



Surveillance Audit Report

Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Standard

September 19, 2009

A. Wisconsin DNR

FRS #: 1Y941

B. Scope:

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

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

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

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

No Change

Changed (see Section H, revised scope statement noted on FRS)

C. NSF Audit Team: Lead Auditor: Mike Ferrucci; Auditors: Robert Hrubes, JoAnn Hanowski

D. Audit Dates: August 12 - 14, 2009

E. Reference Documentation:

2005-2009 SFI Standard®

Company SFI Documentation:

Rev. Level:

Date Revised:

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

Acceptable with no nonconformances; or

Acceptable with minor nonconformances that should be corrected before the next regularly scheduled surveillance visit;

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

Several major nonconformances - the certification may be canceled unless immediate action is taken

G. Changes to Operations or to the SFI Standard:

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

H. Other Issues Reviewed:

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

Yes No N.A. SFI and other relevant logos or labels are utilized correctly.

I. Corrective Action Requests: (see also Appendix IV)

Correct Action Requests issued this visit:

Major Non-conformance SFI-2009-01: Complete preliminary land management objectives for all properties.

Minor Non-conformance SFI-2009-02: Not all employees applying chemicals are trained or working under a trained supervisor.

Corrective Action Plan is not required.

Corrective Action Plan is required within sixty days of this visit (for Minor Nonconformances).

CARs will be verified during the next Surveillance Audit.

Corrective Action Plan is required within thirty days of this visit (for Major Nonconformances).

The auditor will make arrangements to verify the corrective action has been effectively implemented. All major nonconformance(s) must be closed by the auditor prior to the

next scheduled surveillance audit by a special verification visit or by desk review, if possible.

Corrective Action Plans should be provided to Mike Ferrucci: mferrucci@iforest.com

At the conclusion of this Surveillance Audit visit these CARs remain open:

MAJOR(S): 1 MINOR(S): 1

In addition, 1 Opportunity for Improvement (OFI) was identified.

Appendices:

Appendix I: Tentative SFIS Surveillance Audit Plan

Appendix II: Corrective Action Requests

Appendix III: Public Surveillance Audit Report

Appendix IV: Audit Matrix

Appendix V: Reporting Form

Appendix I



Tentative SFIS Surveillance Audit Plan

**Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Standard
2005-2009 Edition**

for

Wisconsin DNR State Lands

July 15, 2009

NSF-ISR

789 North Dixboro Road

Ann Arbor, MI 48105

888-NSF-9000

www.nsf-isr.org

Mike Ferrucci, Lead Auditor

Office and Mobile: 203-887-9248

mferrucci@iforest.com

Introduction

The Wisconsin State Forests have been certified to the Sustainable Forestry Initiative® (SFI) Standard, 2005-2009 Edition (SFIS) since May 5, 2004 (SFI certificate #NSF-SFIS-1Y941-S1). In 2008 DNR achieved a scope expansion and recertification of its programs for management of several categories of state lands including state forests, parks, wildlife lands, and other categories more fully described in the scope statement below.

This audit plan describes the conduct of the first annual NSF-ISR SFIS Surveillance Audit being conducted by a joint audit team in conjunction with the FSC 2009 Annual Audit of the same lands against the FSC Lake States Regional Standard. The two processes (SFI and FSC) share the same auditors and much of the same evidence. However this report is intended to describe the SFI portion of the evaluation; more information about the FSC portion of the evaluation is available from SCS.

An audit team assembled by NSF-ISR will make a determination of continuing conformance to the requirements of the according to the Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Audit Procedures and Qualifications (SFI APQ). This Audit Plan describes the conduct of the NSF-ISR SFIS Certification Audit conducted to determine conformance. Additional details about how NSF-ISR's SFIS Certification Audits are conducted are contained in the NSF-ISR SFIS Certification Process Standard Operating Procedure (4742), which is consistent with the SFI® requirements.

SFIS Certification Scope and Objective

The audit will apply to the Wisconsin DNR's SFI Program implementation, primarily forest land management, and other related activities that are covered by the SFI Standard 2005-2009. As specified in the SFI® Standard 2005-2009, the NSF-ISR SFIS Surveillance Audit objective is to establish whether the Wisconsin DNR's SFI program is in continuing conformance with the SFIS Objectives, Performance Measures, and Indicators. Activities taken by the program to address the Minor Non-conformances will be the primary focus. Any activities taken to improve the program, including those relating to the Opportunities for Improvement identified in the 2008 report are the secondary focus. The team will also look at conformance to any relevant indicator on as broad a range of land categories as possible.

