest area in scope of certificate which is included in FMUs that:	**Units: ☐ ha or ☒ ac**
are less than 100 ha in area	0
are between 100 ha and 1000 ha in area	0
meet the eligibility criteria as *low intensity* SLIMF FMUs	0

Division of FMUs into manageable units:
Properties are divided into compartments and then into stands.

Production Forests

Timber Forest Products	**Units: ☐ ha or ☒ ac**
Total area of production forest (i.e. forest from which timber may be harvested)	760,610 scheduled for management (WisFIRS Rpt 101)
Area of production forest classified as 'plantation'	0
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by replanting or by a combination of replanting and coppicing of the planted stems	89,865
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by natural regeneration, or by a combination of natural regeneration and coppicing of the naturally regenerated stems	668,673 (Total area minus replanting)
Silvicultural system(s)	**Area under type of management**
Even-aged management	
Clearcut (clearcut size range 18)	261,887
Shelterwood	195,839
Other:	6,981
Uneven-aged management	
Individual tree selection	101,891
Group selection	126,912
Other:	
☐ Other (e.g. nursery, recreation area, windbreak, bamboo, silvo-pastoral system, agro-forestry system, etc.)	298
The sustainable rate of harvest (usually Annual Allowable Harvest or AAH where available) of commercial timber (m3 of round wood)	24,316 acres of all forest types (area control)
Non-timber Forest Products (NTFPs)	
Area of forest protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for the production of NTFPs or services	0
Other areas managed for NTFPs or services	0
Approximate annual commercial production of non-timber forest products included in the scope of the certificate, by product type	Balsam boughs 5 tons; Christmas trees 1,043
Explanation of the assumptions and reference to the data source upon which AAH and NTFP harvest rates estimates are based:	
Data are derived from "WisFIRS" which is a database that contains all recon, treatment, and timber sale data for State and County Lands.	
Species in scope of joint FM/COC certificate: *Scientific/ Latin Name* (Common/ Trade Name)	
Aspen/Popple:	Populus tremuloides Populus grandidentata
Balsam poplar	Populus balsamifera
White birch	Betula papyrifera
Eastern Cottonwood	Populus deltoides
Swamp white oak	Quercus bicolor

Silver maple	Acer saccharinum
American elm	Ulmus americana
River birch	Betula nigra
Green ash	Fraxinus pennsylvanica
White oak	Quercus alba
Bur oak	Quercus macrocarpa
Black oak	Quercus velutina
Northern pin oak	Quercus ellipsoidalis
Black walnut	Juglans nigra
Butternut	Juglans cinerea
Shagbark hickory	Carya ovata
Bitternut hickory	Carya cordiformis
Black cherry	Prunus serotina
Red maple	Acer rubrum
Hackberry	Celtis occidentalis
Scotch pine	Pinus sylvestris
European larch	Larix decidua
Norway spruce	Picea abies
Eastern redcedar	Juniperus virginiana
Blue spruce	Picea pungens
Norway maple	Acer platanoides
Boxelder	Acer negundo
Black locust	Robinia pseudoacacia
Honey locust	Gleditsia triacanthos
Eastern Hophornbeam, Ironwood	Ostrya virginiana
Musclewood, Bluebeech	Carpinus caroliniana
Sugar maple	Acer saccharum
Yellow birch	Betula alleghaniensis
White ash	Fraxinus americana
American beech	Fagus grandifolia
American basswood	Tilia americana
Northern red oak	Quercus rubra
Northern white cedar	Thuja occidentalis
Balsam fir	Abies balsamea
Eastern hemlock	Tsuga canadensis
Red Pine	Pinus resinosa
Jack Pine	Pinus banksiana
Eastern white pine	Pinus strobus
Black spruce	Picea mariana
Tamarack	Larix laricina
Black ash	Fraxinus nigra
White spruce	Picea glauca.

FSC Product Classification

Timber products		
Product Level 1	**Product Level 2**	**Species**
W1 Rough wood	Roundwood (logs)	6,256 MBF and 317,005 cds, all species (Completed sales FY 14 Rpt 28B)
W1 Rough wood	Fuel wood	717 cds, all species
W3 Wood in chips	Wood chips	6,294 cds and 500 tons, all species
Non-Timber Forest Products		

Conservation Areas

Total area of forest and non-forest land protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for conservation objectives	216,573 stands not scheduled for management (with WisFIRS prefix R,Y, Z)

High Conservation Value Forest/ Areas

High Conservation Values present and respective areas: **Units:** ☐ **ha or** ☒ **ac**

	Code	HCV Type	Description & Location	Area
☒	HCV1	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g. endemism, endangered species, refugia).	Driftless Area: Large rivers, complex floodplains, sand terraces; Large Blocks of Southern Forest; Prairie & Savanna Remnants Northwoods: Old-growth Developmental Stages HH and NH; Old-growth Developmental Stages Pines; Embedded Wetlands Glacial Outwash Plains & Lakebeds: Xeric Pine-Oak Forests; Pine-Oak Barrens; Large Peatlands, Sedge Meadow, & Wetlands Lake Michigan: Ridge & Swale Communities (inc. Lakeplain Prairie); Beach and Dune Formations; Level Bedrock Influenced Communities; estuaries, Green Bay Marshes Lake Superior: Freshwater Estuaries; Sandscapes; Dunes & Pine Forest; Boreal Clay Plain Forest; Apostle Islands Cliffs & Maritime	19,787

			Forest; Red Clay Wetlands Glaciated Southeast Wisconsin Prairies, Fens, Savannas Niagara Escarpment: Niagara Escarpment Ecological Landscape Features: Central Lake Michigan Central Sand Hills Central Sand Plains Forest Transition North Central Forest Northeast Sands Northern Highland Northern Lake Michigan Northwest Lowlands Northwest Sands Southeast Glacial Plains Southern Lake Michigan	
☒	HCV2	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant large landscape level forests, contained within, or containing the management unit, where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance.	Driftless Area: Large rivers, complex floodplains, sand terraces; Large Blocks of Southern Forest; Prairie & Savanna Remnants; Springs and Cold Water Streams; Cliffs, Caves and Talus Slopes; Relic Conifer Stands and Algific Slopes Northwoods: Old-growth Developmental Stages HH and NH; Old-growth Developmental Stages Pines ;Embedded Wetlands; Biologicaly Rich Freshwater Lakes Glacial Outwash Plains & Lakebeds: Xeric Pine-Oak Forests; Pine-Oak Barrens; Large Peatlands, Sedge Meadow, & Wetlands Lake Michigan: Ridge & Swale Communities (inc. Lakeplain Prairie); Beach and Dune Formations; Level Bedrock Influenced Communities;	104,189

			estuaries, Green Bay Marshes Lake Superior: Freshwater Estuaries; Sandscapes; Dunes & Pine Forest; Boreal Clay Plain Forest; Apostle Islands Cliffs & Maritime Forest; Red Clay Wetlands Glaciated Southeast Wisconsin Prairies, Fens, Savannas, Kettle Moraine Forest, Emergent Marshes Niagara Escarpment: Niagara Escarpment Ecological Landscape Features: Central Lake Michigan Central Sand Hills Central Sand Plains Forest Transition North Central Forest Northeast Sands Southeast Glacial Plains Southern Lake Michigan Key Ecological Features: Marl Lakes, Lower Wolf River	
☒	HCV3	Forests or areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems.	Driftless Area: Large rivers, complex floodplains, sand terraces; Large Blocks of Southern Forest; Prairie & Savanna Remnants; Springs & Cold Water Streams; Cliffs, Caves, and Talus Slopes;Relict Conifer Stands & Algific Slopes Northwoods: Old-growth Developmental Stages HH and NH; Old-growth Developmental Stages Pines; Embedded Wetlands; Biologically Rich Wild Freshwater Lakes Glacial Outwash Plains & Lakebeds	184,997

