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

State of Wisconsin

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources

SCS-FM/COC-00070N

101 S. Webster Street
P.O. Box 7921
Madison, WI 53707-7921
Mark Heyde
dnr.wi.gov

CERTIFIED	EXPIRATION
12/31/2013	12/30/2018

DATE OF FIELD AUDIT
22-25 August 2017
DATE OF LAST UPDATE
25 September 2017

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

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	☐ Other (*expansion of scope, Major CAR audit, special audit, etc.*):
Name of Forest Management Enterprise (FME) and abbreviation used in this report:				

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:	Beth Jacqmain	**Auditor role**:	FSC Lead Auditor, ATFS Team Auditor
Qualifications:	Beth Jacqmain is a Certification Forester with SCS Global Services. Jacqmain has MS Forest Biology from Auburn University and a BS Forest Management from Michigan State University. Jacqmain is Society of American Foresters (SAF) Certified Forester (#1467) with 20+ years' experience in the forestry field including private corporate, private consulting, and public land management. Jacqmain is a qualified ANSI RAB accredited ISO 14001 EMS Lead Auditor and is a qualified FSC Lead Auditor for Forest Management/Chain of Custody. Jacqmain has audited and led FSC certification and precertification evaluations, harvest and logging operations evaluations, and has participated in joint SFI and American Tree Farm certifications. Jacqmain is a 9 year member of the Forest Guild and 20 year adjunct-Faculty with Itasca Community College, Natural Resources Department. Jacqmain's experience is in forest management and ecology; the use of silviculture towards meeting strategic and tactical goals; forest timber quality improvement, conifer thinning operations, pine restoration, and fire ecology in conifer dominated systems.		
Auditor Name:	Norman Boatwright	**Auditor role**:	ATFS Lead Auditor; FSC Team Auditor
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:	Ruthann M. Schulte	**Auditor role**:	Lead (Trainee)
Qualifications:	For decades Ruthann has worked on issues related to landscape management, wildlife management, and the long-term stewardship of private forest and ranch lands. Over her career, she has coordinated forest certification programs for private		

	industry. Ruthann holds a B.S. in Biology from Siena Heights College in Adrian, Michigan and a Masters of Biology from the University of Louisville in Louisville, Kentucky. She is an ISO 14001 accredited auditor and has served on internal audit teams for ISO 9001. Ms. Schulte is an auditor for the SCS Forest Management and Chain of Custody programs.

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:	2
D. Total number of person days used in evaluation:	**14**

1.3 Standards Employed

1.3.1. Applicable FSC-Accredited Standards

Title	Version	Date of Finalization
FSC-US Forest Management Standard	V1-0	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).		

1.3.2. SCS Interim FSC Standards

Title	Version	Date of Finalization
SCS COC indicators for FMEs including Trademarks	V6-0	2017
This SCS Interim Standard was developed by modifying SCS' Generic Interim Standard to reflect forest management in the region and by incorporating relevant components of the Draft Regional / National Standard and comments from stakeholders. More than one month prior to the start of the field evaluation, the SCS Draft Interim Standard for the country / region was sent out for comment to stakeholders identified by FSC International, SCS, the forest managers under evaluation, and the National Initiative. A copy of the standard is available at www.scsglobalservices.com/certification-standards-and-program-documents or upon request from SCS Global Services (www.SCSglobalServices.com).		

2 Annual Audit Dates and Activities

2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities

Tuesday Aug 22	
9:45-10:00 Black River State Forest Opening	Opening Meeting: Introductions, client update, review audit scope, audit plan, intro/update to FSC and SCS standards and protocols, review of open CARs/OBS, final site selection or adjustments.
10:00- 12:00 Black River SF site audit	All Auditors,3 sites (2 sales, regen)
Black River SF: All auditors	

BLACK RIVER STATE FOREST Tract 6-17, White Pine, Active.	Active pine group selection. 19 acres. This sale was an experiment to begin converting a two-aged white pine stand to an uneven aged stand using patch cut and shelterwood. Stand age ~80 years, thinned 10 years ago. Harvest to release some 10 year old understory and open up areas for a third class of white pine. Had blowdown event while the plan was open and were able to salvage those trees in a timely manner resulting in good quality timber removal. ATV trail along one edge. Logger interview conducted, Confirmed PPE, contract, harvest map, pre-harvest meetings, safety 1st aid, and spill kit.
BLACK RIVER STATE FOREST Tract 6-15, Red and White Pine, Completed.	Competed pine thinning. 68 acres. Red and white pine thinning to increase tree growth and quality. Harvest completed summer 2015. Third thinning on the stand. Sale had a historic site of an old logging camp -- boundaries were well marked for an EEZ.
Black River SF: Boatwright	
Black River State Forest (BRSF), Active Red Pine Thinning. Tract 6-17, 10 acres	Red pine 3rd thin to release some 10 year old regen and create open areas for a 3rd age class. No issues. Reviewed 2010 Black River State Forest Master Plan.
BRSF, Red pine 2nd thin. Tract 6-15, 68 acres	Good stocking and with minimal damage to residuals. An old logging camp was identified during the marking and was marked out. No issues.
BRSF, Smrekar hike/bike trail	Very nice lodge with water, restrooms and a fire place with 12 miles of trail maintained by DNR.
BRSF, complete timber sale (unscheduled visit)	Part of the Ketchum Creek Pines State Natural Area. Very old natural red/white pine stand with a complete harvest to open areas for regen. Good white pine, white oak and maple regen. No issues.
BRSF, marked timber sale on Tract 9-17, 150 acres	Red/white pine 1st thin and jack pine final harvest. Well marked thinning. Observed a state/federal threatened species – the Massasauga rattlesnake. No issues.
BRSF, Final harvest. Tract 5-16, 65 acres	Oak/red pine stand final harvest leaving red pine group and red pine/oak single tree retention. Good aspen, oak and maple regen with no issues.
BRSF, Jack pine final harvest. Tract 14-17, 43 acres	Not cut jack pine final harvest with red/white pine retention. The goal is promote white pine regen as the site is out of the normal jack pine area. No issues.
Weber Flowage-Jackson County (unscheduled visit)	16 acre lake that's a part of a water system that connects several flowages east of the BRSF.
Monroe County and Other: Schulte	
Monroe County: Meadow Valley Wildlife Area, Tract 6-13, Oak/Jack Pine, Active	Objective of generating high quality game and nongame habitat. 116 acres. Regeneration harvest leaving white oak, scattered red pine and white pine. Leave snags and den trees that are not safety hazard. Natural regeneration. Observed heavy oak undergrowth. Two harvest units – one completed and one active. Land owned by federal government and managed by WI DNR. Meadow Valley is one of three wildlife areas within a work unit that hires a seasonal employee specifically to work on invasives 70-80% under the supervision of a tech.

	Logger interview conducted.
Scattered Forest Lands - Monroe Cty. Tract 3-17, Oak and Jack Pine, Marked	Three different prescriptions in sale: Jack pine clearcut, oak coppice, and oak shelterwood. 44 acres. Objective to thin stands to increase growth and vigor and create general wildlife habitat. Create a diversity of age, structure, and species. As with many properties, forester and wildlife biologist worked together on developing a plan for the property. The wildlife area shares a boundary with Fort McCoy. A previously undocumented old foundation was found on in the sale area and was reported to the archeologist. Who accessed the area and prescribed treatment. Sale boundaries were well marked.
La Crosse River Fishery Area, Tract 3-16, Red Pine, Sale Open	Red pine stands with an area of hardwood. 64 acres. Red pine thinning and hardwood coppice. This is the third thinning for Area 2. Area 1 has not been thinned because of access issues across private land. Forester worked with neighboring landowner to gain access for this sale under mutually favorable conditions -- winter timber harvest after soybean field is harvested. Sale area includes gas line that was taken into consideration.
Jackson and Trempealeau Other State Lands: Jacqmain	
Halls (Stockwell) Creek Fishery Area, Tract 14-1, Red Pine, Completed	Completed pine thinning. 59 acres. Red pine to be thinned, hardwood species in nearby stand was clearcut to regenerate through sprouting. Heterobasidion Root Disease, or HRD, was a concern at site and treated by a Certified Pesticide Applicator. Inspected Stockwell Creek, Class 2 trout stream. Forester worked with Fisheries staff to install “breaker rock” for creek protection. Discussions: Integrated Property Management meetings (IPMM), Halls (Stockwell) Creek Fishery Area Interim forest management plan (2016) examined and discussed.
Beaver Creek Rearing Station Tract 16-1	Set up harvest on 34 acres in 3 blocks. Block examined with primarily oak and some aspen, red maple, basswood, and cherry. Reserves trees maintained. Sold not yet cut. Pheasant stocking in adjacent wildlife management area. Nearby Beaver Creek Rearing station. Nearby stocking pond which fills quota state-wide. Adjacency planning considerations. Discussion: Interim FMPs, IPMM, wildlife land acquisitions strategy.
Rem-Buffalo River Tract 16-2	Red pine and balsam fir planted sites totaling 13 acres including a 2 acre patch cut of oak. Planning Docs reviewed: Buffalo River Fishery Area, Timber Sales Contract, 2400-005. Timber Sale Bid (2400-049), Timber Sale Transaction/Remittance/Invoice (2460-003), 2460 (Tract 6211-2-2016), Prospectus (Terms, Special Conditions, map). Buffalo River Fishery Area Interim Forest Management Plan examined. Also examined North Branch Trempealeau River Fishery Area and Jackson County Pond and Lake Properties Interim FMPs.
Wed August 23	
8:00 – 4:00	

Buffalo and Pepin County Other State Lands: Boatwright	
Big Swamp Wildlife Area, Tract 17-2, Central Hardwoods and Oak 42 acres	Not yet cut. 2 stands: 1) Declining mature oak/maple stand with shelterwood cut with single tree retention, 12 acres. 2) Unevenaged northern hardwood stand improvement cut removing the declining, lower quality and less desirable trees, 30 acres. No issues.
Tiffany WMA (unscheduled)	Viewed the WMA across the Chippewa River from boat landing. Wind damage from straight line winds and Tornado. Due to flooding, haven't been able to get to the site to access damage and began salvage sale.
Tiffany WMA Tract 17-1 23 acres	Not yet cut regeneration harvest/storm salvage in mixed hardwood. Good job marking. Harvest restrictions timing wise for oak wilt, woodland bird nesting. Contract also contains a clause for timing restriction if the Massasauga rattlesnake is federally listed (it is). No issues. Reviewed 2010 Lower Chippewa River Properties Master Plan.
Tiffany WMA (unscheduled)	Not sold tornado salvage along Chippewa River. Well marked with seasonal harvest restrictions. No issues.
Tiffany WMA, Tract 1-16 , Oak, Active	Dropped because vehicle got stuck!
Tiffany WMA, 5 Mile Bluff Lunch	Beautiful 800' bluff overlooking the confluence of the Mississippi and Chippewa Rivers. Oak forest/prairie burned every 2 years. Timber rattle snake nursery area with a large flat rock. Observed 4 large female snakes sunning on rock.
Tiffany WMA, Tract 1-17, Chippewa River Bottomland Hardwoods sold not cut, 23 acres	Regen harvest/storm salvage with take trees marked. Goal is to promote the regen of a mixed bottomland hardwoods stand.
Maiden Rock Bluff SNA, Completed Sale, 77 acres	Much of this tract is former field converted to prairie by the DNR. Stand 1 goal is to convert central hardwood to an oak savanna or native prairie. Review of old aerial photo confirms the area was an oak savanna. The western portion of the SNA has a limestone cliff that faces on a bluff high above the Mississippi River overlooking Lake Pepin. Extending for nearly a mile, the 400-foot high bluff is especially noteworthy for the presence of nesting peregrine falcons, a state-endangered species. The cliff is one of only six bluffs on the Mississippi River where peregrines are successfully nesting on natural substrate. Representative cliff species include red cedar aged at 250 years of age, hairbell, slender lip fern, smooth cliff brake, slender cliff brake, white-flowered leaf-cup, and plains muhly grass. The open cliff and adjacent narrow band of dry prairie provide habitat for several rare plant species including cliff goldenrod (Solidago sciaphila), dragon wormwood (Artemisia dranunculus), and prairie sagebrush (A. frigida). Many dry prairie species are also present including little bluestem, wild bergamot, columbine, leadplant, mountain mint, alumroot, pasque flower and silky aster.