DNR land included in the project includes approximately 1.5 million acres:

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

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

Scope:

SFI Program implementation and other related activities covered by the SFI Standard 2005-2009. The SFI Certification Number is NSF-SFIS-1Y941-S1. Categories included in the DNR Lands forest certification review include:

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

The following DNR properties (about 155,000 acres) are explicitly excluded from the certification project:

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

Certification Criteria

Determination of conformance to the SFI Standard will be based on the requirements of the 2005-2009 Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Standard. Findings will be based upon the literal language of the SFIS Objectives, Performance Measures and Indicators. The NSF-ISR Audit Team will not add additional requirements that are not specified in the SFI Standard. The SFIS Performance Measures that are included in and excluded from the scope of the SFIS Certification Audit are the same as in previous state forest audits.

Roles and Responsibilities

The Wisconsin DNR's management representative with respect to this SFIS Certification Audit will be: Paul E. Pingrey, Forest Certification Coordinator, Wisconsin DNR - Division of Forestry, PO Box 7921, Madison, WI 53707 ph. 608-267-7595 paul.pingrey@wisconsin.gov

The other key members of the Wisconsin DNR's SFI Team that will be involved in all aspects of the SFIS Certification Audit Process are listed below in Appendix 1.

The NSF-ISR lead auditor will be Mike Ferrucci, Office and Mobile: 203-887-9248 mferrucci@iforest.com. The other members of the audit team will include Robert Hrubes, FSC Lead Auditor and Forester; and JoAnn Hanowski, Wildlife Biologist. Auditor qualifications shall be consistent with Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Audit Procedures and Qualifications (SFI APQ) 2005–2009 Edition. Detailed auditor background information is provided in Appendix 2.

Confidentiality and Conflict of Interest

All NSF-ISR auditors will maintain complete and strict confidentiality regarding all aspects of the audit. The Wisconsin DNR reserves the right to release NSF-ISR and its subcontractors from specific terms of this confidentiality agreement in writing. NSF-ISR will retain copies of the Wisconsin DNR's SFIS Indicators and evidence for its records, and audit team members may each retain a copy of the audit report.

All NSF audit team members will sign confidentiality agreements that include provisions regarding the avoidance of conflict of interest, including requirements of the SFI Standard. Prior to finalizing the audit team, the auditor and audit team members shall disclose to Wisconsin DNR any prior land appraisal or assessment work or land brokerage activity they or their employers conducted related to the property to be audited.

Audit Planning

A series of planning phone calls and emails between Wisconsin DNR's key staff and the lead auditors were completed from May through July. Preliminary field routes, forests and lands to be audited, sales to view, and the overall substance of the audit plan was discussed and agreed to.

Wisconsin DNR and the lead auditor also reviewed and came to agreement on the specific indicators of conformance that will be used to judge conformance with the SFI Standard. The lead auditor and audit team members will not introduce additional or modified indicators during the field audit. Agreement on the indicators of conformance is necessary to avoid surprises during the SFIS Certification Audit process.

Field Sites and Interviewees

Potential Field Visit Sites

The NSF-ISR audit team will inspect a variety of field sites to assess conformance with the SFI Standard. During audit planning the Lead Auditor and the Company's representative reviewed the range of field activities and formulated a sampling plan. The Lead Auditor and Company representatives first determined appropriate sample areas or geographic strata within which to sample field sites. The Lead Auditor then used randomized selection methods to select a subset of all available sales and assigned a priority number to each site.

Wisconsin DNR staff members worked with the lead auditor to designate the final selection list from this prioritized list. The final selection list is larger than the number of sites expected to be visited, allowing adjustments during the audit to ensure flexibility and allow for additional samples as needed. Local foresters will schedule appropriate field site visits in a manner that balances efficiency of travel routes, the priority number for sites, and factors designed to assure coverage of key issues under the SFI and FSC certification requirements. A preliminary list of field site selections is contained in Appendix 3.

Potential Audit Interviewees

Robert Hrubes, FSC lead auditor and SFI Audit Team member identified interviewees that may be contacted during the audit. Wisconsin DNR personnel helped develop a list and scheduled discussions with the audit team.

Other categories of people to be contacted directly by the audit team may include:

- Forestry Association staff;
- Staff or leadership of the SFI program State Implementation Committees;
- Wisconsin DNR's representatives on the SFI program State Implementation Committees;
- Law enforcement or regulatory personnel.