			Xeric Pine-Oak Forests Pine-Oak Barrens Large Peatlands, Sedge Meadow, & Wetlands Lake Michigan: Ridge & Swale Communities (inc. Lakeplain Prairie); Beach and Dune Formations; Level Bedrock Influenced Communities; Estuaries; Green Bay Marshes Lake Superior Freshwater Estuaries; Sandscapes, Dunes & Pine Forest; Boreal Clay Plain Forest; Apostle Islands Cliffs & Maritime Forest; Red Clay Wetlands Glaciated Southeast Wisconsin: Prairies, Fens, Savannas; Kettle Moraine Forests; Emergent Marshes; Wisconsin's Key Ecological Features Marl Lakes; Lower Wolf River Niagara Escarpment: Niagara Escarpment Ecological Landscape Features: Central Lake Michigan Central Sand Hills Central Sand Plains Forest Transition North Central Forest Northeast Sands Northern Highland Northern Lake Michigan Northwest Lowlands Northwest sands Southeast Glacial Plains Southwest Grasslands Superior Coastal Plain Western Coulees & Ridges	

			Western Prairie	
☐	HCV4	Forests or areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g. watershed protection, erosion control).		
☐	HCV5	Forests or areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g. subsistence, health).		
☒	HCV6	Forests or areas critical to local communities' traditional cultural identity (areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in cooperation with such local communities).		776
Total Area of forest classified as 'High Conservation Value Forest/ Area'				**309,749**

Areas Outside of the Scope of Certification (Partial Certification and Excision)

☐ N/A – All forestland owned or managed by the applicant is included in the scope.	
☒ Applicant owns and/or manages other FMUs not under evaluation.	
☐ Applicant wishes to excise portions of the FMU(s) under evaluation from the scope of certification.	

Explanation for exclusion of FMUs and/or excision:	The following DNR owned properties (about 30,477 total acres) are excluded from the scope of forest certification:
	• Agricultural fields subject to share-crop agreements (approximately 21,500 acres – (Stands with cover-type F in WisFIRS)
	• Specific intensive non-forest use areas, as provided below:
	  • State Fish Hatcheries, Rearing Ponds & Rough Fish Stations (180 acres – LMS[1] (4 ac./site))
	  • State Forest Nurseries (297 acres – WisFIRS)
	  • Poynette Game Farm and McKenzie Environmental Center (621 acres - WisFIRS)
	  • Boat Access Sites (718 acres – LMS[2] (1 ac./access))
	  • Fire & Radio Tower Sites (143 acres – LMS[3] (1 ac./tower))
	  • Ranger Stations, Administrative Offices and Storage Buildings (6,818 acres – LMS[4] (2.5 ac./building))
	  • State Park Intensively Developed Recreation Areas (200 acres – WisFIRS) e.g. Peninsula State Park golf course, Blue Mound State Park swimming pool
	
	Additionally, lands leased or eased from other owners who have retained vegetative management authority are also excluded.
	
	*Included in the scope of forest certification are DNR fee title owned properties and the leased Meadow Valley, McMillian, and Wood County Wildlife Areas.

Control measures to prevent mixing of certified and non-certified product (C8.3):	Excised areas are not managed for timber and logs are not sold from these areas, thus there is no risk of mixing.

Description of FMUs excluded from or forested area excised from the scope of certification:		
Name of FMU or Stand	**Location (city, state, country)**	**Size (☐ ha or ☐ ac)**

8. Annual Data Update

8.1 Social Information

Number of forest workers (including contractors) working in forest within scope of certificate (differentiated by gender):		
#Division of Forestry: 331 of male workers	# Division of Forestry: 104 of female workers	
Number of accidents in forest work since last audit	**Serious:** 11	**Fatal:** 0

8.2 Annual Summary of Pesticide and Other Chemical Use

☐ *FME does not use pesticides.*

Commercial name of pesticide / herbicide	**Active ingredient**	**Quantity applied annually (kg or lbs)**	**Size of area treated during previous year**	**Reason for use**
See attached list				
Final_Pesticide Use List_State Lands.xlsx				

SECTION B – APPENDICES (CONFIDENTIAL)

Appendix 1 – List of FMUs Selected For Evaluation

[x] FME consists of a single FMU

[ ] FME consists of multiple FMUs or is a Group

SCS staff establishes the design and level of sampling prior to each group or multiple FMU evaluation according to FSC-STD-20-007. A list of the FMUs sampled and the rationale behind their selection is listed below.

FMU Name	FMU Size Category: - SLIMF - non-SLIMF - Large > 10,000 ha	Forest Type: - Plantation - Natural Forest	Rationale for Selection: - Random Sample - Stakeholder issue - Ease of access - Other – please describe

Appendix 2 – List of Stakeholders Consulted

List of FME Staff Consulted

Name	Title	Contact Information	Consultation method
Dan Yankowiak	Property Manager		Interview
Randy Sobralski	Forester		Interview
Jim Kujala	Forester		Interview
Pete Wisdom	Forestry		Interview
Don Schumacher	Price/Taylor Forestry Team Leader		Interview
Kyle Schmidt	DNR- Price County Liason Forester		Interview
Tom Onchuck	Forester/Ranger Park Falls		Interview
Fred Freeman	Forester FRSF		Interview
Pat Beringer	DNR Wildlife- Kimberly Clark		Interview
Mark Schmidt	DNR Wildlife Liason Flambeau Forest		Interview
Heidi Brunkow	Forester FRSF		Interview
Larry Gladoski	Area Forestry Leader Hayward		Interview

Mark Heyde	Forest Cert. Coord. Madison DNR		Interview
Teague Prichard	DNR State Lands		Interview
Maggie Lorenz	Forester FRSF		Interview
Jim Halvorson	Superintendent FRSF		Interview
Roy Gilge	FRSF Forestry Tech		Interview
Matt Bauer	Forester, Mellen		Interview
Joe Schmidt	Forester		Interview
Heather Berklund	Forestry, Team Leader		Interview
Chris Paulik	TFF Property Manager		Interview
Ryan Magana	Ecologist – NW		Interview
Craig Thompson	Land		Interview
Dan Yankowiak	Chippewa Flowage Property Manager		Interview
Randy Hoffman	SNA Ecologist		Interview
Matt Blaylock	Bayfield Forestry Team Leader		Interview
Dave Schulz	Forest Superintendent		Interview
Dan Kephar	Ranger – Assistant Manager		Interview
Jason Leu	Forestry Intern		Interview
Eric Sirrine	Forester		Interview
Collen Matula	Forest Ecologist		Interview
Nichol Martin	Brule Area Staff Specialist		Interview
Zak Neitzel	Brule Private Lands Forester		Interview
Greig Bebling	Brule Wildlife Tech		Interview
Bob Hanson	NW Sands Wildlife Biologist		Interview
Todd Naas	Wildlife Biologist		Interview
Joseph LeBouton	Forester – North Bayfield		Interview
Tom Duke	District Forester		Interview
Eric Martin	Forest Ranger		Interview
Ryan Magana	NHC Ecologist		Interview
Paul Piszczek	Fisheries Biologist		Interview
Ben Bergey	Parks		Interview
Tom Piikkila	Forester/Ranger – Mellon		Interview
Bryon Lund	Technician – Spooner		Interview