	Stand 2 was an aspen regen cut. Observed successful regen. Documents reviewed included the IPMP for the SNA written prior to harvest, the Site-Specific Management Sheet Tier-3 Resource Management Property Plan written after the harvest and the Timber Sales Contract.
Dunn and St. Croix County Other State Lands: Schulte	
Dunnville Wildlife Area, Tract 2-2016, Bottomland Hardwood, Marked	Low grade bottomland hardwood of variable density. Stand is an island surrounded by wetlands slough. About 60 year old stand with scattered aspen. Remove everything 1" and larger to increase the vigor of the stand. Goal to regenerate a young, dense stand of early/mid successional lowland hardwoods with aspen and birch since most forests of Dunnville are transitioning to later successional species. Winter harvest across frozen wetland. The stand has not been managed because of poor access. Entering now because of an opportunity to "piggy back" with a project on adjoining land.
Dunnville Wildlife Area, Tract 2-2013 (Add On), Hazard Tree Removal From Red Cedar Trail , Harvested	Rob Strand – Forester and Jess Carstens – Property Manager The Red Cedar Trail bisects the Dunnville Wildlife Area. The trail is a well-used converted rail-to-trail that was built in 1978. Maintenance is a difficult issue due to many hazardous and blowdown trees after storms. Took advantage of a harvest in an adjacent area and offered an additional sale to experiment with removing potential hazard trees and blowdown along trail for about 1 mile. The concept was to reduce maintenance needs by removing hazardous trees. This has seemed to be successful as less maintenance has been needed since the harvest.
Dunnville Wildlife Area Tract, 2-2013, Bottomland Hardwood, Harvested	Rob Strand – Forester and Jess Carstens – Property Manager Two units – one older bottomland hardwood stand, one oak stand. Stands had not been managed for 50-60 years. On the hardwood stand, thinning/group selection for stand improvement leave the larger trees and remover the lower quality trees. Followed big tree silviculture guidelines. Natural regeneration. Will return in about 15 years for another thinning depending on stand biological maturity. On the oak savanna area, clearcut with reserves and natural regeneration.
Dunnville Wildlife Area, Prescribed Burn At Dunnville Road South	Jess Carstens – Property Manager Remnant prairie restoration of about 100 acres. Old oak woodlot along edges. Goal was to restore oak savanna and prairie. Historically the oaks along the edge of the prairie were thinned to leave burr oaks to recreate oak savanna. The previously harvested area was mowed in 2016. Prairie has been burned for the past four years. Burn plan reviewed.
Dunnville Wildlife Area, Tract 2-2015, Oak And White Pine, Active	Rob Strand – Forester Primary oak stand is 90-100 years old and black oaks are nearing maturity. 110 acres. Red Cedar Trail and Red Cedar River adjacent to sale so harvest boundaries were intentionally set back from both. A no-cut island was left on top of the highest hill to mitigate

	visual impacts seen from the river and highway 25 west of the river. Thinning/group selection in Area 1 and clearcut regeneration with reserves in Area 2. Scattered large diameter, large crowned white oaks marked as reserve trees. All white pine left including approximate 15 acre patch. Big tree, extended rotation silviculture to retain the oak forest type is the long term goal for the site as well as retain and perpetuate white pine. Natural regen planned for clearcut. Road building needed for sale that will also function for future access. Worked with County Conservation engineer on road/eroded gully issue. Logger interview conducted.
Hoffman Hills State Recreation Area Tract 3-2014, Aspen And Oak, Completed	Aspen and Oak. 20 acres total. Harvest adjacent to trails completed summer of 2015. Aspen regeneration, small oak savanna restoration component, and trail maintenance. Burn plan developed to address thick regeneration. Harvest provided public education opportunities regarding forest management due to its location in recreation area. Project is a good example of collaboration and creative planning to achieve multiple objectives for the property. Property was donated to the State and was developed in the late 1980s.
Bolen Creek Fishery Area, Tract 4-2016, Aspen, Marked.	Bottomland hardwood and aspen acquired in the 1960s. Never harvested. 20 acre. Clearcut harvest for aspen regeneration, overstory removal for swamp hardwood regeneration. Winter only harvest due to need for frozen ground. Observed marked sale boundary around RMZs on Bolen Creek (Brook Trout stream) and small tributary. Natural regen planned.
Cylon Wildlife Area, Tract 1-2017, Red Pine Unit, White Spruce Unit, Open	Two distinct units. One unit of 50 year old not previously harvested red pine. Overstory removal to pre-salvage a declining stand, convert to hardwood type, harvested last year. Retained a few higher quality red pine as well as oak and aspen in the stand. Natural regeneration. The other unit selection thinning on an old white spruce plantation, marked not yet harvested. Land acquired in the 1950s/60s. First intermediate treatment of stand. Goal of species and habitat diversity.
Cyclon State Natural Area	Toured one of four State Natural Areas in the Cyclon Wildlife Area. The stand is a forest community representative of the area. Bottomlands hardwoods with a large white pine component. Prescription is passive management.
Cylon Wildlife Area, Tract 1-2014, Aspen With Some White Pine And Red Pine, Open Partially Harvested	Aspen, 87 acres regeneration harvest. White pine, 10 acres thinning. Red pine (old plantation), 2 acres salvage/conversion cut. Opportunity to regenerate young aspen and early successional forest on a property that has significant acreage of over-mature, declining aspen stands. Natural regen planned. Biomass sale. Cherry regeneration observed in white pine portion.
Eau Claire And Chippewa County Other State Lands: Jacqmain	
Augusta Wildlife Area, Tract 15-1	Oak, aspen, hardwood stands totaling 59 acres in a newly designated Pine Barrens management area. Conversion project involving all stem removal >2” diameter to biomass, to manage

	under prescribed burn to maintain as pine barren ecosystem. Reviewed IFMP (2013). Designed to complement a nearby sedge meadow to create one continuous open habitat. Funding for project from Turkey Stamp Program, farming grants, and pheasant grants. Discussion: prioritization of WL projects under new realignment.
Augusta Wildlife Area Brush Mowing	Brush removal project part of the overall pine barrens management, adjacent to harvest in 15-1. Remnant prairie site has been identified for expansion. Being managed in conjunction with and to be joined with 15-1.
Augusta Wildlife Area Tract 16-1	Red pine improvement thinning in 2 acres. No HRD. Maintaining red pine component in the area. Avian survey done in 2013 prior to new management. 2016 resurvey done in 2016,
Hallie Marsh Wildlife Area	Grassland conversion project, 6 acres. Clearcut to convert to grassland for a variety of wildlife species of interest.
Lake Wissota State Park, Tract 14-2	Red pine plantation, 41 acres, thinning down to 100 sq ft basal area, marked tree cut.
Thursday Aug 24	
La Crosse County Other State Lands And Coulee Experimental State Forest: Boatwright	
Van Loon Wma 1-16 Not Sold	2 stands: 1) red pine 1st thin with haul corridors and 2) bottomland hardwood stand with a stand improvement cut and patch regen cuts. Season harvesting restrictions die to NHI data. No issues.
Mcgilvray Road Bridges (Unscheduled)	County Rd across the Van Loon WMA built in 1930's with 7 bridges. County abandoned road and DNR now maintains it. On the National Historic Register.
Coulee Experimental Forest Tract 3-14	Firewood sale after hardwood harvest with no issues.
Coulee Experimental Forest Tract 2-15 54 Acres, Not Sold	Red Pine 2nd thin on hilltop with good road access. Marked cut trees; good residual sticking and no issues.
Coulee Experimental Forest Tract 1-14 86 Acres, Not Sold	2 stands: 1) red pine 2nd thin with cut trees marked – good residual stocking. Will have an intermittent stream crossing using wooden mats; 2) aspen regen cut with group retention and no issues.
Coulee Experimental Forest Tract 2-16 52 Acres, Sold-Not Cut	Sale is in the Southwest Russian Coulee Woods Native Community Management Area. Unusual prescription with removing low quality and declining trees to allow the stand to convert to an all aged condition. Cut trees marked with good residual stocking. No issues.
Meadow Valley Wildlife Area: Schulte	
Meadow Valley Wildlife Area (MVWA)Tract 2-14, Oak, Completed	Primarily Oak with secondary Jack pine component and pockets of red and white pine. Harvest conducted a year ago. Regen harvest with some thinning. Most red and white pine retained as well as 2-3 mature oak per acre where present. Regen from seed, stump sprouting, and advance regeneration. Goal of early successional habitat for wildlife habitat. High potential for Karner Blue Butterfly (KBB). Survey for KBB and its habitat, significant clumps of lupine, were conducted -- no occurrences were detected.
MVWA, Tract 3-16, White/Red Pine, Marked	The area toured was primarily in an old white and red pine plantation that is not typical of the surrounding old forest natural

Kingston Old Forest Native Community Management Area (SNA)	stand. Harvest will be a very light thin to improve stand quality to continue to enhance the old forest and move area with pine plantation to older successional species. Area includes a primitive camping area open during hunting seasons. Sale will also improve camping opportunities.
MVWA, Tract 5-15, Oak/Aspen, Marked	Oak, Jack Pine, and Red Maple stand primary components. Retention of all White Oak, White Pine, Tamarack, River Birch, and Red Pine. Natural regeneration of Oak, Aspen, and Jack Pine is the primary objective. No known management of this area in the past.
MVWA, Tract MWVA 2920, Red Pine, Completed	Completed Barrens development. This shows the "after" example compared to marked example in the next site. Thick natural oak regeneration present. Potential Barrens development areas are determined based on the soil type (Friendship Sand) on which lupine grows and creates habitat for Karner Blue Butterfly. Surveys are conducted for both lupine and Karner Blue Butterfly in appropriate circumstances. Have found lupine colonizing this post-harvest area.
MVWA, Tract 3-15, Oak/Jack Pine, Marked	Oak/Jack Pine stand marked for Barrens development plan. Prospectus was issued as biomass harvest since prescribed fire is planned for Barrens maintenance. Natural regen planned. Witnessed boundary around cultural site.
MVWA, Tract 2-15, Red Pine , One Unit Completed, One Unit Marked	Harvest completed on thinning of red and white pine unit. Area was planted with pine in 1941 and has been thinned in the past. This is the fourth thinning. Blowdown occurred in this unit between the sale and the harvest. Logger was able to harvest the low quality blowdown timber but had to pulp it. The other unit has not been harvested yet and is an overstory removal of Jack Pine/Black Oak unit that has been growing since 1949. No prior harvest activity in that unit area.
Tomah Office	Review of WisFIRs database
Jacqmain	
Buckhorn Wildlife Area, Tract 15-14	Oak-pine barrens 1st harvest of a seed-tree cut in 2016 for regeneration. Abundant natural, advanced white oak species sprouting in understory. Plans to prescribed burn in 6-7 years to eliminated unwanted ground flora.
Buckhorn Wildlife Area, (unscheduled)	Oak-pine barrens, harvest, fee-con. Older oak-pine barrens harvest. Fee-con brush/debris crusher used to clear site with plans to prescribed burn. Oak regeneration
Buckhorn Wildlife Area, (unscheduled)	Existing oak-pine barrens being maintained with periodic harvest and prescribed burning on 6-8 year intervals. Advanced regeneration present.
Buckhorn State Park, Tract 14-11	2015 harvest white pine, aspen.
Buckhorn State Park, Tract 14-12	Aspen clearcut, harvest completed date
Buckhorn Wildlife Area, Tract 14-13	Jack Pine, set up not yet sold.
Dells of WI River Natural Area, Tract 14-1	White Pine thinning and regeneration harvest, improve forest health, planned not yet sold. Timber sale adjacent to paved town

	road and gated gravel access road, some visual considerations. Winter only harvest to protect Blanchard's Cricket Frog, Slender Glass Lizard. Treating Japanese knotweed.
Friday Aug 25	
8:00 AM – Noon Madison office	Documents and office records audit
Noon – 1:00 PM	Closing Meeting Preparation: Auditor(s) take time to consolidate notes and confirm audit findings
1:00 PM – 2:00 PM	Closing Meeting and Review of Findings: Convene with all relevant staff to summarize audit findings, potential non-conformities and next steps

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

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

☒ Significant changes occurred since the last evaluation that may affect the FME's conformance to FSC standards and policies (*describe*):

Major restructuring has occurred and continues operational implementation 2017-2018. These include the following:

1. Recreation in State Parks and State Forests have been combined under Parks and Recreation management program to manage parks and rec facilities. Will be shifting Fisheries facilities to Parks and Recreation as well.
2. Law enforcement – had 4 diff programs with credentialed staff and now being consolidated into specialized "Conservation Warden Services" across all properties.
3. Prescribed burning – looking to streamline and have certifications. The Forestry Division will manage all prescribed fire on state properties in cooperation with other DNR programs.
4. Property planning is consolidated in the internal services Planning Section.
5. DNR continues to hold high levels of vacancy. The overall vacancy rate for the FWP division is 19%, but with variability across individual programs with Parks having the greatest challenge at about a

45% vacancy rate. This was determined during the course of the audit to be "difficult to audit". See Section 6, Certification Decision. All DNR programs are actively hiring staff to reduce vacancy rates to manageable levels.

6. The Wildlife Management Bureau will lead the management of game species across all state properties and the Natural Heritage Conservation Bureau will lead the management of non-game and threatened and endangered species.

4. Results of the Evaluation

4.1 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations

	Finding Number: 2016.1
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:	6.3.e
Non-Conformity: At the time of the audit, DNR was unable to provide evidence, in the form of documentation and/or expert opinion, that the use of seed sources collected from throughout Wisconsin and portions of Minnesota (for some species) for producing planting stock that is deployed throughout the state meets the FSC requirement, in 6.3.e, that use of non-local sources shall be justified. That is, DNR is not using planting stock of known local provenance. Note: This Non-Conformity was raised at the closing meeting of the 2016 surveillance audit.	
Corrective Action Request: Wisconsin DNR must provide justification based upon evidence and/or expert opinion that seed collected from throughout Wisconsin and portions of Minnesota without geographic differentiation results in planting stock that is sufficiently well adapted across the range of site conditions found on DNR-managed state forests so as to meet the FSC requirement that, where available, local sources of known provenance are utilized.	
FME Response *(including any evidence submitted)*	On 24 August 2016, DNR arranged for and engaged in a teleconference involving DNR's Joe VandeHey and Jeremiah Auer (both engaged in leadership roles at the state nurseries) and the SCS Lead Auditor. DNR Certification Coordinator, Mark Heyde, facilitated the teleconference and listened in but was not an active participant. The purpose of the teleconference was to provide the Lead Auditor with information and expert opinion regarding the Department's seed collection and planting stock propagation procedures at its nurseries. Mr. VandeHey and Mr. Auer provided arguments in support of the DNR's longstanding policy of not differentiating the sub-state regional origin of seed sources. The practice has been validated through ongoing monitoring of young planted stand survival and growth rates and further supported by the fact that genetic variation in red pine found throughout Wisconsin and Minnesota is quite limited.