SFIS Certification Audit Schedule

The SFIS Certification Audit will be conducted August 12-14, 2009 commencing with an opening meeting at 8 a.m. in Madison in GEF 2, Room G09. The closing meeting will be 2 to 3:30 on August 14 at Black River State Forest. The schedule for the office and field audit to be performed by the NSF-ISR audit team is detailed in Appendix 1.

Audit Team Meeting

The NSF-ISR Audit Team will receive introductory materials in advance of the audit, and may have preliminary e-mail and telephone discussions regarding the assignments and logistics. The audit team will meet prior to conducting the audit to review the audit plan and make any final adjustments. This meeting will generally occur the night before the Opening Meeting.

Daily Briefings

Each day of the SFIS Certification Audit will begin with a brief opening meeting to document the day's schedule, responsibilities, and arrangements; to obtain any needed documents; and to answer other preliminary questions. Each day will conclude with a short closing meeting to review the day's findings, to confirm plans for the evening, and to plan for activities the following day.

Potential areas of minor or major non-conformance identified during the field audit will be discussed at the daily closing meeting. Additional evidence or field site investigations that could clarify the areas of non-conformance should be identified and prepared for the following day.

Dispute Resolution Process

The NSF Lead Auditor is responsible for making a recommendation for certification. The NSF Certification Review Board member will review the audit report, consider the Lead Auditor's recommendation, and make a final determination regarding certification.

In the event that there is a dispute between the lead auditor and the Wisconsin DNR over interpretations of the SFI Standard or any other aspect of the certification audit the first step is for the Program Participant's management representative to call the Audit Manager (888-NSF-9000) to resolve the dispute. If the dispute continues, the formal dispute resolution process of NSF-ISR (AE-989-0002) will be followed.

Reporting

Process for Preparation and Review of the Final Report

The lead auditor will prepare a draft report consistent with the format and contents outlined in the NSF-ISR SFIS Certification Process document. The lead auditor shall forward the draft final report to the Wisconsin DNR for a review of factual accuracy within two weeks of the Closing Meeting. The Wisconsin DNR will have up to four weeks to submit comments to the lead auditor. The lead auditor will incorporate appropriate suggestions from the Wisconsin DNR and then forward the Final Report to the NSF-ISR CB reviewer within one week of receipt of comments.

The CB reviewer will review the Final Report for thoroughness and completeness and shall make the final decision regarding continuing certification. Upon approval, the SFI Program Manager will send the Final Report to NSF and will ensure that a copy and certificate are issued to the Wisconsin DNR within eight weeks of the closing meeting. If additional time is required the SFI Program Manager and/or the Lead Auditor will so notify the Company.

Public Report

A public report must be provided to SFI Inc. for posting on their web site. This public report must be provided to SFI Inc. at least two weeks in advance of any public claims or statements about the results of the SFIS Certification Audit.

The content of the public report will be agreed to by NSF-ISR and the Wisconsin DNR to ensure that it captures all of the relevant findings. This public report will normally consist of the first section of the SFI Audit Report and shall include the following:

- Description of the audit process, objectives, and scope;
- Name of Program Participant that was audited, including its SFI representative;
- General description of the Program Participant's forestland and manufacturing operations included in the audit;
- Name of the audit firm and lead auditor (names of the audit team members, including technical experts may be included at the discretion of the audit team and Program Participant);
- Dates the certification was conducted and completed;
- Summary of the findings, including general descriptions of any non-conformances and corrective action plans to address them, opportunities for improvement, and exceptional practices; and

- Certification recommendation.

Final Report

In addition to the core elements of the Public Report described above, the Final Certification Report shall include the following:

- The Audit Plan including audit team personnel;
- Notification letter, including the audit dates; and
- The Audit Matrix and Notes pages.

Distribution of Reports

The final and summary reports are the sole property of the Wisconsin DNR. The distribution of the final and summary reports will be at the discretion of the Wisconsin DNR. Consistent with the requirements of the Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Audit Procedures and Qualifications (SFI APQ) 2005–2009 Edition, the Wisconsin DNR should submit a copy of the summary report to SFI Inc.

All working documents, draft and final and summary reports in the possession of the audit team members and lead auditor shall be destroyed at the end of the SFIS Certification Audit process, unless agreed to in writing by NSF-ISR and the Wisconsin DNR. NSF-ISR and the lead auditor shall retain one copy of all documents related to the SFIS Certification in permanent files for purposes of conducting surveillance audits and re-audits, and for other legitimate purposes.