Craig Roberts	Fisheries Biologist – Washburn/Burnett		Interview
Kyle Young	Forester – Spooner		Interview
Brad Johnson	Forestry Team Leader		Interview
Rod Fouks	Forestry Area Leader		Interview
Tobi Clark	Wildlife Technician - Spooner		Interview
Paul Cunningham	Fishery		Interview
Paul Bruggink	District Land Program Manager		Interview
Frank Trcka	Wildlife		Interview
Adrian Wydeven	Wildlife Biologist		Interview
Larry Glodoski	Area Forestry Leader		Interview
Kate Fitzgerald	Facilities & Land		Interview
Ken Jonas	WM Area Supervisor		Interview
Jim Warren	Forestry		Interview
Bob Mather	Forestry		Interview
Joe Schwantes	Forestry		Interview
Jim Becker	DNR Forestry		Interview
Kyle Anderson	DNR Forestry		Interview
Mike Wallis	DNR Forestry		Interview
Steve Hoffman	DNR Wildlife		Interview
Pete Engman	DNR Wildlife		Interview
John Furr	DNR Forestry		Interview
Jay Riewestahl	DNR Forestry		Interview
Jim Ulmaniec	DNR Forestry		Interview
Steve Runstrom	DNR Forestry		Interview
Terry Asleson	Forester – Webster		Interview
Nancy Christel	Wildlife Biologist – Spooner		Interview
Nolan Kriegel	LTE Forester – Spooner		Interview
Dave Kafura	DNR Forest Hydrologist		Interview
Kurt Dreger	Property Manager, Interstate Park		Interview
Janette Cain	Forester		Interview
Kevin Morgan	Property Manager, Mackenzie Creek Wildlife Area		Interview
Paul Heimstead	Forester		Interview
Chris Rucinski	Forester		Interview
Bob Masnado	HR Bureau Director		Interview
Roy Pedretti	HR Section Chief		Interview
Shelly Allness	DNR Tribal Liason		Interview

List of other Stakeholders Consulted

None, efforts at tribal outreach during the audit were unsuccessful.

Appendix 3 – Additional Audit Techniques Employed

No additional audit techniques were used.

Appendix 4 – Pesticide Derogations

Compliance with pesticide derogation conditions was not reviewed during this audit. Wisconsin DNR is in the process of reapplying to FSC International for pesticide derogations in order to continue using these normally prohibited chemicals. If the derogations are granted, compliance with the conditions will be reviewed during the next audit.

[x] There are no active pesticide derogations for this FME.		
Name of pesticide / herbicide (active ingredient)		**Date derogation approved**
Condition	**Conformance (C / NC)**	**Evidence of progress**

Appendix 5 – Detailed Observations

Evaluation Year	FSC P&C Reviewed
2013	All – (Re)certification Evaluation
2014	1.5, 2.3, P3, P4, 5.6, 6.2, 6.3, 6.9, 8.2, and 9.4
2015	
2016	
2017	

C= Conformance with Criterion or Indicator
NC= Nonconformance with Criterion or Indicator
NA = Not Applicable
NE = Not Evaluated

REQUIREMENT	C/NC	COMMENT/CAR
P1 Forest management shall respect all applicable laws of the country in which they occur, and international treaties and agreements to which the country is a signatory, and comply with all FSC Principles and Criteria.		
C1.5. Forest management areas should be protected from illegal harvesting, settlement and other unauthorized activities.	C	
1.5.a. The forest owner or manager supports or implements measures intended to prevent illegal and unauthorized activities on the ***Forest Management Unit*** (FMU).	C	As a state agency WDNR has its own law enforcement staff, including forestry law enforcement specialists and game wardens. Most common forest related crimes involve timber theft and unauthorized fires. No trespass issues were observed during the audit (dumping, illegal harvest, squatting). Property managers have detailed, on-the-

		ground knowledge of land units. Personnel with Law Enforcement credentials are readily available for consultation and support. During the period from 07-01-13 through 07-01-14, Forestry Law Enforcement Specialist Eric Grudzinski was contacted by DNR Forestry staff who reported two issues concerning illegally harvested timber from state trails, with cases still pending. Two timber thefts from State Forests were reported. Both cases involved commercial logging operations and were investigated by Northern State Forest (NSF) officers. In one case, the logger realized he had inadvertently crossed on to state property and contacted the state forest to resolve the matter. The logger was cited and billed for double stumpage. The other case involved a logger who hauled loads of timber from the state sale and did not pay for the timber. This case remains under investigation.
1.5.b. If illegal or unauthorized activities occur, the forest owner or manager implements actions designed to curtail such activities and correct the situation to the extent possible for meeting all land management objectives with consideration of available resources.	C	WDNR staff law enforcement work cooperatively with local law enforcement and county prosecutors when cases are brought to court. DNR Forestry is in the process of implementing a new model of addressing forestry related violations that occur on state land as well as private lands. The NSF officers have received specialized training pertaining to forestry related violations (i.e. timber theft.) NSF officers are transitioning into the role of lead investigator on complex forestry violations. Currently there is no statewide database to capture this type of information. The DNR Forestry Division has furthered development of a temporary database to document and track forestry violations. A final version of the complaint form is expected by the end of 2014, and training on the use of the form will be provided to field staff. The information gathered from use of the complaint form will assist in compiling future reports. The DNR Forestry Division plans to partner with other DNR law enforcement branches in developing and utilizing a statewide DNR law enforcement database in the future.
P2 Long-term tenure and use rights to the land and forest resources shall be clearly defined, documented and legally established.		
C2.3. Appropriate mechanisms shall be employed to resolve disputes over tenure claims and use rights. The circumstances and status of any outstanding disputes will be explicitly considered in the certification evaluation. Disputes of substantial magnitude involving a significant number of interests will normally disqualify an operation from being certified.	C	
2.3.a. If ***disputes*** arise regarding tenure claims or use rights then the forest owner or manager initially attempts to resolve them through open communication, negotiation, and/or mediation. If these good-faith efforts fail, then federal, state, and/or local laws are employed to resolve such disputes.	C	No significant disputes over tenure rights have occurred. Extensive stakeholder consultation in formal and informal (open door policy) is undertaken to diffuse any potential disputes.
2.3.b. The forest owner or manager documents any significant disputes over tenure and use rights.	C	There are no significant disputes over tenure and use rights. Should such disputes arise they are to be handled through the State Natural Resources Board.
P3 The legal and customary rights of indigenous peoples to own, use and manage their lands, territories, and resources shall be recognized and respected.		
C3.1. Indigenous peoples shall control forest management on their lands and territories unless they delegate control with free and informed consent to other agencies.	NA	
3.1.a. Tribal forest management planning and implementation are		