SCS Review	On the basis of the information conveyed to the Lead Auditor during the teleconference, it is concluded that DNR has adequately justified its longstanding practice of not utilizing regional (sub-state) seed collection zones for the propagation of planting stock at the State Nurseries. The Lead Auditor is satisfied that the Department is deploying native species planting stock well suited to the range of planting sites found on the state forests and that planted stand performance is well within acceptable limits. With this additional information and justification provided on August 24th, the Lead Auditor concludes that closure of this Minor Corrective Action Request in conjunction with issuance of the audit report is warranted. Closed during 2016 audit.
Status of CAR:	☒ Closed ☐ Upgraded to Major ☐ Other decision (refer to description above)

	Finding Number: 2016.2
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): No deadline for Observations
FSC Indicator:	6.3.h
Issue: Invasive non-native plant species, such as the spotted knapweed (*Centaurea stoebe)*, are commonly present and generally expanding in their presence throughout the Wisconsin state forest system.	
Observation: While the task of limiting their continuing spread, let alone eliminating their presence, is a challenging one, there remain opportunities for DNR field personnel and managers to place greater emphasis on and effort at monitoring and limiting the ongoing spread of invasive non-native plant species across the state forests.	

FME Response *(including any evidence submitted)*	Spotted knapweed is one of many species that are widespread and abundant in many parts of WI. Mowing doesn't control it, and there will never be enough funds to control it state-wide with herbicides. Fortunately, it is one species for which there are effective biological controls already in place. DNR and DOT have partnered with Wade Oehmichen, a former WDNR Wildlife Biologist, to release biocontrol agents on state lands where they are needed. Oehmichen has released agents for over 10 years and tracks their distribution. Monies from Wisconsin's allocation of PR funds (see below) will be used for the next 3 years to increase the amount of state acreage where the insects are released. General responses to the observation on invasives: Administrative Rule and BMPs Wisconsin Administrative Rule NR 40 is how invasive species are regulated across the state, including within state forests, wildlife management areas, and SNAs. Concurrent with the development of NR 40, staff worked extensively with many stakeholder groups to create reasonable voluntary Best Management Practices (BMPs) for Minimizing the Spread of Terrestrial Invasive Species. This resulted in 4 separate sets of BMPs for 1) Forestry, 2) Rights-of-way, 3) Urban forests and the built environment, and 4) Outdoor recreation. This last one included BMPs specifically for land managers of recreation land, which includes almost all DNR lands. Soon thereafter, the forestry BMPs were made mandatory on all state lands, for DNR staff and contractors. DNR foresters, loggers, consulting foresters and others in the industry have undergone extensive training on invasive plant identification, control and prevention BMPs. Forestry Division invasives specialists are currently finalizing online BMP training modules that will be used for Forest Industry Safety & Training Alliance (FISTA) training. These BMPs have been used as a model for BMP development by many other states. In addition, WI DNR has developed similar BMPs for aquatic invasives, wetlands, forest pests and jumping worms. Handouts on BMPs for specific audiences are also available. WDNR Strategic Plan for Invasive Species Wisconsin has a state-wide invasive species strategy that lays out a vision for management of invasive species across the state, as well as the prevention of new invasive species entering the state: http://invasivespecies.wi.gov/initatives/strategic-plan/ WDNR Department Invasive Species Team The Department Invasive Species Team (DIST) is working with other teams to work towards more integrated invasives inventory, mapping, control, pesticide use reporting, monitoring and restoration work: Inventory/Mapping/Pesticide Use Reporting: -The Pesticide Use Team and the Pittman-Robertson (PR) Bump Invasives Team will be working with Wildlife Management to get terrestrial and wetland invasive plant mapping and pesticide use reporting incorporated into the Land Management System. We have some limited funding from PR to work on this.

	-WDNR now has an "invasive species occurrence archive", developed by Jason Granberg. This archive gathers all online and reported invasive species records with location info and puts them all into one comprehensive GIS database. The archive can be viewed by anyone with Arc software or Google Earth. We can share invasives data with property managers specific to their regions. We regularly encourage property managers to submit their invasive plant records, but many have them on paper or in formats that would take time to transfer to a format we can use. At this point there is not one state-wide mapping system that managers use or have access to enter data into. -Property managers know that it would be good to inventory and map the invasives on their properties, to record all management work, and follow up with monitoring. However, we do not have the funds nor staff time to do this, so it is currently done only as needed for specific projects that have attached funding, or as individual staffers find extra time. Control/Monitoring/Restoration: -For the first time, PR funds are being made available for invasives work on state lands. A team developed, and the administration approved a proposal that will disperse $1,300,000 over 3 years to a range of projects, including prescribed fire, herbicide control, biological control and other categories. Along with the other PR bump fund teams, a set of criteria will be developed for the distribution of these funds for approval by the administration. Mapping, monitoring and reporting of invasives will be important requirements for field staff receiving funding. -DIST will begin work on developing a comprehensive plan to determine priorities for invasive species work on state lands. We have tools developed already through the Invasive Species Archive for identifying priority areas for management and priority species to work on. In addition, the UW Madison has developed a program to identify probable areas for the future range expansion of high priority invasive species. These tools will help to determine how to best disperse the PR invasives funds, but also to help field staff identify what projects should be priorities and which efforts may have to be dropped. Invasives work specific to the State Forest System Since 2005, the WDNR northern forest ecologist (NFE) has been responsible for inventory, control, and monitoring of terrestrial invasives on the 4 Northern Region (NOR) state forests, and also for work with NHC District Ecologists on SNAs embedded in NOR State Forests. -Inventory: In 2005/06 the Forestry Division contracted a very large survey of invasives in the State Forests (SF) (both NOR and in the south), including areas in SNAs embedded within SFs. The GIS mapping layer and invasive report are found on the Forestry website/state forest. Since then the NFE has set up focused inventory efforts that pertain to recreation or high use areas, proposed timber sales, and other ground disturbing activities.

	- Monitoring: The NFE has done some brief monitoring efforts such as updates to the GIS mapping layer (inventory, control treatment and new occurrences). The NFE has also set up some monitoring plots to assess invasive control treatments (manual, herbicide). For example the Forestry Division is coordinating an effort to assess buckthorn treatment on the Governor Knowles SF, including mechanical treatment, herbicide application, and goats. -Control: The NFE also coordinates terrestrial invasive control work: both internal staff effort and contracting. On SNAs embedded within SFs, the NFE coordinates this with the NHC District ecologists (for example, organizing inventory and control work for honeysuckle in the Johnson Lake Barrens and Springs SNA in the Northern Highland American Legion State Forest). - Restoration: The NFE has put limited time towards considering restoration efforts after control. Some effort has been put into soil stabilization (seeding) after control efforts. Most of this work is done in collaboration with the District Ecologists. -Funding: Most of the funding comes from SF funds that the SF working group has decided to set aside for this effort. Any inventory and control effort near or in a proposed timber sale area are funded by the SF regeneration funds, which are applied for annually per project. For funding invasives work on SNAs, the NFE usually coordinates with the regional ecologist to focus efforts and fund projects where needed. Monitoring and control of invasive species on stand-alone SNAs: Invasive species are monitored by NHC District Ecologists (DEs) on the SNAs in their regions primarily through: -conducting SNA site inspections -visiting SNAs for management activities. This is especially relevant on disturbance-dependent communities in southern, central, and western Wisconsin, where many SNAs are visited and managed on an annual basis. DEs note the presence of invasives, often mapping them on aerial photos, and then use management techniques to control or eliminate them.
SCS Review	SCS confirmed referenced documents; interviews with staff confirmed increased sharing of existing projects, knowledge, and projects; observations in the field (treatments for Japanese knotweed, interviews and Agenda documents confirmed associated training.
Status of OBS:	☒ Closed ☐ Upgraded to Major ☐ *Other decision (refer to description above)*

	Finding Number: 2016.3
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): No deadline for Observations
FSC Indicator:	7.2.a
Issue: Indicator 7.2.a requires that management plans are kept up to date, as guided by ongoing review. At a minimum, full revision of the management plans should take place every 10 years. Master Plans for numerous DNR-managed state lands units are many years out of date, however most such out of date Master Plans have been augmented by relatively brief interim plan documents. While DNR clearly understands the importance of maintaining currency and relevancy of its property management plans, there remain ample opportunities to demonstrate greater conformity to this Indicator through greater allocation of resources to the plan revision and/or update process.	
Observation: Master Plans for numerous DNR-managed state lands units are many years out of date, although most such out of date Master Plans have been augmented by relatively brief interim plan documents. While DNR clearly understands the importance of maintaining currency and relevancy of its property management plans, there remain ample opportunities for demonstrating greater conformity to this Indicator through additional allocation of resources to the plan revision and/or update process. Replacing/revising unit master plans that are well beyond their intended lifespan should be a higher priority for the DNR.	

FME Response *(including any evidence submitted)*

Master Planning Accomplishments – FY17

August NRB - Lower WI State Riverway (2 properties)
December NRB – Sauk Prairie State Recreation Area
Powell Marsh Wildlife Area
January NRB - Horicon-Shaw Planning Group (3 properties)
NW Barrens Properties (3 properties)
Blue Mound State Park Master Plan Amendment
June NRB - Menominee River State Park and Recreation Area
Tier 3 Management Plans for 12 State Natural Areas
Approval of department's recommendation to conduct regional master planning:

June2017_NRB
Master planning lands

Master Planning Metrics - July 2017

% of acres under an NRB-approved master plan per NR44 requirements

Fiscal Year	Acres w/ NR44 approved plan	% under approved NR44 MP	Target % under approved MP
13	645,815	45.9	
14	663,027	47.1	
15	672,893	47.8	50
16	754,306	53.6	55
17	865,929	61.6	60
18	*914381*		65
19	*984718*		70
20	*1055055*		75
21	*1125392*		80
22	*1195729*		85
23	*1266066*		90
24	*1336403*		95
25	*1406740*		100

based on 1,406,740 acres of Tier 1 and 2 properties

FY 2017 Approved Interim Forestry Management Plans		
Property Name	**County**	**Acreage**
1. Fenley State Recreation Area	Grant	287
2. Tamarack Creek Wildlife Area	Trempealeau	577
3. North Branch Trempealeau River Fisheries Area	Jackson	177
4. Van Loon Wildlife Area	Lacrosse and Trempealeau	3,918
5. Buffalo River Fisheries Area	Jackson and Trempealeau	1,247
6. Small scattered Dodge County properties	Dodge	2,941
7. Small scattered Jefferson County properties	Jefferson	429
8. Lost Creek Bog SNA	Bayfield	729
9.Dunbar Barrens SNA	Marinette	1,409
10. Paul J Olson Wildlife Area	Portage and Wood	3,432
11.Rush Creek SNA	Crawford	2,638
12. Upper Neenah Creek Fisheries Area	Adams	361
13. Adams Co Remnant Fisheries Areas	Adams	376
14. Buena Vista Wildlife Area	Portage	13,552
15. Leola Marsh Wildlife Area	Adams	1,875
16. Dunn Co Scattered parcels	Dunn	6,146
17. Nelson-Dewey State Park	Grant	743
18. Belmont Mound State Park	Lafayette	274
19. Kroenke Lake SNA	Shawano	150
FY 2017 Total	**Statewide**	**41,261 acres**

Total overall statewide acreage coverage for IFMPs is 511,794 acres (as of 7/28/17)

SCS Review

FY 2017 Approved Interim Forestry Management Plans

Property Name	County	Acreage
1. Fenley State Recreation Area	Grant	287
2. Tamarack Creek Wildlife Area	Trempealeau	577
3. North Branch Trempealeau River Fisheries Area	Jackson	177
4. Van Loon Wildlife Area	Lacrosse and Trempealeau	3,918
5. Buffalo River Fisheries Area	Jackson and Trempealeau	1,247
6. Small scattered Dodge County properties	Dodge	2,941
7. Small scattered Jefferson County properties	Jefferson	429
8. Lost Creek Bog SNA	Bayfield	729
9.Dunbar Barrens SNA	Marinette	1,409
10. Paul J Olson Wildlife Area	Portage and Wood	3,432
11.Rush Creek SNA	Crawford	2,638
12. Upper Neenah Creek Fisheries Area	Adams	361
13. Adams Co Remnant Fisheries Areas	Adams	376
14. Buena Vista Wildlife Area	Portage	13,552
15. Leola Marsh Wildlife Area	Adams	1,875
16. Dunn Co Scattered parcels	Dunn	6,146
17. Nelson-Dewey State Park	Grant	743
18. Belmont Mound State Park	Lafayette	274
19. Kroenke Lake SNA	Shawano	150
FY 2017 Total	**Statewide**	**41,261 acres**

Total overall statewide acreage coverage for IFMPs is 511,794 acres (as of 7/28/17)

Status of OBS:	Based on the Master Planning and Interim Forest Management Planning data above, the department is on track with its schedule to update or create all NR44 master plans for Tier 1 & 2 properties by 2025, the target set by the Natural Resources Board. However the NRB recently approved a new strategy to address master planning by grouping properties by ecological landscape (16-17 ELs state-wide). The first pilot landscape planning project is underway and it is hoped that planning efficiencies will be gained through this planning model while maintaining conformance to forest certification standards. Regarding IFMPs the total acreage has declined as IFMPs are replaced by master plans. Target was 60% now at 61% complete. Interim Plans completed for 19 properties.
SCS review	SCS reviewed the above information. Interviews with staff in the field confirm that the objectives and Tiered approach to completing Master Plans is well understood. Interviews with planning staff provided additional information that 3 (1 GIS and 2 planners) new hires are underway in support of developing improvements to the overall planning process and delivery. DNR is on track meeting current targets and demonstrated capacity to continue to meet targets.
Status of CAR:	☒ Closed ☐ Upgraded to Major ☐ Other decision (refer to description above)