Surveillance Audit Schedule

The periodic surveillance audits will generally be scheduled within twelve months of the initial audit, and will occur annually. A date for the 2010 audit will be set during the Closing Meeting if possible.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 Audit Schedule and Itinerary
- Appendix 2 Qualifications of Auditors
- Appendix 3 Potential Field Sites



Appendix 1A

DNR Lands Audit Schedule and Field Audit Routes

Schedule Overview (see following tables for details)

Tuesday, August 11

Auditors Travel to Madison, Wisconsin
Auditors meet in evening at hotel

Wed., August 12

Morning (start at 8 a.m. to 11 a.m.) - all
Meet with DNR Integrated Certification Implementation Team on CAR reports
Madison - DNR Building - Room G09

11 am through Afternoon
SW: Hrubes - Pingrey - Hoffman
Central: Hanowski - Mather - Feldkirchner
NE: Ferrucci - Prichard - Fitzgerald

Thurs., August 13

Hrubes - Pingrey - Hoffman
LaCrosse - Area Office (Room B19-B20) - 8:00 a.m. to 10:30 a.m.

Hanowski - Mather - Feldkirchner
Tomahawk - LeMay Center - 8:00 a.m. to 10:30 a.m. (Wisconsin Room)

Ferrucci - Prichard - Fitzgerald
Green Bay - Regional Hdqrs (Lake Michigan Room) - 8:00 a.m. to 10:30 a.m.

Friday, August 14

8 a.m. to early afternoon Auditors visit field sites as a group
1 p.m. to 2 p.m. Auditors meet privately to compile findings
2 p.m., adjourn by 3:30 p.m. Auditors provide a preliminary report

Dr. Robert J. Hrubes (cell 510-913-0696)
Mike Ferrucci – (cell 203-887-9248)
Teague Prichard (cell 608-628-5606)
Paul Pingrey – (cell 608-669-0327)
Bob Mather (cell ?)

Agenda - WI DNR State Lands FSC-SFI Annual Audit 2009 August 12 - 14, 2009

Date	Activity			
Wed., August 12				
Morning (start at 8 a.m. to 11 a.m.) - all	Meet with DNR Integrated Certification Implementation Team on CAR reports - Madison - DNR Building - Room G09			
Teams split		Hrubes - Pingrey - Hoffman	Hanowski - Mather - Feldkirchner	Ferrucci - Prichard - Fitzgerald
		SW	Central	NE
Afternoon		3 field stops Lower Wisconsin State Riverway (Peck's Landing, WP&L, Blue River Bottoms) and Wyalusing State Park (Madison-Wyalusing SP is 98 miles - 2 hrs; LaCrosse ~ 73 miles, 2 hrs)	WI Rapids - Quincy Bluff Natural Area and Roche-A-Cri State Park (native petroglyphs and mound access) in Adams Co. and Emmons Creek Fisheries Area in Portage Co. (Madison to Adams is 93 mi – about 2 hours ; Adams to Tomahawk is 116 mi – about 3 hours)	Fond du Lac-Manitowoc vicinity: Glacial Habitat Restoration Area Town of Waupun; Mullet Creek Wildlife Area; Collins Marsh Wildlife Area, Pt. Beach S.F. ; Madison-Fond du Lac is 74 miles (1 1/2 hours); there to Two Rivers is 61 mi (about 1 1/2 hours)
		Personnel: Hefty, Brian (Wyalusing Property Supervisor), Will, Ryder S (Wyalusing SP); Hutnik, Bradley M (DNR Forester), Carlson, William L (Forestry Team Leader)	Personnel: Greg Dahl (Area Wildlife Supervisor), Steve Courtney (Area Forestry Leader) Joe Stecker Kochanski (Park Manager) and Nina Stensburg (Forester), Tom Meronek (Fisheries), Shirley Bargander (Forestry Team Leader) & others.	Personnel: Sue Crowley (FR Manitowoc), Tom Vanden Elzen (FR Fond du lac), Ron Jones (FR Area Forestry Leader), Curt Wilson (Regional Forestry Leader), Aaron Buchholz (Wildlife Biologist), Guy Willman (PBSF Superintendent), Bryon Woodbury (Wildlife Biologist)

		Hotel: (Hrubes - Pingrey - Hoffman) Holiday Inn, 200 PEARL STREET, LA CROSSE, WI 54601; phone (877) 863-4780; Conf. Code 60051220	Hotel: (Hanowski - Mather - Feldkirchner) Rodeway Inn & Suites, 1738 Comfort Drive, Tomahawk; phone 715-453-8900; Conf. Code 144691	Hotel: (Ferrucci - Prichard - Fitzgerald) Settle Inn, 2620 South Packerland Drive Green Bay WI 54213; phone 1-920-499-1900; Conf Codes 148176, 148177, 148178
--	--	---	---	---