carried out by authorized tribal representatives in accordance with tribal laws and customs and relevant federal laws.		
3.1.b. The manager of a tribal forest secures, in writing, informed consent regarding forest management activities from the tribe or individual forest owner prior to commencement of those activities.		
C3.2. Forest management shall not threaten or diminish, either directly or indirectly, the resources or tenure rights of indigenous peoples.	C	
3.2.a. During management planning, the forest owner or manager consults with American Indian groups that have legal rights or other binding agreements to the FMU to avoid harming their resources or rights.	C	Consultation is undertaken at several levels. The DNR's statewide tribal liaison (Shelly Allness) to interact with tribes at a government to government level. Other individual staff serve as liaison and contacts for individual tribes. Tribes are formally consulted during the master planning process to make sure that their resource rights are preserved. Examples of informal consultation reviewed during the 2014 audit included working with tribal foresters from the Bad River Band on sale establishment. Chief concerns were recruitment of birch for bark collection, improved aesthetics, and potential sites for maple syrup gathering.
3.2.b. Demonstrable actions are taken so that forest management does not adversely affect tribal resources. When applicable, evidence of, and measures for, protecting tribal resources are incorporated in the management plan.	C	Known archeological and cultural sites are protected. DNR works cooperatively with tribes on managing tribal resources (jointly setting spearing limits, for example). Unit managers interviewed all demonstrated an understanding of the treaty rights of the Chippewa Tribes. Managers of land units within the treaty rights area indicated that they regularly work with tribal members to allow for gathering right, and many reach out to tribal leaders regularly to seek consultation. Examples reviewed during the 2014 audit include for the Flambeau River state forest, issuing tribal gathering permits (for bough bark and lodgepoles) was streamlined. Tribal members are now allowed receive permits through their own conservation agency. This is a pilot project that may rolled out elsewhere in the state. Currently tribal members need to seek permits from DNR itself.
C3.3. Sites of special cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance to indigenous peoples shall be clearly identified in cooperation with such peoples, and recognized and protected by forest managers.	C	
3.3.a. The forest owner or manager invites consultation with tribal representatives in identifying sites of current or traditional cultural, archeological, ecological, economic or religious significance.	C	See responses to 3.2. Master planning process goes through archeological review, etc. review Chippewa flowage site visited during the audit contains extensive sites of tribal significance, as part of the original Lac Courte Oreilles reservation was flooded to create the flowage. DNR works with a cultural representative from the tribe to identify cultural sites during timber sales. Burial mounds are found on approximately 75% of the sales, and are buffered out of harvest areas.
3.3.b. In consultation with tribal representatives, the forest owner or manager develops measures to protect or enhance areas of special significance (see also Criterion 9.1).	C	Through master planning process some special protection measures are identified. However, many special sites are kept confidential for their protection.
C3.4. Indigenous peoples shall be compensated for the	NA	

application of their traditional knowledge regarding the use of forest species or management systems in forest operations. This compensation shall be formally agreed upon with their free and informed consent before forest operations commence.		
3.4.a. The forest owner or manager identifies whether ***traditional knowledge*** in forest management is being used.		
3.4.bWhen traditional knowledge is used, written protocols are jointly developed prior to such use and signed by local tribes or tribal members to protect and fairly compensate them for such use.		
3.4.c. The forest owner or manager respects the confidentiality of tribal traditional knowledge and assists in the protection of such knowledge.		
P4 Forest management operations shall maintain or enhance the long-term social and economic well-being of forest workers and local communities.		
C4.1. The communities within, or adjacent to, the forest management area should be given opportunities for employment, training, and other services.	C	
4.1.a. Employee compensation and hiring practices meet or exceed the prevailing ***local*** norms within the forestry industry.	C	DNR staff indicated general satisfaction, although wages and benefits were stagnant in recent years coinciding with the downturn in the economy. DNR has begun hiring new staff across the agency to backfill open positions, indicating that funding for employment has opened up somewhat. Interviews with DNR HR department indicated that staff turnover rate is relatively low, less than 4.5% in 2013. Salary surveys are conducted in order to make sure that staff wages are in line with the state labor market.
4.1.b. Forest work is offered in ways that create high quality job opportunities for employees.	C	DNR has a variety of positions within its large agency, allowing for a diverse array of natural resource related positions. As a whole the DNR contains over 350 different job classifications.
4.1.c. Forest workers are provided with fair wages.	C	Wages for independent logging contractors are set by market rates. DNR competes with private industrial forestland in the market for contractors.
4.1.d. Hiring practices and conditions of employment are non-discriminatory and follow applicable federal, state and local regulations.	C	Hiring and employment decisions are managed by a human resources department responsible in part for ensuring that discrimination laws are met. DNR has an affirmative action approved by a separate state board, which requires balanced hiring panels. No information on race and other protected classes is included on job applications, i.e. application packages are stripped of sensitive data while hiring decisions are made, and then included later on for demographic analysis purposes.
4.1.e. The forest owner or manager provides work opportunities to qualified local applicants and seeks opportunities for purchasing local goods and services of equal price and quality.	C	Most logging contractors are local, and sales are advertised in different sizes to provide opportunities for both large and small businesses. DNR offices are located throughout the state, offering local employment for office staff, maintenance workers, and local vendors.
4.1.f. Commensurate with the size and scale of operation, the forest owner or manager provides and/or supports learning opportunities to improve public understanding of forests and forest management.	C	Wide variety of different opportunities to support public learning about forest management. DNR regularly publishes brochures, guides, and other printed materials intended to educate the general public about forestry and provide technical expertise to the profession. Examples include state BMP guidelines, guides for maintaining soil quality, forest pest management, etc. DNR also uses its forestland as a venue for outdoor learning, through interpretive trails, experimental forests, etc.

		Examples in the field viewed during the 2014 audit included the installation of a forest management interpretive trail at Interstate Park, a DNR property that had not undergone timber harvesting for decades.
4.1.g. The forest owner or manager participates in local economic development and/or civic activities, based on scale of operation and where such opportunities are available.	C	DNR offices are well distributed throughout the state where they are frequently a large presence in small rural communities. Individual staff reported on their civic engagement.
C4.2. Forest management should meet or exceed all applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of employees and their families.		
4.2.a. The forest owner or manager meets or exceeds all applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of employees and their families (also see Criterion 1.1).	C	Staff has access to relevant laws, including state statutes and administrative codes using the internet. The Department maintains an intranet that houses manual codes and handbooks for all Department programs. A list of applicable laws and regulations was updated in 2011 and is maintained in the Division of Forestry's Forest Management Guidelines publication, Appendix D.
4.2.b. The forest owner or manager and their employees and contractors demonstrate a safe work environment. Contracts or other written agreements include safety requirements.	C	No active harvesting was reviewed during the audit, but safety discussions were held prior to field days. Contracts were reviewed on all timber sales, and contain language requiring that contractors follow OSHA safety regulations.
4.2.c. The forest owner or manager hires well-qualified service providers to safely implement the management plan.	C	Loggers are required to undergo FISTA training.
C4.3 The rights of workers to organize and voluntarily negotiate with their employers shall be guaranteed as outlined in Conventions 87 and 98 of the International Labor Organization (ILO).		
4.3.a. Forest workers are free to associate with other workers for the purpose of advocating for their own employment interests.	C	There is a union for state employees covering DNR staff. Legislation passed in 2011 (Act 10) eliminated the ability of public unions to engage in collective bargaining, but the unions still exist in order to advocate for union members.
4.3.b. The forest owner or manager has effective and culturally sensitive mechanisms to resolve disputes between workers and management.	C	Dispute resolution procedures including an employee grievance procedure continue to be available and were not affected by Act 10.
C4.4. Management planning and operations shall incorporate the results of evaluations of social impact. Consultations shall be maintained with people and groups (both men and women) directly affected by management operations.		
4.4.a. The forest owner or manager understands the likely social impacts of management activities, and incorporates this understanding into management planning and operations. Social impacts include effects on: • Archeological sites and sites of cultural, historical and community significance (on and off the FMU; • Public resources, including air, water and food (hunting, fishing, collecting); • Aesthetics; • Community goals for forest and natural resource use and protection such as employment, subsistence, recreation and health; • Community economic opportunities; • Other people who may be affected by management operations. A summary is available to the CB.	C	WDNR takes affirmative steps to understand the social impacts of their management. A summary document was prepared in response to a previous CAR indicating where discussion of each impact could be identified. DNR has staff sociologists dedicated to understanding the social impact of forest management. The Wisconsin Environmental Policy act requires an evaluation of social impacts, including historic, cultural, scenic, and recreational resources. Archeological sites are mapped in state database and protections measures are put in place prior to activities beginning. Individual master plans include discussion of social impacts as part of a regional property analysis.
4.4.b. The forest owner or manager seeks and considers input in management planning from people who would likely be affected	C	Input from the public is required as part of management planning.