4.2 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations

	Finding Number: 2017.1
Select one: ☐ **Major CAR** ☒ **Minor CAR** ☐ **Observation**	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	☐ Pre-condition to certification/recertification ☐ 3 months from Issuance of Final Report ☒ 12 months or next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) ☐ Observation – response is optional ☐ Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	US-FM 6.7.a
Non-Conformity *(or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations)*: A logging job inspected during the audit did not have a hazardous spill kit on site (Dunneville Wildlife Area, 2-2-2015).	
Corrective Action Request *(or Observation)*: The FME shall ensure employees and contractors, have the equipment and training necessary to respond to hazardous spills. This may include but is not limited to: spill kits, plans, and knowledge of qualified personnel to call on in an event of a hazardous spill.	
FME response *(including any evidence submitted)*	
SCS review	

Status of CAR:	☐ Closed ☐ Upgraded to Major ☐ *Other decision (refer to description above)*

	Finding Number: 2017.2
Select one: ☐ **Major CAR** ☒ **Minor CAR** ☐ **Observation**	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	☐ Pre-condition to certification/recertification ☐ 3 months from Issuance of Final Report ☒ 12 months or next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) ☐ Observation – response is optional ☐ Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 1.11 and 1.16
Non-Conformity *(or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations)*: The audit team identified uses of the trademark in the prospectus for two State Forests and in a public handbook that were not approved by the CB. Noted that this was identified during internal audit by the WI DNR and has already taken action towards correction of this issue justifying grading of this CAR as Minor.	
Corrective Action Request *(or Observation)*: The FMU shall request approval for use of the trademarks.	
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

FISTA	Contractors
ENGO	

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: FSC requires reporting those situations encountered that are challenging or difficult to audit. The overall vacancy rate for the FWP division is 19%, but with variability across individual programs and Parks having the greatest challenge at about 45% vacancy rate. It is also important to note that some of Parks vacancy rates are directly related to restructuring and job reclassifications. This situation was evaluated during the course of the audit as "difficult to audit". In response to this significant restructuring and alignment of staff, the DNR is actively adjusting and experiencing a general	

consolidation and movement of current staff on a preferential basis for recently created or open vacant positions while actively recruiting new employees. Auditors determined that conformity is being maintained with the FSC Standard. However, auditors will monitor and review vacancy rates again in 2018.

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 Sales contact information same as above.*			
FSC salesperson	Sabina Dhungana, WDNR, Forest Products Services		
Address	101 S. Webster Street P.O. Box 7921 Madison, WI 53707-7921	**Telephone**	608-261-0754
		Fax	608-266-8576
		e-mail	Sabina.Dhungana@wisconsin.gov
		Website	dnr.wi.gov

Scope of Certificate

Certificate Type	☒ Single FMU	☐ Multiple FMU	☐ Group	
Forest zone	☐ Boreal	☒ Temperate	☐ Subtropical	☐ Tropical
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is:			**Units:** ☐ **ha or** ☐ **ac**	
privately managed				
state managed	1,551,210			
community managed				
Number of FMUs in scope that are:				
less than 100 ha in area		100 - 1000 ha in area		
1000 - 10 000 ha in area		more than 10 000 ha in area	1	
Division of FMUs into manageable units:				
Individual management units are identified by property name and responsible bureau.				

Production Forests

Timber Forest Products	**Units: ☐ ha or ☒ ac**
Total area of production forest (i.e. forest from which timber may be harvested)	746,006
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	92,154
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by natural regeneration, or by a combination of natural regeneration and coppicing of the naturally regenerated stems	653,852
Silvicultural system(s)	**Area under type of management**
Even-aged management	
Clearcut (clearcut size range) (A, 1/3 PJ, OX)	311,282
Shelterwood (PW and O)	201,356
Other:	233,368
Uneven-aged management	
Individual tree selection (NH)	102,012
Group selection (BH, SH, CH)	128,563
Other:	
☐ Other (e.g. nursery, recreation area, windbreak, bamboo, silvo-pastoral system, agro-forestry system, etc.)	
The sustainable rate of harvest (usually Annual Allowable Harvest or AAH where available) of commercial timber (m3 of round wood) All forest types (area control) -Rpt. 303 Planning year 2016	20,699
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	
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* and 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)	All species
W1 Rough wood	Fuel wood	All species
W3 Wood in chips	Wood chips	All species
Non-Timber Forest Products		
Product Level 1	**Product Level 2**	**Product Level 3 and Species**

Conservation Areas

Total area of forest and non-forest land protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for conservation objectives:	238,602 acres Note: The acres above may or may not equal HCV acres below.

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 Forest; Red Clay Wetlands Glaciated Southeast Wisconsin Prairies, Fens, Savannas Niagara Escarpment: Niagara Escarpment	20,475

		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; Biologically 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; 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	114,588

		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 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;	192,071

		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'			327,910

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 37,798 total acres) are excluded from the scope of forest certification: • Agricultural fields subject to share-crop agreements (approximately 20,600 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, Granite Peak Ski Area • Cooperatively managed state trails where the responsibility and authority for planning and management have been given to partners, primarily counties (7,321 acres) Additionally, lands leased or eased from other owners who have retained vegetative management authority are also excluded (i.e. Forest Legacy conservation easements, stream access easements, etc). *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):	Certified areas are well defined so that any timber sold from uncertified lands is not mixed. Certified and uncertified material is sold as part of separate timber sales.

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):		
643 (289 Permanent) of male workers	193 (87 Permanent) of female workers	
Number of accidents in forest work since last audit:	**Serious:** 0	**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 spreadsheets	 state lands 2016 pesticideSearchResult			
	 Aquatic_State_lands _Certified_2017_revi			

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

Appendix 2 – List of Stakeholders Consulted

List of FME Staff Consulted

WI DNR staff Directory located here, http://dnr.wi.gov/staffdir/_newsearch/contactsearchext.aspx allows search by last name for FME staff listed below.

Name	Title	Consultation method
Peter Bakken	Black River State Forest Property Manager	Open, Field, Close
Heather Berklund	Forestry Division Deputy Administrator for Operations	Open, Field, Close
Diane Brusoe	Planning Section Chief	Open
Aaron Buchholz	FWP Deputy Administrator	Open, Field, Close
Mary Ann Buenzow	Southern District Forestry Leader	Open, Field, Close
Jess Carstens	Wildlife Management Area Supervisor and Dunnville WA Property Manager	Field
Mark Chryst	Forester	Open, Field, Close
Sean Davison	Property Manager, Forester	Open, Field, Close
Pete Duerkop	Conservation Biologist/Researcher	Open, Field, Close
Tom Duke	Northwest District Forestry Leader	Open, Field
Greg Edge	Silviculturist/Ecologist	Field
Nate Fayram	Conservation Biologist	Open
Clint Gilman	Forester	Field
Sarah Gollnick	Forestry Technician	Open
Ryan Haffele	Property Manager	Field
Wayne Hall Jr.	Wildlife Biologist	Field
Mark Heyde	Sustainable Forestry Certification Coordinator	Open, Field, Close
Dave Hladilek	NR Property Supervisor	Field
Andrew Haffele	NR Property Supervisor	Field
Gavin Hutchinson	Forestry Technician	Open, Field
Brad Hutnik	Silviculturist/Ecologist	Open, Field
Anna Jahns	Wildlife Technician	Field
Eric Kramer	Fish Technician	Field
Calvin Kunkle	Park Ranger	Field
Tim Lizotte	Wildlife Biologist	Open, Field

Ron Lichtie	Wildlife Biologist	Field
Darren Ludwig	Forester	
Trent Marty	Forestry Field Operations Bureau Director	Open
Megan Mickelson	Forester	Open, Field
Greg Mitchell	Area Forestry Leader	Field
Kirk Olson	Fisheries Biologist	Field
Neal Paisley	Forester	Open, Field, Close
Teague Prichard	State Forest Specialist	Open, Field,
Jon Robaidek	Conservation Biologist	Open
Steve Rodenkirsch	Conservation Biologist	Open
Scott Roepke	Wildlife Biologist	Open, Field, Close
Kevin Schilling	Forester	Field
Barbara Scott	Fisheries Technician	Field
Chris Semann	Forestry Technician	Open, Field,
Fred Souba	Division of Forestry Administrator/Chief State Forester	Open, Close
Andy Sorenson	Area Forestry Leader	Open, Field, Close
Rob Strand	Forester	Field
Travis Verdegan	Area Forestry Staff Specialist	Open, Field
Joe Wyss	Forestry Technician	Open, Field, Close
Eric Zenz	Forestry Team Leader	Open, Field
Paul Zajackowski	District Park Supervisor	Open, Field

List of other Stakeholders Consulted

Name	Organization	Contact Information	Consultation method	Requests Cert. Notf.
Clayton Eggebrecht	Delaney Forest Products	(608) 378-3022	Field interview	N
Mike Mason	Mason Forest Products	Rt. 1, Box 205 Stanley, WI 54768	Field interview	N
Jenny Baker	FISTA	jennie.baker@fistausa.org	email	N
Representative	The Nature Conservancy	Contact information on file	Email	N

Appendix 3 – Additional Audit Techniques Employed

[X] None.

[ ] Additional techniques employed (*describe*):

Appendix 4 – Pesticide Derogations

[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

Criteria required by FSC at every surveillance audit (*check all situations that apply*)	☐ NA – all FMUs are exempt from these requirements. ☐ Plantations > 10,000 ha (24,710 ac): 2.3, 4.2, 4.4, 6.7, 6.9, 10.6, 10.7, and 10.8 ☐ Natural forests > 50,000 ha (123,553 ac) ('low intensity' SLIMFs exempt): 1.5, 2.3, 3.2, 4.2, 4.4, 5.6, 6.2, 6.3, 8.2, and 9.4 ☒ FMUs containing High Conservation Values ('small forest' SLIMFs exempt): 6.2, 6.3, 6.9 and 9.4
Documents and records reviewed for FMUs/ sites sampled	☒ All applicable documents and records as required in section 7 of audit plan were reviewed; or ☐ The following documents and records as required in section 7 of the audit plan were NOT reviewed (*provide explanation*):

Evaluation Year	FSC P&C Reviewed
2014	1.5, 2.3, P3, P4, 5.6, 6.2, 6.3, 6.9, 8.2, and 9.4
2015	P1, P2, P5, 6.2, 6.3, 6.9, 8.2, and 9.4
2016	1.5, 2.3, 3.2, 4.2, 4.4, 5.6, P6, 8.2, P9
2017	1.5, 2.3, 3.2, 4.2, 4.4, 5.6, 6.2, 6.3, 6.9, P7, P8, 9.4
2018	Full evaluation (recertification)

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

FSC Forest Management Standard (v1.0)—United States

REQUIREMENT	C/ NC	COMMENT/CAR
Principle #1: Compliance with Laws and FSC Principles **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.**		

1.5. Forest management areas should be protected from illegal harvesting, settlement and other unauthorized activities.		
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	DNR tracks illegal activities that have been detected on the property. As a state agency WDNR has its own law enforcement staff and actively takes measures to prevent illegal and unauthorized activities on the FMU through a variety of mechanisms, depending on the activity, resource, local circumstances, and conditions. DNR maintains a suite of timber harvesting, fishing, hunting, and other recreational and use licenses, permits, rules and regulations to manage access and activities on state lands.
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	DNR routinely takes actions designed to enforce all rules and regulations that apply to access and use of state lands and resources. In addition, DNR maintains data on complaints, warnings, eviction, and arrests.
Principle #2: Long-term tenure and use rights to the land and forest resources shall be clearly defined, documented and legally established.		
2.3. 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.		
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 since the last audit as reported by the DNR Division of Forestry Attorney in 2017. 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 since the last audit as reported by the DNR Division of Forestry Attorney in 2017.

		Should such disputes arise they are to be handled through the State Natural Resources Board.
Princple #3: The legal and customary rights of indigenous peoples to own, use and manage their lands, territories, and resources shall be recognized and respected.		
3.2. Forest management shall not threaten or diminish, either directly or indirectly, the resources or tenure rights of indigenous peoples.		
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	DNR reports that no management activities have affected any resources or tenure rights of indigenous peoples. Annual Operation meetings and the Master Planning Process along with the Department's consultation policy, allow for input from Native American bands and tribes on all aspects of state forest management. Additionally, the six federally recognized Chippewa Bands in Wisconsin are currently engaged in the fourth year of a six year pilot study for a self-reporting system for non-timber forest products on state lands in the ceded territory (roughly the northern 1/3 of Wisconsin). This pilot is going well and is being considered for extension. Consultation is undertaken at several levels. DNR has a statewide tribal liaison to interact with tribes at a government to government level. All harvests are screened through the state archeological office, which provides protection measures based on the type of resource to be protected – usually buffering out of sites. Location of the exact areas is kept confidential from DNR staff and contractors. Examples of protection viewed during this audit were a variety of archeological sites protected during harvesting.
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	The Integrated Property Management Meetings and the Master Planning Process along with the Department's consultation policy, allow for input from Native American bands and tribes on all aspects of state forest management. Additionally, the six federally recognized Chippewa Bands in Wisconsin are currently engaged in the fourth year of a six year pilot study for a self-reporting system for non-timber forest products on state lands in the ceded territory (roughly the northern 1/3 of Wisconsin). This pilot is going well and is being considered for extension. Known archeological and cultural sites are protected.
Principle #4: Forest management operations shall maintain or enhance the long-term social and economic well-being of forest workers and local communities.		