Thurs., August 13				
Teams split		Hrubes - Pingrey - Hoffman	Hanowski - Mather - Feldkirchner	Ferrucci - Prichard - Fitzgerald
Morning	Auditors hold "Program Review" type meetings	LaCrosse - Area Office (Room B19-B20) - 8:00 a.m. to 10:30 a.m.	Tomahawk - LeMay Center - 8:00 a.m. to 10:30 a.m. (Wisconsin Room)	Green Bay - Regional Hdqrs (Lake Michigan Room) - 8:00 a.m. to 10:30 a.m.
		Personnel: Kris Belling (Wildlife Regional Program Manager), Tim Babros (Wildlife Area Supervisor), Jean Rygiel (Parks Regional Program Manager), Joe Stecker-Kochanski (Buckhorn SP Manager), Armund Bartz (ER Conservation Biologist), Dave Vetrano (Fisheries Team Supervisor), Craig Thompson (Regional Land Leader), Arvid Haugen (West Central Regional Forester). Greg Edge (Area Forestry Leader - La Crosse)	Personnel: Tom Duke (Regional Forestry Staff Supervisor), Gary Bartz (Facilities and Lands Field Manager), Jeff Olsen - (State Forest Management Supervisor), Steve Ave'Lallemant (Fisheries Supervisor), Paul Bruggink (Facilities and Lands Supervisor), Bill Smith (Regional Lands Leader), Dawn Bishop (State Park Superintendent), Chuck McCullough (Antigo Area Lands Supervisor)	Personnel: Curt Wilson, (Regional Forestry Leader), Ron Jones (Lake Shore Area Forestry Leader), Shelley Wrzochalski (Forester for Brown and Kewaunee County), Jeff Pritzl (Regional Wildlife Supervisor), Joe Henry (Regional Ecologist), Dick Nikolai (Wildlife Biologist), Arnie Lindauer (Regional Park Supervisor)
Afternoon	Auditors visit a selection of field sites	Coon Creek Fishery Area (Neprud property project - Vernon County), Jersey Valley property (State owned but operated by Vernon County -- Recreational issues, dam failure, and a timber sale), Wildcat Mountain SP -Ontario; Mill Bluff State Park in Monroe County (If time allows); Note: Al Crossley to join team at Wildcat?	DNR Properties in Lincoln & Langlade Counties - Menard Island (wild rivers resource management area) - Lincoln County; Peters Marsh (wildlife area) - Langlade County; Upper Wolf River (fisheries area) - Langlade County	Menominee Natural Resources Area - Pembine (managed "old-growth"), Peshigo River SF ; (Green Bay-Pembine: 90 miles about 2 hours); (MNRA to PRSF - 45 mi, 1hr 20 min.)

		<p>Personnel: Coon Creek: Dave Vetrano - fisheries - property mgr. - lead. Craig Thompson - Regional Land Leader, Arvid Haugen - Regional Forestry Leader , Greg Edge - LaCrosse Area Forester, Armund Bartz - Regional Ecologist , Dennis Hutchison - Vernon Co. Forester, Joel Jepsen - 2nd Vernon Co. Forester, a partner from Vernon Co. Parks and Forestry (most likely Adam Zirbel); Ron Campbell - WCM Park Supt., Lenore Schroeder - Park Supervisor, Kevin Schilling - Monroe Co. Forester</p>	<p>Personnel: Tom Duke (Regional Forestry Staff Supervisor), Gary Bartz (Facilities and Lands Field Manager), Andy Shaney (Forester/Ranger), Ron Zalewski (Forester/Ranger), Rick Wiede (Wildlife Biologist), Dave Beer (Forester/Ranger), Eric Borchert (Wildlife Technician), Dave Seibel (Fisheries Biologist), Terry Trapp (Forester Ranger)</p>	<p>Personnel: Dan Mertz (PRSF Property Manager), John Lubbers (Regional Forestry Staff Sup), Mike Folger (Area Forestry Leader), Cole Couvillion (Forestry Team Leader-Wausaukee), Curt Wilson (Regional Forestry Leader), Dave Halfmann (Wildlife Biologist), Joe Henry (Regional Ecologist), Aaron McCullough (Wildlife Tech), Craig Leitzke (Facilities and Lands Tech LTE); Djupstrom, Bruce (Forester/Ranger Pembine)</p>
Evening	All auditors converge on WI Rapids	Stay at Black River: Holiday Inn Express	Stay at Black River: Holiday Inn Express	Stay at Black River: Holiday Inn Express
		<p>Hotel: (Hrubes - Pingrey - Hoffman) Holiday Inn Express Hotel & Suites, W10170 HIGHWAY 54 E BLACK RIVER FALLS, WI 54615; phone (715) 284-0888; Conf. #60059104</p>	<p>Hotel: (Hanowski - Mather - Feldkirchner) Holiday Inn Express Hotel & Suites, W10170 HIGHWAY 54 E BLACK RIVER FALLS, WI 54615; phone (715) 284-0888; Conf. #60059104</p>	<p>Hotel: (Ferrucci - Prichard - Fitzgerald) Holiday Inn Express Hotel & Suites, W10170 HIGHWAY 54 E BLACK RIVER FALLS, WI 54615; phone (715) 284-0888; Conf. #60059104</p>