by management activities.		Notably, DNR issued itself a 2014 internal CAR aiming to improve their response rates in their calls for public comment on property level annual work plans. " Supervisors report that Integrated Property Management Meetings to discuss and plan annual work at a property level have occurred as required. The Integrated Certification Implementation Team (ICIT) finds that the Department's Property Manager Handbook standard operating procedures do not include guidance for public review and comment of annual work plans. Some properties such as state forests are assuring public review through public meetings or review or comment through the Web, but minutes generated from IPMMs (i.e. work plans or annual property action plans) are not being noticed for tribal or public review." An internal corrective action was issued to ensure that annual work plans were being posted.
4.4.c. People who are subject to direct adverse effects of management operations are apprised of relevant activities in advance of the action so that they may express concern.	C	Local neighbors are contacted by individual property managers when activities begin. At a larger level, there is a government email distribution list that allows for interested parties to opt into notifications on certain topics and properties.
4.4.d. For ***public forests,*** consultation shall include the following components: 1. Clearly defined and accessible methods for public participation are provided in both long and short-term planning processes, including harvest plans and operational plans; 2. Public notification is sufficient to allow interested stakeholders the chance to learn of upcoming opportunities for public review and/or comment on the proposed management; 3. An accessible and affordable appeals process to planning decisions is available. Planning decisions incorporate the results of public consultation. All draft and final planning documents, and their supporting data, are made readily available to the public.	C	Government email distribution list that allows for interested parties to opt into notifications on certain topics (e.g. wolf management) and properties (e.g. X state forest). At an individual harvest level, managers communicate with neighboring owners when they are harvesting on a boundary. WEPA process provides opportunity for public input. Issues on a site level basis happen more informally. Harvest planning done on annual basis, with an opportunity for comment as part of that. All planning activities are presented on the DNR website for comment. Parties can avail themselves of administrative hearing process. Any decision by the department can be appealed (a decision being defined as any plan or permit). The aggrieved party has the opportunity to have appeal heard in front of hearing examiner. DNR issued itself an internal CAR to improve its consultation measures, see 4.4.2.
C4.5. Appropriate mechanisms shall be employed for resolving grievances and for providing fair compensation in the case of loss or damage affecting the legal or customary rights, property, resources, or livelihoods of local peoples. Measures shall be taken to avoid such loss or damage.		
4.5.a. The forest owner or manager does not engage in negligent activities that cause damage to other people.	C	No evidence of negligence during the audit.
4.5.b. The forest owner or manager provides a known and accessible means for interested stakeholders to voice grievances and have them resolved. If significant disputes arise related to resolving grievances and/or providing fair compensation, the forest owner or manager follows appropriate dispute resolution procedures. At a minimum, the forest owner or manager maintains open communications, responds to grievances in a timely manner, demonstrates ongoing good faith efforts to resolve the grievances, and maintains records of legal suites and claims.	C	DNR first tries to resolve disputes through informal means. The administrative hearing process is in place for aggrieved parties if required. Finally there is the backup of the court system.
4.5.c. Fair compensation or reasonable mitigation is provided to local people, communities or adjacent landowners for	C	Compensation would be provided in cases where DNR was found liable for some damage.

substantiated damage or loss of income caused by the landowner or manager.		
P5 Forest management operations shall encourage the efficient use of the forest's multiple products and services to ensure economic viability and a wide range of environmental and social benefits.		
C5.6. The rate of harvest of forest products shall not exceed levels which can be permanently sustained.	C	
5.6.a. In FMUs where products are being harvested, the landowner or manager calculates the sustained yield harvest level for each sustained yield planning unit, and provides clear rationale for determining the size and layout of the planning unit. The sustained yield harvest level calculation is documented in the Management Plan. The sustained yield harvest level calculation for each planning unit is based on: • documented growth rates for particular sites, and/or acreage of forest types, age-classes and species distributions; • mortality and decay and other factors that affect net growth; • areas reserved from harvest or subject to harvest restrictions to meet other management goals; • silvicultural practices that will be employed on the FMU; • management objectives and desired future conditions. The calculation is made by considering the effects of repeated prescribed harvests on the product/species and its ecosystem, as well as planned management treatments and projections of subsequent regrowth beyond single rotation and multiple re-entries.	C	The sustained yield harvest in an output of the Wisconsin Forest Inventory and Reporting System (WisFIRS), and is routinely projected for 15 years. At present, growth rates are not used in projections, although a CFI system is being implemented that will allow calculation of growth. Instead, forest stands are visited on a 10-year cycle for reconnaissance, which includes measurements of volume. Recon data are considered in the annual update of 15-year harvest projections.
5.6.b. Average annual harvest levels, over rolling periods of no more than 10 years, do not exceed the calculated sustained yield harvest level.	C	Harvest rates are still within the calculated levels. In 2013, Sales established (Rpt. 301) CY 2013 = 23,838 vs. Long term goal (Rpt. 201) = 24,297.
5.6.c. Rates and methods of timber harvest lead to achieving desired conditions, and improve or maintain health and quality across the FMU. Overstocked stands and stands that have been depleted or rendered to be below productive potential due to natural events, past management, or lack of management, are returned to desired stocking levels and composition at the earliest practicable time as justified in management objectives.	C	Master plans clearly set desired conditions for different forest types and age classes on each property. Management codes for each stand are established to move the land unit toward these conditions. Several site visits during the audit were to stands that were being restored to historical conditions.
5.6.d. For NTFPs, calculation of quantitative sustained yield harvest levels is required only in cases where products are harvested in significant commercial operations or where traditional or customary use rights may be impacted by such harvests. In other situations, the forest owner or manager utilizes available information, and new information that can be reasonably gathered, to set harvesting levels that will not result in a depletion of the non-timber growing stocks or other adverse effects to the forest ecosystem.	C	NTFPs include firewood, berries, bark, and boughs. Permits are issued for firewood cutting, in small quantities; berry picking occurs in several locations, but there is no indication that any of it is commercial. Tribes track the harvest of their members and report to DNR annually.
P6 Forest management shall conserve biological diversity and its associated values, water resources, soils, and unique and fragile ecosystems and landscapes, and, by so doing, maintain the ecological functions and the integrity of the forest.		
C 6.2. Safeguards shall exist which protect rare, threatened and endangered species and their habitats (e.g., nesting and feeding areas). Conservation zones and protection areas shall be established, appropriate to the scale and intensity of forest management and the uniqueness of the affected resources. Inappropriate hunting, fishing, trapping, and collecting shall be controlled.	C	