4.2. 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. A list of applicable laws and regulations is maintained in the Division of Forestry's Forest Management Guidelines publication, Appendix D. The DNR tracks claims made by staff from Endangered Resources, Facilities & Lands, Fisheries Management & Habit Protection, Forestry, Nursery, Parks & Recreation, and Wildlife Management. Within this is tracked whether claims resulted from incidents on or outside of DNR lands. There were 110 claims reported in the 2017 Annual Audit Info Summary.
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	The Department has a Safety Coordinator. Interviews with foresters in the field confirmed that general safety training (first aid, travel safety, vehicle safety) is conducted while on boarding new hires. Additionally, job specific safety training is available on an individual basis. Training is tracked in DNR system. Safety messages are sent employees periodically. Contracts 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	During the audit an example came up where DNR rebid a contract that was rescinded from a logger because of performance issues emphasizing DNRs commitment to this indicator. Interviews with two of the logging contractors during the audit underscored safety protocols and training courses. Loggers recited safety related training through their companies required by either DNR and/or the company and an emphasis on a safe work environment. One interviewee described occasional crew safety meetings on the landings. Loggers are required to undergo FISTA training, focusing on safety and logging techniques by DNR requirements.
4.4. 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	DNR research scientists currently have projects active for the socioeconomic implications of: 1. Ironwood Survey: Wisconsin DNR Forestry recently conducted a survey of forestry professionals across the state in order to better understand the level of impact of competition from ironwood (Ostrya virginiana) on DNR forests, where it is a problem, and potential methods that have been used to successfully control ironwood. This information is being used to design a research project or silvicultural trial with the goal of providing guidance on the most successful and cost effective methods for controlling ironwood where it is a problem. 2. Logger Survey: A longitudinal survey conducted every 5 years. This year the survey included questions about knowledge and attitudes regarding Good Neighbor Authority and their behaviors regarding harvesting in forests with HRD or Oak wilt. 3. Survey of foresters, wildlife biologists and land managers regarding the rotation ages they are using for aspen, red pine and oak. Survey was used to inform an ad hoc team looking at rotation ages for the silviculture handbook. 4. Forest Regeneration Metric-Ad hoc team looking at forest regeneration wanted to know how regen data can answer questions about deer browse and developed a forest regen metric (FRM) to look at browse impacts using height classes, development and browse severity index. 5. Growing Stock Classification-survey of foresters asking about standard order of removal (OOR) and what they thought was valuable, what they thought needed to be improved and what factors should be considered when evaluating tree risk. This survey helped shape a new growing stock classification system that combines risk, vigor and quality into tiered decision tree 6. Ephemeral Pond Study- Examines the habitat value of ephemeral ponds and the short and long-term impact of harvest on these systems in order to provide better advice to foresters in the field. 7. Silviculture Trials- Silviculture staff maintains and coordinate a statewide directory of silviculture trials. Trials explore new silvicultural approaches for forest cover types. Once trials are documented, the results and recommendations are shared with other forestry professionals. See http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/wildlifehabitat/research/forestry.html for details.

		DNR's Park and Recreation Bureau completed the process to revise the State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP); see http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/Lands/scorp/ for details. The Department is piloting a landscape based Recreation Opportunities Area process to inform recreation issues for state lands master planning. DNR has a staff sociologist 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. The Ecological Landscapes Handbook and the Statewide Forest Assessment include discussions of socioeconomics. Individual master plans include discussion of social impacts as part of a regional property analysis. Examples of interaction with stakeholders during this audit include a timber sale in Mecan River Fishery Area. Public interest in the sale has been high due to the proximity to the Mecan Springs, and relatively long period of time since previous harvesting in this area. DNR has held public meetings and done outreach to interested parties. Original planned harvest area was 300 acres, now closer to 100 based on different considerations taken into account as part of planning.
4.4.b The forest owner or manager seeks and considers input in management planning from people who would likely be affected by management activities.	C	Logger Survey: A longitudinal survey conducted every 5 years. This year the survey included questions about knowledge and attitudes regarding Good Neighbor Authority and their behaviors regarding harvesting in forests with HRD or Oak wilt. Survey of foresters, wildlife biologists and land managers regarding the rotation ages they are using for aspen, red pine and oak. Survey was used to inform an ad hoc team looking at rotation ages for the silviculture handbook. DNR's Park and Recreation Bureau completed the process to revise the State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP); see http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/Lands/scorp/ for details. The Department is piloting a landscape based Recreation Opportunities Area process to inform recreation issues for state lands master planning. Input from the public is a standard part of management planning. All planning documents are posted online. In cases of higher interest, public meetings are held to discuss individual plans.

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. Interviews with foresters in 2017 confirmed routine and consistent communication with neighbors preceding any management activity. Examples were provided for forestry, WMA, and Fisheries lands. 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. Records of stakeholder complaints and their resolution are maintained by the individual property managers.
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 and properties. A report of the Integrated Program Management Meeting is made available to the public well in advance of forest activities. 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.
Principle #5: 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.		
5.6. The rate of harvest of forest products shall not exceed levels which can be permanently sustained.		
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	C	2017 AAIS: The annual allowable harvest rate is adjusted each fiscal year based primarily on resource needs, master planning status, staff resources, and other factors. The Forestry Division Leadership team (FLT) is briefed and sets harvest targets to meet the legislative intent of Act 166.

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.		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.		The 15-year projected AAH in 2016 was 24,610, which includes the smoothed backlog of harvesting due, in part, to the addition of "other" state lands into the universe of managed lands. DNR will on average have 18,000 acres per year of established sales.
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 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	C	The DNR does not make any claims for NTFP products.

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.		
Principle #6: 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.		
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.		
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	2017: 1) Following changes to streamline the DNR's Master Planning process, biotic inventories are being conducted by Ecological Landscapes (EL). In FY17, priority ELs included finishing work in the Northern Lake Michigan Coastal EL and initiating inventory in the Central Sand Plains and Superior Coastal Plain ELs. Also, all properties within these ELs without a current NR-44 compliant master plan are evaluated through desk-top review by taxa experts; and taxa-specific and ecology field surveys are being conducted where likely habitat or potentially high quality natural communities are present. Priorities in FY18 will include finishing work on the Central Sand Plains and Superior Coastal Plain ELs and initiating work on the Western Prairie EL. 2) Rare butterfly/moth surveys continue in west, southwest, central, and southeast Wisconsin, including Poweshiek skipperling, Karner blue butterfly, Regal fritillary, Ottoe skipper and other species. 3) Numerous bat surveys continue throughout the state. 4) Bald eagle nest surveys were again done across the state, including many state-owned properties.

		5) Eastern Massasauga rattlesnake population monitoring (done once every 3-4 years) occurred at Tiffany Bottoms SNA. Continued population assessment and monitoring of wood turtles took place at Brule River and NHAL State Forests, as well as on state lands near Menard Island, on the Upper Wolf River Fisheries Area, and on the Pine River hear Spread Eagle Barrens SNA. Wood turtle presence/absence surveys were done on the Trout and Manitowish Rivers within the NHAL State Forest. 6) Reference Wetland surveys continue to take place across the state, including state lands. In FY17 rare plant surveys were conducted in wetlands throughout the Driftless Area and Northern Kettle Moraine. FY18 is the final year of the project and is focusing on southeast Wisconsin. 7) Dwarf Lake Iris surveys were conducted in forested sites on state lands in Door and Brown counties. 8) We have 21 ongoing Citizen Based Monitoring projects dealing with rare, threatened, and endangered species on state lands throughout Wisconsin, involving many partner programs and individuals. One example is the volunteers with the Rare Plant Monitoring Program, who revisited known rare plant populations at numerous state lands throughout Wisconsin, including forested sites in SNAs and State Forests. 9) District Ecologists and other staff routinely work with department land managers to review for potential impacts to rare species, develop master plans, etc. DNR Ecologists/Conservation Biologists will be available during the audit for questions on these subjects. 10)Master Plans approved in this past year have increased SNA acreage by a net total of 10,111 acres either by creating NEW SNAs or expanding others. a. Northwest Barrens Properties Plan: 1) NEW – Namekagon Barrens 6,438 acres, 2) NEW – County Line Barrens and Forests, 338 acres, 3) NEW – Totogan Pines 239 acres b. Menominee River State Park and Recreation Area Plan: 1) NEW - Grand Island Complex 271 acres c. Lower Wisconsin State Riverway Plan: 1) Expanded – Tower Hill Bottoms 334 acres (from 147 to 481 acres), 2) Expanded – Arena Pines and Sand Barrens 13 acres (from 80 to 93 acres), 3) Expanded - Richwood Bottoms 728 acres (from 207 to 935 acres), 4) Expanded – Gotham Jack Pine Barrens 60 acres (from 353 to 413 acres), 5) Expanded – Adiantum Woods 224 acres (from 49 to 273 acres), 6) NEW – Millville Oak Woodlands 1,265 acres, 7) Expanded – Wyalusing Hardwood Forest 201 acres (from 202 to 403 acres). 11) The four approved Master Plans above have designated a total of 20,324 acres as Native Community Management Areas (NCMAs; including the aforementioned SNA acres). NCMA's are managed with the primary objective of representing, restoring, and perpetuating native plant and animal communities, whether

		upland, wetland, or aquatic, and other aspects of native biological diversity. Tier3 Management Plans have been approved for twelve State Natural Areas in northeast and central Wisconsin, covering 2,286 acres.
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	2017: 1) Much native plant community restoration work has been completed by NHC and other DNR staff on SNAs. This and virtually all other land management activities are captured during the annual Integrated Property Management meetings, which are available for viewing online for comment, as well as anytime thereafter. 2) DNR conducted inventories of a number of SNAs in the north for invasive species; the inventory area included the NHAL State Forest. 3) Consultation with Wildlife Management and Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) staff occurs before management activities are done around conservation areas.
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	
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	2017: All activities funded, conducted, or approved by the department are screened for potential impacts to rare species using the Natural Heritage Inventory Portal. Standard guidance and other tools are available for a large number of species, and foresters and other land managers routinely consult with wildlife and Natural Heritage Conservation staff.
6.3. 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.		
6.3.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	C	DNR Master Plans and operational plans (IFMPs) contain goals meeting the requirements of this Indicator. Also, numerous examples provided in the field on FRM 2460s specify for the

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.		provision of successional stages in the landscape. Observations in the field were that foresters are routinely and consistently aware of and incorporating goals of age diversity factoring in ages of adjacent stands. Interviews demonstrated knowledge among most staff and all wildlife and fisheries staff of the measures currently being actively undertaken to enhance or restore old growth characteristics in the state forests. 2017: Assessments of under-represented, naturally occurring successional stages would occur during the master planning processes. Specific property goals for management of these areas would be described in the master plan and in annual work plans. Planned and completed land management activities are captured during the annual Integrated Property Management meetings, which are available for viewing online.
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	DNR staff are 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. Relict old growth stands (Type 1) are typed as reserved - no management. On any managed old-growth stand – any forest management is conducted primarily to maintain or enhance old growth characteristics. There were discussions during 2016 field site visits regarding the enhancement of existing forest stands to achieve older, more mature forest conditions.
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.	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. A variety of habitat restoration and enhancement projects are conducted annually on department lands including: savanna/barrens restoration, native prairie restoration, wetland restoration/ enhancement, and young forest management. These

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.		activities are primarily guided by the WI Wildlife Action Plan, Joint Venture Waterfowl Plan, the Young Forest Initiative, and the various WI species management plans (turkey, etc). Property master plans identify the specific priority habitat types/work for each property based on guidance in the regional plans. Department staff often conduct habitat work in close partnership with habitat organizations (e.g. Ruffed Grouse Society, Wild Turkey Federation, Pheasants Forever, Ducks Unlimited, Trout Unlimited, etc.). 2017: Relict old growth stands (Type 1) are typed as reserved - no management. On any managed old-growth stand – any forest management is conducted primarily to maintain or enhance old growth characteristics. Activity since last audit - None.

5. Conservation zones representative of old growth stands are established. 6. Landscape level considerations are addressed. 7. Rare species are protected.		
6.3.b To the extent feasible within the size of the ownership, particularly on larger ownerships (generally tens of thousands or more acres), management maintains, enhances, or restores habitat conditions suitable for well-distributed populations of animal species that are characteristic of forest ecosystems within the landscape.	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. The BMPs are no longer seen as “new” rules, and foresters, logging contractors, and other agency staff were all knowledgeable of their details. Language in contracts instruct harvesters to avoid felling and leaving woody debris in seasonal wetlands. 2017 observations and interviews with field staff confirm that foresters are consistently implementing riparian protective buffers and including other considerations to protect forest resources. 2017: A variety of habitat restoration and enhancement projects are conducted annually on department lands including (but not limited to) savanna/barrens restoration, native prairie restoration, wetland restoration/enhancement, and young forest management. These activities are primarily guided by the WI Wildlife Action Plan, Joint Venture Waterfowl Plan, the Young Forest Initiative, and the various WI species management plans (turkey, etc). Property master plans identify the specific priority habitat types/work for each property based on guidance in the regional plans.. Department staff often conduct habitat work in close partnership with habitat organizations (e.g. Ruffed Grouse Society, Wild Turkey Federation, Pheasants Forever, Ducks Unlimited, Trout Unlimited, etc.). A new program, “Adopt a Fish and Wildlife Area” has created many new partnerships and is providing additional resources for conducting habitat work on these lands. Due to limited base operations funding, most habitat projects are funded through grants, partnerships, donations, or species stamp revenue.