Friday, August 14				
8 a.m. to early afternoon	Auditors visit field sites as a group	Black River State Forest 8:00 All three teams meet with BRSF staff. Conduct 45 minute update on current status of draft master plan and proposed changes. 9:00 Leave for field. A property wide map with sites identified will be provided to the audit team. Visit proposed Jack Pine Habitat Management Area (barrens restoration - new in draft master plan). Visit Motorized trail/wetland interface sites where work is actively being done to meet Department wetland standards. Visit as many of the six "high priority" timber sales as time and travel route allows (probably will only have time for 2-4). 1:00 Return to BRF office (get fast-food lunch on the way to eat at office)		
		Personnel: Peter Bakken (superintendent), Adam Wallace (forester), Jennifer Boice (forester), Armund Bartz (Conservation Biologist) NOTE: Due to a previously scheduled personal commitment, Peter will only be participating for a couple hours in the AM.		
1 p.m. to 2 p.m.	Auditors meet privately to compile findings	Black River Falls - DNR Office - West Room	Black River Falls - DNR Office - West Room	Black River Falls - DNR Office - West Room
2 p.m., adjourn by 3:30 p.m.	Auditors provide a preliminary report	Black River Falls - DNR Office - West Room	Black River Falls - DNR Office - West Room	Black River Falls - DNR Office - West Room
Post Audit		Hrubes to Des Moines, Ia (320 mi – about 5 hours 6 mins) ROBERT NEEDS A RIDE TO CAR RENTAL IN LA CROSSE (Greg Edge?)	Ferrucci & Hanowski to Eau Claire - start County Forest Audit on Monday	



Appendix 1B

Qualifications of Auditors

Michael Ferrucci, SFI Lead Auditor

Michael Ferrucci is a founding partner and President of Interforest, LLC, and a partner in Ferrucci & Walicki, LLC, a land management company that has served private landowners in southern New England for 18 years. Its clients include private citizens, land trusts, municipalities, corporations, private water companies, and non-profit organizations. He has a B.Sc. degree in forestry from the University of Maine and a Master of Forestry degree from the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies.

Mr. Ferrucci's primary expertise is in management of watershed forests to provide timber, drinking water, and the protection of other values; in forest inventory and timber appraisal; hardwood forest silviculture and marketing; and the ecology and silviculture of natural forests of the eastern United States. He also lectures on private sector forestry, leadership, and forest resource management at the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies.

Robert J. Hrubes, Ph.D., FSC Lead Auditor

Dr. Hrubes is a California registered professional forester (#2228) and forest economist with over 30 years of professional experience in both public and public forest management issues. He is presently Senior Vice-President of Scientific Certification Systems. In addition to serving as team leader for the Wisconsin state forestlands evaluation, Dr. Hrubes worked in collaboration with other SCS personnel to develop the programmatic protocol that guides all SCS Forest Conservation Program evaluations.

Dr. Hrubes has previously led numerous SCS Forest Conservation Program evaluations of North American public forests, industrial forest ownerships and non-industrial forests, as well as operations in Scandinavia, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Australia and New Zealand.

Dr. Hrubes holds graduate degrees in forest economics, economics and resource systems management from the University of California-Berkeley and the University of Michigan. His professional forestry degree (B.S.F. with double major in Outdoor Recreation) was awarded from Iowa State University. He was employed for 14 years, in a variety of positions ranging from research forester to operations research analyst to planning team leader, by the USDA Forest Service. Upon leaving federal service, he entered private consulting from 1988 to 2000. He has been Senior V.P. at SCS since February, 2000.