6.2.a. If there is a likely presence of RTE species as identified in Indicator 6.1.a then either a field survey to verify the species' presence or absence is conducted prior to site-disturbing management activities, or management occurs with the assumption that potential RTE species are present. Surveys are conducted by biologists with the appropriate expertise in the species of interest and with appropriate qualifications to conduct the surveys. If a species is determined to be present, its location should be reported to the manager of the appropriate database.	C	DNR has a thorough process for addressing the management of RTE species. Prior to master planning, Rapid Ecological Assessments are conducted by ecologists from the Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation. Thus, any RTE species known to the ecologists or documented in the survey is considered in the planning process. In addition, any planned harvesting activity is reviewed by representatives from all relevant divisions of DNR, and Natural Heritage Inventory databases are referenced. Interviews with a number of NHC ecologists during field visits revealed descriptions of numerous surveys designed to assess rare species and important indicator species. Along the Mississippi River corridor birds have been monitored to assess importance of blocks of mature forest for migrants. An ongoing survey project, conducted jointly by DOF and NHC, involves a survey of ephemeral ponds. Wood turtle management has been a recurring issue because of their habitat use. DNR is forming an advisory team to develop an incidental take permit that would allow for the incidental take of wood turtles during forestry operations as long as permit requirements are followed. Cooperative field research on turtle habitat use is being done with neighboring states as part of this permit process.
6.2.b. When RTE species are present or assumed to be present, modifications in management are made in order to maintain, restore or enhance the extent, quality and viability of the species and their habitats. ***Conservation zones*** and/or ***protected areas*** are established for RTE species, including those S3 species that are considered rare, where they are necessary to maintain or improve the short and long-term viability of the species. Conservation measures are based on relevant science, guidelines and/or consultation with relevant, independent experts as necessary to achieve the conservation goal of the Indicator.	C	As above, pre-management reviews are conducted with an integrated team of personnel. Also, Form 2460 is required as part of a timber sale. This forms lists, among other things, descriptions of a number of ecological considerations, and the appropriate management response. Examples of protected areas and conservation zones during the 2014 audit included buffering around goshawk nests, and harvests focused on increasing habitat in the Crex Meads Wildlife area.
6.2.c. For medium and large public forests (e.g. state forests), forest management plans and operations are designed to meet species' recovery goals, as well as landscape level biodiversity conservation goals.	C	These priorities are evident when reviewing a number of Form 2460s and observing the close working relationship among DNR foresters, wildlife and fisheries biologist, and NHC ecologists.
6.2.d. Within the capacity of the forest owner or manager, hunting, fishing, trapping, collecting and other activities are controlled to avoid the risk of impacts to vulnerable species and communities (See Criterion 1.5).	C	On lands managed by the same Department that controls hunting, fishing, and trapping, risks to vulnerable communities and species are minimized. New deer management units have been created following recent legislation, with a shift from managing specific deer densities to managing densities within counties. New County Conservation Advisory Councils are being established to recommend management goals and harvest levels.
C6.3. Ecological functions and values shall be maintained intact, enhanced, or restored, including: a) Forest regeneration and succession. b) Genetic, species, and ecosystem diversity. c) Natural cycles that affect the productivity of the forest ecosystem.	C	
C6.3.a. Landscape-scale indicators		
6.3.a.1. The forest owner or manager maintains, enhances, and/or restores under-represented ***successional*** stages in the FMU that would naturally occur on the types of sites found on the FMU. Where old growth of different community types that would naturally occur on the forest are under-represented in the landscape relative to natural conditions, a portion of the forest is managed to enhance and/or restore old growth characteristics.	C	Auditors visited numerous sites where management activities were designed to maintain or restore under-represented forest types or age classes. On an experimental basis, some stands are being managed to accelerate old-growth forest structure. **OBS 2014.3** Observations during the audit made it clear that DNR staff have embraced the "young forest initiative" effort to increase the amount of early seral forest. On the other hand, it was unclear how DNR set landscape level goals for maintaining or recruiting older forest throughout their management area. Currently landscape analysis future age and size class distribution of habitats is done through the

		NR 44 Master Plans. However, not all properties are covered by these plans yet, and areas outside these plans may not receive the same level of attention.
6.3.a.2. When a ***rare ecological community*** is present, modifications are made in both the management plan and its implementation in order to maintain, restore or enhance the viability of the community. Based on the vulnerability of the existing community, ***conservation zones*** and/or ***protected areas*** are established where warranted.	C	If a rare ecological community is present, it is identified in the state's NHI database, at which point the land manager consults with an ecologist in the Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation to develop appropriate management options. More commonly, rare communities are already identified and may be part of an SNA, with a management plan developed to feature a viable community.
6.3.a.3. When they are present, management maintains the area, structure, composition, and processes of all ***Type 1*** and ***Type 2 old growth***. Type 1 and 2 old growth are also protected and buffered as necessary with conservation zones, unless an alternative plan is developed that provides greater overall protection of old growth values. Type 1 Old Growth is protected from harvesting and road construction. Type 1 old growth is also protected from other timber management activities, except as needed to maintain the ecological values associated with the stand, including old growth attributes (e.g., remove exotic species, conduct controlled burning, and thinning from below in dry forest types when and where restoration is appropriate). Type 2 Old Growth is protected from harvesting to the extent necessary to maintain the area, structures, and functions of the stand. Timber harvest in Type 2 old growth must maintain old growth structures, functions, and components including individual trees that function as refugia (see Indicator 6.3.g). On public lands, old growth is protected from harvesting, as well as from other timber management activities, except if needed to maintain the values associated with the stand (e.g., remove exotic species, conduct controlled burning, and thinning from below in forest types when and where restoration is appropriate). On American Indian lands, timber harvest may be permitted in Type 1 and Type 2 old growth in recognition of their sovereignty and unique ownership. Timber harvest is permitted in situations where: 1. Old growth forests comprise a significant portion of the tribal ownership. 2. A history of forest stewardship by the tribe exists. 3. High Conservation Value Forest attributes are maintained. 4. Old-growth structures are maintained. 5. Conservation zones representative of old growth stands are established. 6. Landscape level considerations are addressed. 7. Rare species are protected.	C	DNR is very aware of the importance of identifying and protecting old-growth forests. To that end, systematic reconnaissance of all forest stands on state lands uses three codes to designate different levels of late successional forests: relict forest, old-growth forest, and old forest. The relict forest designation corresponds to FSC Type 1 old growth; these forests are also coded as reserved. DNR also has developed an Old-Growth and Old Forest Handbook to assist in the assessment, classification, and management of old forests. These stands have been removed from harvest, with no activity since the last audit.
6.3.b. To the extent feasible within the size of the ownership, particularly on larger ownerships (generally tens of thousands or more acres), management maintains, enhances, or restores habitat conditions suitable for well-distributed populations of animal species that are characteristic of forest ecosystems within the	C	DNR's forest management goals are ecologically oriented, and management is conducted to maintain ecological habitat conditions that are suited to each site. These decisions are aided by the habitat classification that is done as a component of reconnaissance surveys for each site. Sites visited by auditors routinely had prescriptions that