		As part of a core work and alignment process, the department developed habitat priorities for all department owned and managed lands. These priorities were vetted through a diverse stakeholder review. Habitat was prioritized 1-3, with 1 being the highest priority habitat. These priorities will be used to direct funding and staff to the highest priority habitat work within the state to make the best use of available resources. Low priority habitat work will be discontinued or handed off to partners.
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	Management prescriptions for sites visited were consistently written to enhance or maintain current or desired composition of plant species on the site. This is done primarily by favoring natural regeneration, and focusing harvesting on removal of non-native species that had historically been planted on the FMU. DNR also uses extensive chemical, controlled burning, and mechanical treatments to combat invasive exotic species and maintain native plant communities. Examples of white pine restoration and restoration of oak-pine barrens included non-commercial removal of competing woody vegetation as non-herbicide site preparation.
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 in 2017 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. Often this was explicitly included in the stand level prescription form 2460.
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	2017: Seed sources come from areas around the state's two nurseries (Wi Rapids, Boscobel) through the Division's tree improvement program. See supplemental Annual Reforestation Report. http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/TreePlanting/documents/treeImprovement-2014.pdf

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	Seed sources come from areas around the state's two nurseries (Wi Rapids, Boscobel) through the Division's tree improvement program. See supplemental Annual Reforestation Report. http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/TreePlanting/documents/treeImprovement-2014.pdf
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. 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.	C	2017: 5,189 acres were even-aged harvest in CY 2016 When even-aged harvests are conducted green tree retention guidelines, biomass harvesting and course woody debris guidelines are all followed.
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	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

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.		methodology to control invasive species. Parks are especially active in controlling invasive species. Reconnaissance 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. DNR continues to have an aggressive system to monitor and control the spread of invasive species. While invasive species remain a challenge, their management continues to be a strong element of DNR's overall performance. See closure of **OBS 2016.2** for additional detail.
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	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. Many DNR personnel are certified fire fighters, and respond to wildfires when necessary. For the 2017 audit DNR reported Calendar Year 2016 activity including: • Wildfires in DNR protection: 686 fires for 604 acres • Wildfires DNR provide assistance outside protection: 13 for 29 acres • RX burn conducted by DNR: 337 for 27855 acres RX burns conducted by Pvt burners: 351 for 6915 acres 2017: The majority of pesticide applications in calendar year 2016, were for terrestrial and aquatic invasive plant control. The department maintains a system of Integrated Pest Management and in addition to pesticides a variety of hand, mechanical, and prescribed burning control methods are also used. Stand treatments are documented in the WisFIRS system.

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 staff demonstrated awareness during interviews 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. Relict old growth stands (Type 1) are typed as reserved - no management. On any managed old-growth stand – any forest management is conducted primarily to maintain or enhance old growth characteristics. There were discussions during 2017 field site visits regarding the enhancement of existing forest stands to achieve older, more mature forest conditions. 2017: Calendar Year 2016: Wildfires in DNR protection: 686 fires for 604 acres Wildfires DNR provide assistance outside protection: 13 for 29 acres RX burn conducted by DNR: 337 for 27855 acres RX burns conducted by Pvt burners: 351 for 6915 acres
6.9. The use of exotic species shall be carefully controlled and actively monitored to avoid adverse ecological impacts.		
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. Historic plantings of non-native species such as Norway spruce are being phased out and not replanted.
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.
6.9.c The forest owner or manager shall take timely action to curtail or significantly reduce any adverse impacts resulting from their use of exotic species	C	None used.

P7 A management plan -- appropriate to the scale and intensity of the operations -- shall be written, implemented, and kept up to date. The long-term objectives of management, and the means of achieving them, shall be clearly stated.		
C7.1. The management plan and supporting documents shall provide: a) Management objectives. b) description of the forest resources to be managed, environmental limitations, land use and ownership status, socio-economic conditions, and a profile of adjacent lands. c) Description of silvicultural and/or other management system, based on the ecology of the forest in question and information gathered through resource inventories. d) Rationale for rate of annual harvest and species selection. e) Provisions for monitoring of forest growth and dynamics. f) Environmental safeguards based on environmental assessments. g) Plans for the identification and protection of rare, threatened and endangered species. h) Maps describing the forest resource base including protected areas, planned management activities and land ownership. i) Description and justification of harvesting techniques and equipment to be used.		
7.1.a. The management plan identifies the ownership and legal status of the FMU and its resources, including rights held by the owner and rights held by others.	C	Wisconsin Administrative code, NR 44, outlines in detail the requirements for master planning for department properties. NR 44.04 addresses the requirement for describing ownership of the forest (confirmed in review of 2010 plan for Black River State Forest). Some details about legal status and rights are maintained by staff in Central Office and are not included in individual master plans.
7.1.b. The management plan describes the history of land use and past management, current forest types and associated development, size class and/or successional stages, and natural disturbance regimes that affect the FMU (see Indicator 6.1.a).	C	Wisconsin Administrative code, NR 44.05 lists required elements of a property master plan, addressing most of the items in this indicator. A review Black River l State Forest Plan confirms the inclusion of land-use history, current forest types, successional stages, and natural disturbances. More specific descriptions are presented for individual sale units when harvesting is planned (Form 2460).
7.1.c.The management plan describes: a) current conditions of the timber and non-timber forest resources being managed; b) desired future conditions; c) historical ecological conditions; and d) applicable management objectives and activities to move the FMU toward desired future conditions.	C	These elements of the management plan are found in the WISFirs database, which includes inventory data and desired future conditions, as well as on Forms 2460 (several reviewed during field audit). The Black River State Forest master plan presents both current and predicted future land cover for each of its management zones.

7.1.d. The management plan includes a description of the landscape within which the FMU is located and describes how landscape-scale habitat elements described in Criterion 6.3 will be addressed.	C	Wisconsin Administrative code, NR 44.05 requires that master plans contain a description of the landscape. Landscape-scale habitat elements are clearly identified as separate land management areas in plans (e.g., Coulee Experimental State Forest plan, 2009)
7.1.e. The management plan includes a description of the following resources and outlines activities to conserve and/or protect: • rare, threatened, or endangered species and natural communities (see Criterion 6.2); • plant species and community diversity and wildlife habitats (see Criterion 6.3); • water resources (see Criterion 6.5); • soil resources (see Criterion 6.3); • Representative Sample Areas (see Criterion 6.4); • High Conservation Value Forests (see Principle 9); • Other special management areas.	C	Wisconsin Administrative code, NR 44.06, 44.07, and 44.10 addresses most of these elements, requiring their inclusion in master plans. The Black River State forest plans contains discussions of all of these topics, with representative sample areas and HCVF addressed through management of State Natural Areas and special management categories for native communities.
7.1.f. If invasive species are present, the management plan describes invasive species conditions, applicable management objectives, and how they will be controlled (see Indicator 6.3.j).	C	Management of invasive species is a common inclusion in management plans at all levels of DNR planning. Starting with a Statewide Strategic Plan for Invasive Species, the Public Forest Lands Handbook, individual property master plans (e.g., Black River SF), and Form 2460 assessments. Individual plans are required for specific management actions.
7.1.g. The management plan describes insects and diseases, current or anticipated outbreaks on forest conditions and management goals, and how insects and diseases will be managed (see Criteria 6.6 and 6.8).	C	NR 44.06(10) c.3, requires that insects and diseases are addressed in master plans. Master plans, like Black River State Forest present a general discussion of forest health, but more specific information is presented in Form 2460 assessment, which are more time specific.
7.1.h. If chemicals are used, the plan describes what is being used, applications, and how the management system conforms with Criterion 6.6.	C	All Divisions and Bureaus in DNR require that plans are submitted before chemicals are used. Although auditors found some inconsistency in the content of such plans (see 6.6.d), most of the plans examined during the audit were in conformance with 6.6.
7.1.i. If biological controls are used, the management plan describes what is being used, applications, and how the management system conforms with Criterion 6.8.	C	Use of biological controls is generally addressed in Wisconsin Forest Management Guidelines (one of a number of documents comprising the management plan), but more specifically on a pest-by-pest basis. DNR has a competent and active team of forest health specialists who produce annual assessments of disease and insect pests, quarterly publications that summarize plans for control, and annual reports of assessments and control

		efforts. A Forest Health web page provides numerous such documents.
7.1.j. The management plan incorporates the results of the evaluation of social impacts, including: • traditional cultural resources and rights of use (see Criterion 2.1); • potential conflicts with customary uses and use rights (see Criteria 2.2, 2.3, 3.2); • management of ceremonial, archeological, and historic sites (see Criteria 3.3 and 4.5); • management of aesthetic values (see Indicator 4.4.a); • public access to and use of the forest, and other recreation issues; • local and regional socioeconomic conditions and economic opportunities, including creation and/or maintenance of quality jobs (see Indicators 4.1.b and 4.4.a), local purchasing opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.e), and participation in local development opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.g).	C	NR 44 (07), outlines requirements for obtaining public input into master planning for department properties. Evidence of conformance is obvious in review of master plans (four during the audit). The Division of Forestry has an Education and Outreach Strategic Plan, and the Forest Planning web page provides details on submitting comments on draft plans. Interviews with DNR planners confirm that the Department takes communication with the public seriously, and there is a competent staff to implement the strategic plan.
7.1.k. The management plan describes the general purpose, condition and maintenance needs of the transportation network (see Indicator 6.5.e).	C	NR 44 (07) requires that the transportation system is described in master plans. Review of Black River and Coulee SF plans confirm that roads and trails are addressed. Annual work plans for each property propose needed improvement and maintenance.
7.1.l. The management plan describes the silvicultural and other management systems used and how they will sustain, over the long term, forest ecosystems present on the FMU.	C	The Division of Forestry maintains an excellent Silvicultural Handbook (738 pages). It is a dynamic document that is updated periodically. A Silviculture Guidance Team has recently been appointed for reviewing and updating the Silviculture Handbook. The team is comprised of representatives from various facets of the forestry community, rather than just staff from the Division of Forestry.
7.1.m. The management plan describes how species selection and harvest rate calculations were developed to meet the requirements of Criterion 5.6.	C	These descriptions would be found, in general, in a master plan for a particular property or group of properties. Details would be found in WisFIRS, by specific query.
7.1.n. The management plan includes a description of monitoring procedures necessary to address the requirements of Criterion 8.2.	C	Chapter 100 of the Public Lands Handbook outlines procedures for stand inventory. The website for master planning (dnr.wi.gov/topic/lands/masterplanning) describes the WisCFI monitoring system and presents an abundance of reports about the forest resources: e.g., volume of growing stock, sawtimber

		volume, acreage by forest type, even volumes of coarse woody debris, and extent of invasive species. Although this information relates to the Division of Forestry, other administrations also use the WisCFI system and collect the same information.
7.1.o. The management plan includes maps describing the resource base, the characteristics of general management zones, special management areas, and protected areas at a level of detail to achieve management objectives and protect sensitive sites.	C	NR 44 (08) outlines requirements for describing the resource base and Management Areas. Review of master plans for Coulee and Black River State Forests confirms that these requirements are met and are in conformance with the indicator. For instance, the Black River SF plan identifies the following management areas: Forest Production, Habitat, Native Community, Recreation, and State Natural Areas.
7.1.p. The management plan describes and justifies the types and sizes of harvesting machinery and techniques employed on the FMU to minimize or limit impacts to the resource.	C	Wisconsin Forest Management Guidelines (Chapter 13) discusses harvesting machinery appropriate for different sites and objectives. Inspection of pre-harvest plans and prescriptions during field visits revealed examples where foresters had specified type of harvesting equipment in special cases.
7.1.q. Plans for harvesting and other significant site-disturbing management activities required to carry out the management plan are prepared prior to implementation. Plans clearly describe the activity, the relationship to objectives, outcomes, any necessary environmental safeguards, health and safety measures, and include maps of adequate detail.	C	A 219-page Timber Sale Handbook provides guidance for the establishment of timber sales, including the marking of trees to be cut or retained. More specific information is prepared for each sale, using Form 2460, and the information required by this form addresses the elements of this indicator. Numerous 2460 forms were reviewed by auditors during visits to harvest sites.
7.1.r. The management plan describes the stakeholder consultation process.	C	NR 44 (07), outlines requirements for obtaining public input into master planning for department properties. Each master plan has a section entitled “Public Communications Plan (e.g., Black River SF).
C7.2. The management plan shall be periodically revised to incorporate the results of monitoring or new scientific and technical information, as well as to respond to changing environmental, social and economic circumstances.		
7.2.a The management plan is kept up to date. It is reviewed on an ongoing basis and is updated whenever necessary to incorporate the results of monitoring or new scientific and technical information, as well as to respond to changing environmental, social and economic circumstances. At a minimum, a full revision occurs every 10 years.	C	This requirement has been the subject of recent findings. See OBS 2016.3 for more detail.
C7.3. Forest workers shall receive adequate training and supervision to ensure proper implementation of the management plans.		