JoAnn Hanowski, M.Sc., Audit Team Member; Biology/Ecology Specialist-

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

and participated on the wildlife technical team that wrote forest management guidelines for Minnesota. She is a participant in a 14-year project for monitoring avian populations on the Chequamegon National Forest. She is currently a member of the riparian science technical committee that is investigating the effectiveness of Minnesota's current guidelines for forest management in riparian systems. She has published 64 peer-reviewed journal articles and over 75 reports in her 21 year tenure with the University of Minnesota. In 2005 JoAnn participated in the largest forest certification project ever conducted in the United States, the joint FSC/SFI certification of Minnesota's state lands. In 2006 and 2006 JoAnn added regional ecological expertise to the annual surveillance audits of the MN DNR's FSC and SFI certificates.



Appendix 1C

Potential Field Visit Sites

Details provided separately.

Property Name	Sale #	Tract #	Town	Range	Section	Stand #	Primary Type	Proposed Acres	Proposed Even Aged Acres	Proposed Uneven Aged or Thin Acres	Established Date	Sold Date	Closed Date
PESHTIGO RIVER STATE FOREST	5	2	32	19E	09	18	PR	18	126	22	1-Apr-08	20-Jun-08	
PESHTIGO RIVER STATE FOREST	5	2	32	19E	09	24	OX	19	126	22	1-Apr-08	20-Jun-08	
PESHTIGO RIVER STATE FOREST	5	2	32	19E	09	14	OX	4	126	22	1-Apr-08	20-Jun-08	
PESHTIGO RIVER STATE FOREST	5	2	32	19E	09	30	OX	107	126	22	1-Apr-08	20-Jun-08	
PESHTIGO RIVER STATE FOREST	6	1	32	19E	04	17	A	7	117	17	30-May-07	20-Jun-08	
PESHTIGO RIVER STATE FOREST	6	1	32	19E	04	18	OX	7	117	17	30-May-07	20-Jun-08	
PESHTIGO RIVER STATE FOREST	6	1	32	19E	04	16	PR	4	117	17	30-May-07	20-Jun-08	

PESHTIGO RIVER STATE FOREST	6	1	32	19E	04	15	OX	9	117	17	30-May-07	20-Jun-08
PESHTIGO RIVER STATE FOREST	6	1	32	19E	04	13	PR	3	117	17	30-May-07	20-Jun-08
PESHTIGO RIVER STATE FOREST	6	1	32	19E	04	12	O	8	117	17	30-May-07	20-Jun-08
PESHTIGO RIVER STATE FOREST	6	1	32	19E	04	10	MR	61	117	17	30-May-07	20-Jun-08
PESHTIGO RIVER STATE FOREST	6	1	32	19E	04	14	OX	25	117	17	30-May-07	20-Jun-08
PESHTIGO RIVER STATE FOREST	7	4	32	18E	03	18	OX	28	28	67	1-Apr-08	20-Jun-08
PESHTIGO RIVER STATE FOREST	7	4	32	18E	03	14	PR	17	28	67	1-Apr-08	20-Jun-08
PESHTIGO RIVER STATE FOREST	7	4	32	18E	03	16	PJ	10	28	67	1-Apr-08	20-Jun-08
PESHTIGO RIVER STATE FOREST	7	4	32	18E	03	10	PR	40	28	67	1-Apr-08	20-Jun-08
PESHTIGO RIVER STATE FOREST	5	2	32	19E	09	18	PR	18	126	22	1-Apr-08	20-Jun-08

BLACK RIVER STATE FOREST	1086	1	22	02W	05	8	PJ	4	34		17-Oct-08	18-Nov-08	11-Mar-08
BLACK RIVER STATE FOREST	1086	1	22	02W	05	1	PJ	30	34		17-Oct-08	18-Nov-08	11-Mar-08
BLACK RIVER STATE FOREST	1085	22	20	02W	08	4	PW	3	17		29-Apr-08	5-Jun-08	29-Oct-08
BLACK RIVER STATE FOREST	1085	22	20	02W	08	1	PR	9	17		29-Apr-08	5-Jun-08	29-Oct-08
BLACK RIVER STATE FOREST	1085	22	20	02W	08	3	PW	5	17		29-Apr-08	5-Jun-08	29-Oct-08
BLACK RIVER STATE FOREST	1081	17	20	02W	11	13	O	12		89	15-May-08	30-May-08	25-Sep-08
BLACK RIVER STATE FOREST	1081	17	20	02W	11	1	PW	40		89	15-May-08	30-May-08	25-Sep-08
BLACK RIVER STATE FOREST	1081	17	20	02W	11	3	PR	37		89	15-May-08	30-May-08	25-Sep-08
BLACK RIVER STATE FOREST	1087	2	20	02W	04	7	PJ	15	46	97	16-Oct-08	18-Nov-08	
BLACK RIVER STATE FOREST	1087	2	20	02W	04	11	OO	12	46	97	16-Oct-08	18-Nov-08	