landscape.		would allow natural regeneration and succession to occur on the site. For example, stands of planted pines on sites better suited for hardwoods are being allowed to succeed to hardwoods by natural regeneration.
6.3.c. Management maintains, enhances and/or restores the plant and wildlife habitat of ***Riparian Management Zones (RMZs)*** to provide: a) habitat for aquatic species that breed in surrounding uplands; b) habitat for predominantly terrestrial species that breed in adjacent ***aquatic habitats***; c) habitat for species that use riparian areas for feeding, cover, and travel; d) habitat for plant species associated with riparian areas; and, e) stream shading and inputs of wood and leaf litter into the adjacent aquatic ecosystem.	C	Revisions to the Wisconsin Best Management Practices took effect in 2011; these specify additional protection for all wetlands, particularly seasonal wetlands, many of which are small but some of which are ecologically significant; foresters and loggers are aware of these provisions and work to implement them. Sale and/or harvest unit boundaries are designed to avoid or buffer wetlands, stream, lakes, and other water bodies. Riparian buffers associated with harvests are shown on maps and marked on the ground. Confirmed by field observations that non-forested wetlands are protected by excluding them from sales where possible, and by buffering them using special colors of paint to indicate "no harvest" or "no equipment," or by not marking any trees for harvest. Field audits confirmed that foresters are knowledgeable of BMP requirements to protect riparian zones.
Stand-scale Indicators 6.3.d Management practices maintain or enhance plant species composition, distribution and frequency of occurrence similar to those that would naturally occur on the site.	C	Management prescriptions for sites visited were consistently written to enhance or maintain current or desired composition of plant species on the site. Selective management techniques such as controlled burning and use of herbicides are commonly employed.
6.3.e. When planting is required, a local source of known provenance is used when available and when the local source is equivalent in terms of quality, price and productivity. The use of non-local sources shall be justified, such as in situations where other management objectives (e.g. disease resistance or adapting to climate change) are best served by non-local sources. ***Native species*** suited to the site are normally selected for regeneration.	C	Planting stock is provided by Wisconsin's two state nurseries (Wi rapids and Boscobel), and seed sources are local.
6.3.f. Management maintains, enhances, or restores habitat components and associated stand structures, in abundance and distribution that could be expected from naturally occurring processes. These components include: a) large live trees, live trees with decay or declining health, ***snags***, and well-distributed coarse down and dead woody material. ***Legacy trees*** where present are not harvested; and b) vertical and horizontal complexity. Trees selected for ***retention*** are generally representative of the dominant species found on the site.	C	DNR personnel employ written silvicultural guidelines for retaining structural diversity in even-aged management systems. Personnel attended training to gain understanding and application of the new green tree retention standards. Based on recent revisions to the wildlife chapter in the Silviculture Manual foresters are marking more leave trees (individual) and painting off more pockets or clumps of leave trees, especially around wetlands. The definition of Legacy trees is working its way into the silviculture handbook. The new provisions, which they are using already, require that legacy trees be described in the 2460 narrative and then indicated in the Wis FIRS database. **OBS 2014.2** was issued**.** When observing even aged harvest units, retention trees left on site were not always representative of the dominant species in the stand, particularly in the case of aspen dominated stands. A common justification was the poor longevity of aspen would mean that the retention trees would be short lived and not survive until the next rotation. However in some wildlife areas, the expectation was that retention trees would likely become snags or downed trees that provide large wood for wildlife habitat. So in certain cases this justification would not be warranted.
6.3.g.1 In the Southeast, Appalachia, Ozark-Ouachita, Mississippi Alluvial Valley, and Pacific Coast Regions, when ***even-aged systems*** are employed, and during salvage harvests, live trees and other native vegetation are retained within the harvest unit as described in Appendix C for the applicable region.	C	DNR foresters routinely retain green trees in a harvest by prescription and by marking wildlife trees. In addition, native vegetation is retained in riparian buffers and in retention islands. The Silviculture Handbook, Section 24-17, has detailed guidelines for retention of trees in managed stands.

In the Lake States Northeast, Rocky Mountain and Southwest Regions, when even-aged silvicultural systems are employed, and during salvage harvests, live trees and other native vegetation are retained within the harvest unit in a proportion and configuration that is consistent with the characteristic natural disturbance regime unless retention at a lower level is necessary for the purposes of restoration or rehabilitation. See Appendix C for additional regional requirements and guidance.		
6.3.g.2 Under very limited situations, the landowner or manager has the option to develop a qualified plan to allow minor departure from the opening size limits described in Indicator 6.3.g.1. A qualified plan: 1. Is developed by qualified experts in ecological and/or related fields (wildlife biology, hydrology, landscape ecology, forestry/silviculture). 2. Is based on the totality of the ***best available information*** including peer-reviewed science regarding natural disturbance regimes for the FMU. 3. Is spatially and temporally explicit and includes maps of proposed openings or areas. 4. Demonstrates that the variations will result in equal or greater benefit to wildlife, water quality, and other values compared to the normal opening size limits, including for sensitive and rare species. 5. Is reviewed by independent experts in wildlife biology, hydrology, and landscape ecology, to confirm the preceding findings.	C	There are no opening-size limits for the Lake States-Central Hardwoods region.
6.3.h. The forest owner or manager assesses the risk of, prioritizes, and, as warranted, develops and implements a strategy to prevent or control ***invasive species***, including: 1. a method to determine the extent of invasive species and the degree of threat to native species and ecosystems; 2. implementation of management practices that minimize the risk of invasive establishment, growth, and spread; 3. eradication or control of established invasive populations when feasible: and, 4. monitoring of control measures and management practices to assess their effectiveness in preventing or controlling invasive species.	C	Auditors consistently observed efforts to limit the introduction and spread of exotic plants. Many contracts specify that logging equipment is cleaned before harvest is initiated. Staff are well-trained in invasive species BMPs. DNR monitors the effectiveness of their control measures and routinely make changes to methodology to control invasive species. Parks are especially active in controlling invasive species. Recon inventories, at least every 10 years, document the nature and extent of invasive species. DNR developed, in response to legislative directives, A Statewide Strategic Plan for Invasive Species. Invasive plants are a widespread problem on state lands, but DNR employees are well trained to identify and respond to the need for management.
6.3.i. In applicable situations, the forest owner or manager identifies and applies site-specific fuels management practices, based on: (1) natural fire regimes, (2) risk of wildfire, (3) potential economic losses, (4) public safety, and (5) applicable laws and regulations.	C	DNR uses prescribed fire in wildlife management work to maintain open habitat characteristics of lowland and upland habitat. Prescribed fires are planned and controlled to meet safety and risk requirements. As of the audit date in 2014, DNR had conducted 26,000 acres of prescribed burns throughout the state. Many DNR personnel are certified fire fighters, and respond to wildfires when necessary.
C6.9. The use of exotic species shall be carefully controlled and actively monitored to avoid adverse ecological impacts.	C	
6.9.a. The use of ***exotic species*** is contingent on the availability of credible scientific data indicating that any such species is non-invasive and its application does not pose a risk to native biodiversity.	C	Only native tree species are planted on DNR state lands, and seed sources are local. Where grasses and other herbaceous vegetation are planted on log landings or openings for wildlife, approved seed mixes are used. Any non-native species in these mixes are known not to be invasive.