7.3.a. Workers are qualified to properly implement the management plan; All forest workers are provided with sufficient guidance and supervision to adequately implement their respective components of the plan.	C	Auditor requested evidence of the education and training for selected WDNR personnel across the range of agencies involved in the audit. Training records) indicated that employees obtain varied training, ranging from agency-provided meetings up to major conferences and even college-level courses. Interviews with professional staff showed most had 4-year degrees and many have advanced degrees in relevant natural resources fields. Management foresters, ecologists, and biologists interviewed during field visits demonstrated competence in both preparing and implementing plans.
C7.4. While respecting the confidentiality of information, forest managers shall make publicly available a summary of the primary elements of the management plan, including those listed in Criterion 7.1.		
7.4.a. While respecting landowner confidentiality, the management plan or a management plan summary that outlines the elements of the plan described in Criterion 7.1 is available to the public either at no charge or a nominal fee.	C	Wisconsin DNR has an excellent web page (http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/ForestPlanning), where plans in both draft and final form are posted for public review.
7.4.b. Managers of public forests make draft management plans, revisions and supporting documentation easily accessible for public review and comment prior to their implementation. Managers address public comments and modify the plans to ensure compliance with this Standard.	C	Wisconsin DNR has an excellent web page (http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/ForestPlanning), where plans in both draft and final form are posted for public review.

Principle #8: 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.*		
8.1 The frequency and intensity of monitoring should be determined by the scale and intensity of forest management operations, as well as, the relative complexity and fragility of the affected environment. Monitoring procedures should be consistent and replicable over time to allow comparison of results and assessment of change.		

8.1.a Consistent with the scale and intensity of management, the forest owner or manager develops and consistently implements a regular, comprehensive, and replicable written monitoring protocol.	C	Monitoring protocols are described in relevant handbooks as appropriate for the resource being monitored.
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.		
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 Act 166 (2005) requires DNR to maintain a current inventory of forest resources on state forested lands. The DNR reported the following for FY17: Total Recon acres for FY17= 96,913 acres State Forest CFI and Statewide FIA completed annual plot cycle 1/5 of total. Forest regeneration survival monitoring checks (WISFIRS) 3,286 acres CY2016 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 20 years on state land.
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	After large storms DNR does fly overs of property to determine areas of impact. This is followed up by sending foresters out to areas identified by the fly over in order to develop a plan. DNR, while engaging in a full suite of monitoring activities on the lands under its management, has the

		opportunity to identify these unanticipated issues. Discussions with foresters indicate that as issues are identified plans are generated as to how to address the issue.
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	FY17 192,246 cds equivalent all completed sale on certified lands (rpt 28b FY17) The 2460 form associated with each sale has this information.
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; 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).	C	A variety of wildlife surveys are conducted annually to monitor the status of WI wildlife populations, including nesting bird surveys, grouse drumming transects, summer deer observations, game bird brood surveys, pheasant crowing counts, eagle/osprey flights and nest monitoring, otter/beaver flights, winter mammal track surveys, bear bait index, waterfowl flights, waterfowl and dove banding, chronic wasting disease testing, avian influenza testing, and other wildlife disease monitoring, along with a variety of other wildlife and plant monitoring. Forest Health Monitoring which includes gypsy moth and EAB surveys. http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/wildlifehabitat/reports.html For harvest planning a search of the Natural Heritage Inventory database is conducted. If needed a biologist or regional ecologist is then contacted to modify plan accordingly. Invasive species monitoring is currently done as part of recon, harvest prep, and operations.
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	DNR uses a suite of forms; scheduled surveys and inspections; quarterly, biannual, annual, and other period reports to ensure proper implementation of harvest planning and subsequent monitoring to minimize potential environmental impacts and effectiveness of harvest prescriptions. Numerous examples were given throughout the audit for such implementation from the landscape level down to the forest stand, trail, and waterways. Some examples are the harvest inspections, closing inspection,

		The Timber sale handbook details how active timber sales are reviewed and closed out. Individual reports are prepared as part of monitoring visits. In addition, BMP monitoring is conducted. The monitoring is state-wide and rotates each year between landowner type (Federal, Industrial (Large), County, State, Non-Industrial Private (NIP), and Tribal).
8.2.d.2 A monitoring program is in place to assess the condition and environmental impacts of the forest-road system.	C	Interviews indicate that road monitoring is an ongoing process and particularly reviewed at sale closeout. Trail Use and Condition reports, BMP monitoring for water quality and soil disturbance. Monitoring of Master Plan goals http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/lands/masterplanning/mpreports.html
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	Public forests, by their nature, take into account these issues as part of the planning process on many levels. This part of the mission statement of the DNR. DNR consults at every stage with the public. Plans are provided to the general public for input. When neighbors are involved the property manage or forester contacts them to discuss the sale. DNR has daily interaction with state forest products producers. Employees of DNR even have a line at the bottom of their e-mails saying: We are committed to service excellence. Visit our survey at http://dnr.wi.gov/customersurvey to evaluate how I did. Statewide forest action plan looks into detail of effects of timber on state economy. The 10 strategic plan was generated in 2010 and updated in 2015 looking at state of forest products industry including chapter on socioeconomic benefits. Trail Use and Condition reports, BMP monitoring for water quality and soil disturbance. Monitoring of Master Plan goals http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/lands/masterplanning/mpreports.html
8.2.d.4 Stakeholder responses to management activities are monitored and recorded as necessary.	C	As described under 4.4.a, 4.4.d, & 8.2.d.3. Stakeholder responses are reviewed on a property level as part of annual management planning process. Letters go out to adjacent neighbors and sometimes the forester or property manager will go knock on the

		door of a neighbor. Any communications received go into the file at the local field office.
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. DNR communicates planned management to the tribes and provides the opportunity to input.
8.2.e The forest owner or manager monitors the costs and revenues of management in order to assess productivity and efficiency.	C	Quarterly and annual accomplishment reports show progress throughout the year for various work goals (timber sale establishment). Timber sale inspections monitor at sale level. Annual master plan reports are submitted tracking progress towards property goals. 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.
8.3 Documentation shall be provided by the forest manager to enable monitoring and certifying organizations to trace each forest product from its origin, a process known as the "chain of custody."		
8.3.a When forest products are being sold as FSC-certified, the forest owner or manager has a system that prevents mixing of FSC-certified and non-certified forest products prior to the point of sale, with accompanying documentation to enable the tracing of the harvested material from each harvested product from its origin to the point of sale.	C	Wisconsin DNR maintains a chain of custody system based on standard log load ticket system. DNR typically sells standing timber, with ownership of certified material changing when it is cut**.** See SCS FSC Chain of Custody Indicators for Forest Management Enterprises Table.
8.3.b The forest owner or manager maintains documentation to enable the tracing of the harvested material from each harvested product from its origin to the point of sale.	C	The system of combined contract, haul tickets, and invoices contain the required information at a sufficient detail to enable tracking of certified material.
8.4 The results of monitoring shall be incorporated into the implementation and revision of the management plan.		
8.4.a The forest owner or manager monitors and documents the degree to which the objectives stated in the management plan are being fulfilled, as well as significant deviations from the plan.	C	Regular monitoring of objectives occurs with timber sale monitoring, recon, etc. This also occurs through the Master Plan Monitoring process.
8.4.b Where monitoring indicates that management objectives and guidelines, including those necessary for conformance with this Standard, are not being met or if changing conditions indicate that a change in management strategy is necessary, the management	C	Review of management plans and objectives occurs at a tactical level as a part of timber sale administration, i.e. monitoring BMPS, shutting down jobs to protect forest resources if necessary, and regeneration monitoring. At a larger level, WISFIRs data is collected and

plan, operational plans, and/or other plan implementation measures are revised to ensure the objectives and guidelines will be met. If monitoring shows that the management objectives and guidelines themselves are not sufficient to ensure conformance with this Standard, then the objectives and guidelines are modified.		management planning is adjusted when recon indicates a change in stand type or similar update. On the ground foresters are observing the site conditions and adapting as needed. For example, at of the field visits a forester was trying an experimental harvest to develop multiage structure in a stand. DNR has 3 silviculture ecologists who develop and revise guidance to keep up with research. The Meadow Valley Unit conducts many research projects that feed back into practices. See also projects mentioned in 4.4.a that contribute to adaptive management.
8.5 While respecting the confidentiality of information, forest managers shall make publicly available a summary of the results of monitoring indicators, including those listed in Criterion 8.2.		
8.5.a While protecting landowner confidentiality, either full monitoring results or an up-to-date summary of the most recent monitoring information is maintained, covering the Indicators listed in Criterion 8.2, and is available to the public, free or at a nominal price, upon request.	C	A variety of monitoring reports are posted on DNR website. Such as: - State Forest Inventory Report - Natural Heritage Conservation Report - BMP Monitoring Report - Invasive Species Report - Division of Forestry Annual Report - Forest Health Annual Report - Wildlife Report - Outdoor Reports

Principle #9: 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.

9.4 Annual monitoring shall be conducted to assess the effectiveness of the measures employed to maintain or enhance the applicable conservation attributes.		
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	C	CFI bird monitoring was not conducted in FY17 as all of the baseline work has been done and they will wait to monitor these sites on a 5 or 10 year rotation. Annual

effectiveness of the measures employed for their maintenance or enhancement. The monitoring program is designed and implemented consistent with the requirements of Principle 8.		Northern Goshawk nest productivity monitoring on State Forest lands in the Northern Highlands – American Legion (NHAL) and Flambeau River State Forests. The statewide Wisconsin Breeding Bird Atlas involves bird surveys throughout the state, including many state lands, and is being coordinated by the department. Also, site inspections and photo points were employed on many State Natural Areas. Approximately two-thirds of the ~425 SNAs that are owned by the State are embedded in other program projects (e.g., Wildlife Management, Parks, and State Forests), making consistent monitoring of SNAs a challenge. DNR is approaching this difficulty on a number of fronts, including: 1. Completed a review the history of SNA site inspection rules/guidance. In short, historically, SNAs are to be inspected annually unless stated otherwise in the Management/Master plan. 2. Facilitating an effort to establish a site inspection schedule that ensures that we are monitoring SNAs with enough frequency to capture significant events/changes/concerns as early as possible, yet take into consideration community type, location, staffing levels and any other relevant issues. 3. Use the eight SNA/Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) Ecologists, not only to help conduct SNA inspections on the ~140 SNAs that are owned by our program, but also, to facilitate monitoring efforts by our DNR partners across the State. This includes a concerted effort to inform partner programs of the need to conduct site inspections using the SNA Form, and train as necessary and feasible. 4. Solicited help from (non-SNA) Natural Heritage Conservation biologists that are conducting biotic inventories for numerous projects/planning efforts across the state, including SNAs. Specifically, these biologists conducted breeding bird surveys, including point counts done as part of the Wisconsin Breeding Bird Atlas, on the NHAL State Forest, Lemonweir

		Bottoms SNA, and Roche-A-Cri State Park and SNA. Small mammal surveys were conducted at Schluckebier Prairie SNA and NHAL State Forest; and herptile surveys were done at numerous biotic inventories of state-owned properties throughout Wisconsin. In addition, rare plant surveys were conducted in the NHAL State Forest as part of a biotic inventory there. Also in the NHAL, an intern did a mini-biotic inventory of the birds and plants in Van Vliet Hemlocks SNA. On a more informal level, members of the public using State Natural Areas often inform DNR staff of issues they identify while on the property.
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. There are six SNA crews across the state that address these issues.

Appendix 6 – Chain of Custody Indicators for FMEs

☐ Chain of Custody indicators were not evaluated during this annual audit.

SCS FSC Chain of Custody Indicators for Forest Management Enterprises, Version 6-0

REQUIREMENT	C/ NC	COMMENT/CAR
1. Quality Management		
1.1 The organization shall appoint a management representative as having overall responsibility and authority for the organization's compliance with all applicable requirements of this standard.	C	The Sustainable Forest Certification Coordinator for the state is the designated management representative.
1.2 The FME shall maintain complete records of all FSC-related COC activities, including sales and training, for at least 5 years.	C	Timber sale handbook requires record retention for this long.

1.3 The FME shall define its forest gate(s) (check all that apply): *The forest gate is defined as the point where the change in ownership of the certified-forest product occurs.*		[X] **Stump** *Stumpage sale or sales of standing timber; transfer of ownership of certified-forest product occurs upon harvest.* [ ] **On-site concentration yard** *Transfer of ownership of certified-product occurs at concentration yard under control of FME.* [ ] **Off-site Mill/Log Yard** *Transfer of ownership occurs when certified-product is unloaded at purchaser's facility.* [ ] **Auction house/ Brokerage** *Transfer of ownership occurs at a government-run or private auction house/ brokerage.* [ ] **Lump-sum sale/ Per Unit/ Pre-Paid Agreement** *A timber sale in which the buyer and seller agree on a total price for marked standing trees or for trees within a defined area before the wood is removed — the timber is usually paid for before harvesting begins. Similar to a per-unit sale.* [ ] **Log landing** *Transfer of ownership of certified-product occurs at landing/yarding areas.* [ ] **Other** *(Please describe):*
1.4 The FME shall have sufficient control over its forest gate(s) to ensure that there is no risk of mixing of FSC-certified forest products covered by the scope of the FM/COC certificate with forest products from outside of the scope prior to the transfer of ownership.	C	Since DNR sells standing trees, the stump and the gate are the same. Thus there is little risk of mixing while the material is in DNR's Chain of Custody.
1.5 The FME and its contractors shall not process FSC-certified material prior to transfer of ownership at the forest gate without conforming to applicable chain of custody requirements. *NOTE: This does not apply to log cutting or de-barking units, small portable sawmills or on-site processing of chips/biomass originating from the FMU under evaluation.*	C	No processing of material occurs under the scope of this certificate.
2. Product Control, Sales and Delivery		
2.1. Products from the certified forest area shall be identifiable as certified at the forest gate(s).	C	Timber sales are advertised as FSC certified. All forestland managed by DNR is covered under the certificate.
2.2 The FME shall maintain records of quantities/volumes of FSC-certified product(s).	C	Records of all timber sales and volumes are retained at field offices.

2.3. The FME shall ensure that all sales documents issued for outputs sold with FSC claims include the following information: a) name and contact details of the organization; b) name and address of the customer; c) date when the document was issued; d) description of the product; e) quantity of the products sold; f) the organization's FSC Forest Management (FM/COC) or FSC Controlled Wood (CW/FM) code; g) clear indication of the FSC claim for each product item or the total products as follows: i. the claim "FSC 100%" for products from FSC 100% product groups; ii. the claim "FSC Controlled Wood" for products from FSC Controlled Wood product groups. h) If separate transport documents are issued, information sufficient to link the sales document and related transport documentation to each other.	C	The combined Sales Contract, Trip Tickets, and Invoice fulfill this requirement.
2.4 The FME shall include the same information as required in 2.3 in the related delivery documentation, if the sales document (or copy of it) is not included with the shipment of the product. **Note: 2.3 and 2.4 above are based on FSC-STD-40-004 V2-1 Clause 6.1.1 and 6.1.2**	C	The combined Sales Contract, Trip Tickets, and Invoice fulfill this requirement.

2.5 When the FME has demonstrated it is not able to include the required FSC claim as specified above in 2.3 and 2.4 in sales and delivery documents due to space constraints, through an exception, SCS can approve the required information to be provided through supplementary evidence (e.g. supplementary letters, a link to the own company's webpage with verifiable product information). This practice is only acceptable when SCS is satisfied that the supplementary method proposed by the FME complies with the following criteria: a) There is no risk that the customer will misinterpret which products are or are not FSC certified in the document; b) The sales and delivery documents contain visible and understandable information so that the customer is aware that the full FSC claim is provided through supplementary evidence; c) In cases where the sales and delivery documents contain multiple products with different FSC Claims, a clear identification for each product shall be included to cross-reference it with the associated FSC claim provided in the supplementary evidence. *FSC-ADVICE-40-004-05*	NA	
3. Labeling and Promotion	X	**N/A, FME does not use/ intend to use trademarks**
		N/A, CW/FM certificates are not allowed to use FSC trademarks (*Note: it is a Major nonconformity to 3.1 if CW/FM certificates are found to be using trademarks)*
3.1 The FME shall adhere to relevant trademark use requirements of FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2 described in the *SCS Trademark Annex for FMEs*.		The FME does not use any trademarks for labelling or promotion. For other uses see Annex below.
4. Outsourcing	X	**N/A, FME does not outsource any COC-related activities.**
		N/A, FME outsources low-risk activities such as transport and harvesting.
4.1 The FME shall provide the names and contact details of all outsourced service providers.		

4.2 The FME shall have a control system for the outsourced process which ensures that: a) The material used for the production of FSC-certified material is traceable and not mixed with any other material prior to the point of transfer of legal ownership; b) The outsourcer keeps records of FSC-certified material covered under the outsourcing agreement; c) The FME issues the final invoice for the processed or produced FSC-certified material following outsourcing; d) The outsourcer only uses FSC trademarks on products covered by the scope of the outsourcing agreement and not for promotional use.		
5. Training and/or Communication Strategies		
5.1 All relevant FME staff and outsourcers shall be trained in the FME's COC control system commensurate with the scale and intensity of operations and shall demonstrate competence in implementing the FME's COC control system.	C	The duties regarding Chain of Custody are outlined in the Timber Sale Handbook Chapter 50 *Mill Scale Ticket System for Pulpwood Scaling or Certification Chain of Custody.* Interviews confirmed that these procedures are followed. Training is conducted with new hires who have these responsibilities. The Sustainable Forest Certification Coordinator periodically sends out newsletter communications with refreshers on Chain of Custody issues and procedures.
5.2 The FME shall maintain up-to-date records of its COC training and/or communications program, such as a list of trained employees, completed COC trainings, the intended frequency of COC training (i.e. training plan), and related program materials (e.g., presentations, memos, contracts, employee handbooks, etc.).	C	Training records are maintained in an electronic system.

SCS Trademark Annex for FMEs: FSC Trademarks, FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2

☐ N/A, does not use/intend to use FSC trademarks for any purposes (finished with this section); or

☐ N/A, is fully integrated and all trademark uses are treated under the COC Annex to this report that includes a full review of FSC-STD-40-004 and FSC-STD-50-001.

NOTE: This section is **applicable for all organizations that use or *intend* to use any FSC trademarks** for *promotional and/or on-product purposes*. For evaluation audits, it is acceptable to mark C if the client demonstrates an adequate awareness of the requirements through interviews and other applicable evidence. A requirement should be marked NC and a corresponding CAR should be issued for any nonconformance identified, such as use of FSC trademarks prior to granting of certification.

Description of how the organization currently uses, or intends to use, FSC trademarks and/or labels, including but not limited to printed materials, Internet applications, on-product labeling, and other public-facing media:	The only use of trademarks is for informational purposes on the internet and in printed applications such as prospectus documents, training materials, and handbooks.

FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 1.9 Products intended to be labeled or promoted as FSC certified are included in the organization's certified **product group list**.	[X] C [ ] NC [ ] C w/Obs
Evidence: DNR does not label any FSC products and it does not promote any FSC products.	
FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 1.4, 1.6 – 1.8, 1.13 – 1.14 The organization does <u>not</u> use the FSC trademarks in the following ways: ▪ in connection with the sale or promotion of **FSC Controlled Wood** (§1.4) ▪ in any way that could cause **confusion**, misinterpretation or loss of credibility to the FSC certification scheme (§1.6) ▪ to imply any **FSC endorsement** or responsibility of the organization's activities outside of the certificate scope (§1.7) ▪ to imply any **FSC responsibility** for the production of products, documents or promotional materials (§1.8) ▪ in product brand names, company names or website domain **names** (§1.13) ▪ **translated** to another language with no English included (§1.14)	[X] C [ ] NC [ ] C w/Obs
FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 7.2 The FSC trademarks are not used together with the marks of **other forest certification** schemes in a way **which implies equivalence** or in a way which is disadvantageous to the FSC trademarks in terms of size or placement.	[X] C [ ] NC [ ] C w/Obs
Sections 1.4, 1.6 – 1.8, 1.13, 1.14, and 7.2 Evidence: The informational uses on prospectus documents, training materials, and the webpage were reviewed.	
FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 1.11 Any **information about FSC** that is in addition to FSC trademarks and labels included in any material has been given prior **approval** by SCS.	[ ] C [X] NC [ ] C w/Obs [ ] N/A, no additional FSC information
FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 1.15 The use of the FSC "checkmark-and-tree" logo is directly accompanied by the **appropriate trademark symbols** ® or ™ (in superscript font). The appropriate symbol also accompanies the **first use** of "FSC" and "Forest Stewardship Council" in any text. **NOTES**:	[X] C [ ] NC [ ] C w/Obs [ ] N/A, one or more of the noted exceptions apply

1. The use of trademark registration symbol is not required for FSC claims in sales and delivery documents, or for the disclaimer/ statement specified in requirement 7.5 of FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2. The registration symbol is required for any other use of initials "FSC" on documents; however, the omission of the use of trademark registration symbol in promotional texts related to FSC on invoice templates, delivery notes and similar documents is possible if the software used to produce these documents does not support trademark registration symbols. This exception only applies to the use of the trademark registration symbol for the initials "FSC" and the name "Forest Stewardship Council". 2. In January 2014, in Hong Kong, FSC changed the trademark symbol from ® back to ™. Companies affected by this change which have approved artwork with the ® registered trademark symbol for distribution in Hong Kong may continue to produce, distribute and sell into the market product using the registered trademark symbol on the FSC trademarks until 1 September 2015, with an additional liquidation period of six months, which expires 1 March 2016. All **new** artwork must use the ™ trademark symbol. 3. Where the FSC initials are used vertically in the traditional way of writing for Asian nations, the registration status symbol may be used in superscript font in either the top right corner (alongside F), or the bottom right corner (alongside C) as preferred. In this instance, mark "C".	
FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 1.16 All FSC **trademark uses** have been submitted to SCS for **approval**.	[ ] C [X] NC [ ] C w/Obs
Sections 1.11, 1.15 and 1.16 Evidence: The audit team identified uses of the trademark in the prospectus for two State Forests and in a public handbook that were not approved by the CB. See CAR 2017.3	
FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 1.10 All (previously approved) FSC labels **only use the FSC label artwork** provided on the label generator or otherwise issued or approved by SCS or FSC.	[ ] C [ ] NC [ ] C w/Obs [X] N/A, no approved FSC labels
FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, Sections 10, 11 and 12 All (previously approved) FSC labels and logos conform to the standard requirements for **color and font** (§10.1-10.3, 11.5, 11.7, 11.9), **format and size** (§10.4 - 10.7, 11.2, 11.3, 11.8), **trademark symbol** (§10.8, 11.4), **FSC trademark license code** (§10.9), **label text** (§10.10 - 10.15) and/or **mini label** requirements (§10.16 - 10.18). The label or logo is not being **misused** in any manner described in section 12.2.	[ ] C [ ] NC [ ] C w/Obs [X] N/A, no approved FSC labels
Sections 1.10, 10, 11 and 12.2 Evidence:	
Promotional use of the FSC trademarks [ ] **N/A, does not use/intend to use FSC trademarks for promotional purposes (Skip Promotional section)**	
NOTE: This section is applicable for all organizations that use or *intend* to use FSC trademarks for **promotional purposes**. For evaluation audits, it is acceptable to mark C if the client demonstrates an adequate awareness of the requirements through interviews and other applicable evidence. A requirement should be marked NC and a corresponding CAR should be issued for any nonconformance identified, such as use of FSC trademarks prior to granting of certification.	
FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 1.12, 4.4	[X] C [ ] NC

The FSC trademarks are not used to promote **product quality** aspects not covered by FSC certification (§ 1.12). Any claims regarding **qualities outside the control of FSC**, such as other environmental attributes of the product, are separated from text about FSC (§ 4.4).	[ ] C w/Obs [ ] N/A, no additional quality claims
FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 6.1 **Catalogues, brochures, and websites** meet the following requirements: a) The promotional panel, or at least the FSC trademark license code, is in a prominent place. b) When the products are not all on the same page, a link or text such as "Look for FSC certified products" is included next to the panel / code. c) FSC certified products are indicated by using the logo or with "FSC certified" in the product description.	[X] C [ ] NC [ ] C w/Obs [ ] N/A, do not use trademarks in these items
FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 4.1 For labeled **stationery and brochures printed on FSC-certified paper, the label is not in such a prominent position** as to make it appear that any organization (or its products) represented in the publication is endorsed by FSC. (E.g. the FSC label is not placed on the front cover of the brochure or next to images of forest-based products which are not FSC certified.)	[ ] C [ ] NC [ ] C w/Obs [X] N/A, no such labeled items
FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 6.2 FSC certified products are not promoted using only the **SCS Kingfisher** and/or **SCS Global Services logo**. None used	[X] C [ ] NC [ ] C w/Obs
FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 7.3 FSC trademarks are **not used** at the top of **document templates** such as letterheads, sales documents and emails. None used	[X] C [ ] NC [ ] C w/Obs
FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 7.4 The FSC trademarks are not used on **business cards to promote** the organization's certification. NOTE: If authorization was duly received under the previous trademark standard, the organization may use the existing supply until it is depleted. In this case, the approval must be available and must have been granted prior to July 1, 2011. None used	[X] C [ ] NC [ ] C w/Obs [ ] N/A, approval granted prior to July 1, 2011
FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 4.2 If a **business card is printed on FSC-certified paper**, the mini label with product type is used at minimum size. The use of the mini label does not imply that the organization is affiliated with FSC.	[ ] C [ ] NC [ ] C w/Obs [X] N/A, no labeled business cards

FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 8.1, 8.2 All **promotional items** (e.g., mugs, pens, T-shirts, caps, banners, vehicles, etc.) display, at minimum, the FSC logo and FSC trademark license code (§8.1). Any promotional items made wholly or partly of wood (e.g., pencils, memory sticks, etc.) meet the applicable labeling requirements specified by FSC-STD-40-004 (§8.2).	[ ] C [ ] NC [ ] C w/Obs [X] N/A, no FSC labels on promotional items
FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 8.3 For FSC trademarks used for promotion at **trade fairs** the organization has clearly marked which products are FSC certified and the products carry an FSC label; or if no products are displayed, a visible disclaimer stating, “Ask for our FSC certified products,” or, “We can provide FSC certified products upon request,” is present. NOTE: Use of text to describe the FSC certification of the organization does not require a disclaimer.	[ ] C [ ] NC [ ] C w/Obs [X] N/A, no FSC trademarks used for promotion at trade fairs
FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2, 9.1, 9.2 The organization takes full responsibility for the use of FSC trademarks by **investment companies** and others making **financial claims** based on their FSC certified operations(§9.1). Any such claims are accompanied by the disclaimer, “FSC is not responsible for and does not endorse any financial claims on returns on investments” (§9.2).	[ ] C [ ] NC [ ] C w/Obs [X] N/A, no investment claims about FSC operations

Using the FSC labels on products

[X] **N/A, does not use/intend to use FSC on-product/packaging labels (Skip section 11)**

NOTE: This section is applicable for all organizations that use or *intend* to use FSC trademarks for **on-product purposes**. For evaluation audits, it is acceptable to mark C if the client demonstrates an adequate awareness of the requirements through interviews and other applicable evidence. A requirement should be marked NC and a corresponding CAR should be issued for any nonconformance identified, such as use of FSC trademarks prior to granting of certification.