6.9.b. If exotic species are used, their provenance and the location of their use are documented, and their ecological effects are actively monitored.	C	None used, so not applicable.
6.9.cThe forest owner or manager shall take timely action to curtail or significantly reduce any adverse impacts resulting from their use of exotic species	C	No examples surfaced during the audit to suggest the need for such actions.
P8 Monitoring shall be conducted -- appropriate to the scale and intensity of forest management -- to assess the condition of the forest, yields of forest products, chain of custody, management activities and their social and environmental impacts. *Applicability Note: On small and medium-sized forests (see Glossary), an informal, qualitative assessment may be appropriate. Formal, quantitative monitoring is required on large forests and/or intensively managed forests.*		
8.2. Forest management should include the research and data collection needed to monitor, at a minimum, the following indicators: a) yield of all forest products harvested, b) growth rates, regeneration, and condition of the forest, c) composition and observed changes in the flora and fauna, d) environmental and social impacts of harvesting and other operations, and e) cost, productivity, and efficiency of forest management.	C	
8.2.a.1. For all commercially harvested products, an inventory system is maintained. The inventory system includes at a minimum: a) species, b) volumes, c) stocking, d) regeneration, and e) stand and forest composition and structure; and f) timber quality.	C	Wisconsin Forest Inventory Reporting System (WisFIRS), Public Lands Handbook chapter 100 The main timber inventory is done through forest compartment reconnaissance (recon). Recon is a stand level assessment used to populate the Wisconsin Forest Inventory Reporting System (WisFIRS). Plots include measurements of species, volume (merchantable log tally and basal area reading), stocking, site index, timber quality, and general forest conditions. Recon is done on an as needed basis depending on several triggers (timber sale establishment, closeout, land acquisition, etc.) but no longer than every 15 years on state land. DNR has also started a Continuous Forest Inventory system on state forests only. Started in 2007, the first 5 year report has been completed, "Wisconsin Continuous forest Inventory Report." The CFI system captures more in-depth information than the recon, but is done on an annual basis for a smaller area.
8.2.a.2. Significant, unanticipated removal or loss or increased vulnerability of forest resources is monitored and recorded. Recorded information shall include date and location of occurrence, description of disturbance, extent and severity of loss, and may be both quantitative and qualitative.	C	Example includes large blowdown in the northwest. Recon should be conducted after large scale loss events to reassess timber volumes. Salvage sites from this blowdown were visited at Crex Meadows during the 2014 audit. Managers reported that the unanticipated large scale event had resulted in above normal timber harvest, but since an area control is used for controlling sustainable harvest levels, other areas were taken out of harvest planning to compensate.
8.2.b The forest owner or manager maintains records of harvested timber and NTFPs (volume and product and/or grade). Records must adequately ensure that the requirements under Criterion 5.6 are met.	C	Post-harvest reports in the WisFIRS system capture records of harvested material.
8.2.c. The forest owner or manager periodically obtains data needed to monitor presence on the FMU of: 1) Rare, threatened and endangered species and/or their ***habitats***; 2) Common and rare plant communities and/or habitat;	C	CFI captures data on plant communities. Invasive species monitoring currently done as part of recon. State Natural areas are monitored through inspection reports.

3) Location, presence and abundance of invasive species; 4) Condition of protected areas, set-asides and buffer zones; 5) High Conservation Value Forests (see Criterion 9.4).		Examples of common species monitoring are the annual bird surveys conducted at Crex Meadows.
8.2.d.1. Monitoring is conducted to ensure that site specific plans and operations are properly implemented, environmental impacts of site disturbing operations are minimized, and that harvest prescriptions and guidelines are effective.	C	Monitoring of this type is done through timber sale administration. The Timber sale handbook details how active timber sales are reviewed and closed out. Individual reports are prepared as part of monitoring visits.
8.2.d.2. A monitoring program is in place to assess the condition and environmental impacts of the forest-road system.	C	Interviews with facilities managers indicate that road monitoring is an ongoing process. DNR recently completed a formal review of roads and parking lots and identified areas for improvement.
8.2.d.3. The landowner or manager monitors relevant socio-economic issues (see Indicator 4.4.a), including the social impacts of harvesting, participation in local economic opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.g), the creation and/or maintenance of quality job opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.b), and local purchasing opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.e).	C	Statewide forest action plan looks into detail of effects of timber on state economy, updated every 5 years, looking at state of forest products industry, salaries of foresters, etc. DNR has daily interaction with state forest products sector.
8.2.d.4. Stakeholder responses to management activities are monitored and recorded as necessary.	C	Stakeholder responses are reviewed on a property level as part of annual management planning process.
8.2.d.5. Where sites of cultural significance exist, the opportunity to jointly monitor sites of cultural significance is offered to tribal representatives (see Principle 3).	C	Opportunities for joint monitoring are provided to local tribes.
8.2.e. The forest owner or manager monitors the costs and revenues of management in order to assess productivity and efficiency.	C	Although financial return is not the primary motivation of the state agency, revenue and costs are tracked and detailed as part of standard financial record keeping.

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

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

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

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

Central Hardwoods:

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

North Woods/Lake States:

- Old growth – (see Glossary) (a)
- Old forests/mixed age stands that include trees >120 years old (a)
- Blocks of contiguous forest, > 500 ac, which host RTEs (b)
- Oak savannas (b)
- Hemlock-dominated forests (b)
- Pine stands of natural origin (b)
- Contiguous blocks, >500 ac, of late successional species, that are managed to create old growth (a)
- Fens, particularly calcareous fens (c)
- Other non-forest communities, e.g., barrens, prairies, distinctive geological land forms, vernal pools (b or c)
- Other sites as defined by GAP analysis, Natural Heritage Inventory, and/or the World Wildlife Fund's Forest Communities of Highest Conservation Concern (b)

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

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

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

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

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

C9.4. Annual monitoring shall be conducted to assess the effectiveness of the measures employed to maintain or enhance the applicable conservation attributes.	C	
9.4.a. The forest owner or manager monitors, or participates in a program to annually monitor, the status of the specific HCV attributes, including the effectiveness of the measures employed for their maintenance or enhancement. The monitoring program is designed and implemented consistent with the requirements of Principle 8.	C	The SNA web site has an inspection report that is filled out whenever significant changes occur on the site/or when a site is visited. Most sites are inspected at least every other year (with the exception of very remote sites that are difficult to access). Although formal monitoring many not occur annually, virtually all SNA sites are visited by DNR personnel or cooperators capable of reporting any significant changes in the attributes of the SNA, e.g., serious invasion of unwanted plants or animal, storm damage, unauthorized site disturbance. Results of several SNA monitoring projects were reviewed (Oxbow Rapids; Squirrel River Pines; Lake Two Pines). However an observation was issued regarding the concern that embedded SNAs may not be monitored with the same level of scrutiny. See **OBS 2014.1**
9.4.b. When monitoring results indicate increasing risk to a specific HCV attribute, the forest owner/manager re-evaluates the measures taken to maintain or enhance that attribute, and adjusts the management measures in an effort to reverse the trend.	C	The inspection report identifies risk to the HCVF attribute (presence of invasives) and appropriate measures are taken to control the risks to the HCFV attributes on the site.

Appendix 6 – Chain of Custody Indicators for FMEs

[x] Chain of Custody indicators were not evaluated during this annual audit.