BLACK RIVER STATE FOREST	1079	15	22	03W	01	6	PR	92		92	29-Apr-08	30-May-08	30-Oct-08
BLACK RIVER STATE FOREST	1080	16	20	02W	06	13	OX	84	115		29-Apr-08	30-May-08	3-Nov-08
BLACK RIVER STATE FOREST	1080	16	20	02W	06	10	PR	31	115		29-Apr-08	30-May-08	3-Nov-08
BLACK RIVER STATE FOREST	1092	7	20	02W	31	11	OX	78	79	31	16-Oct-08	18-Nov-08	BLACK RIVER STATE FOREST
BLACK RIVER STATE FOREST	1092	7	20	02W	31	16	OO	31	79	31	16-Oct-08	18-Nov-08	BLACK RIVER STATE FOREST

Note: Other state lands sales to be added later.

Appendix II



Corrective Action Requests

2008 Corrective and Preventive Action Request (CAR)

Company/Location: <u>Wisconsin State Forest System</u>	Date: <u>September 19, 2008</u> FRS # <u>1Y941</u>
Auditor: <u>Mike Ferrucci</u>	CAR Number: <u>SFI-2008-01</u>
Location of Finding: <u>Many lands lacking Master Plans</u>	Previous CAR Number/Date: <u>N.A.</u>
Discussed with: <u>Wisconsin DNR staff at closing meeting</u>	Nonconformance Type (underline): Major <u>Minor</u>

AUDITOR FINDING: Standard Number and Clause: 2005-2009 Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard® Indicator 1.1.1 requires “A long-term resource analysis to guide forest management planning at a level appropriate to the size and scale of the operation, including: a periodic or ongoing forest inventory; b. a land classification system; c. soils inventory and maps, where available; d. access to growth-and-yield modeling capabilities; e. up-to-date maps or a geographic information system (GIS); f. recommended sustainable harvest levels; and g. a review of nontimber issues (e.g., pilot projects and economic incentive programs to promote water protection, carbon storage, or biological diversity conservation).”

Description: Master Planning for lands administered by the Land Division (Parks, Wildlife Areas, Fisheries Areas, Recreation Corridors, other misc. categories) is out-of-date or incomplete. Sub-requirements a. through f. are met by regularly updated documents or programs. WDNR is seeking additional resources to meet a 10 to 12 year timeline for completion of Tier 1 and Tier 2 Master Plans. Interim provisions for meeting the overall intent of the SFI requirements (“A long-term resource analysis to guide forest management planning at a level appropriate to the size and scale of the operation...”) are incomplete for most areas without a recent Master Plan.

IF NECESSARY, PLEASE ATTACH A SEPARATE REPORT ADDRESSING THE FOLLOWING THREE ITEMS:

1) ROOT CAUSE ANALYSIS BY COMPANY—Include potential causes & assurance problem does not exist in other areas.
Past Department master planning efforts, constrained by budget and staffing limitations, have focused on high public use properties. Demands from other projects such as addressing Chronic Wasting Disease, reorganization and budget reductions had also diverted energy from master planning. Past master planning processes relied heavily on the central office to draft plans, but the master planning process has been streamlined and positions will be filled within funding constraints.

2) CORRECTIVE ACTION BY COMPANY – Based on the Root Cause Analysis, the following action has been planned/taken to correct the problem. Please include expected completion date.
By the time of the first annual audit after award of certification, the Department will develop preliminary land management objectives for all DNR-managed properties, either for individual tracts or groups that do not currently have master plans. Sideboards established in statutes, rules, and the recently approved Manual Code on deferral consultation will be referenced. The Department will articulate the property objectives to the public and invite comments via the Internet.

3) PREVENTIVE ACTION BY COMPANY – Based on the Root Cause Analysis, the following action has been planned/taken to correct the problem. Please include expected completion date.
The Department has adopted streamlined state master planning policies. Significant progress has been made in the last year to identify property groups and to lay out strategies to complete plans for all DNR properties over the next ten-twelve years. Part of the formula includes receiving more master planning resources in the state budget, and the Department is committed to filling planner positions and moving ahead to the best of our ability.

AUDITOR REVIEW OF COMPANY’S PLAN:
The plan is comprehensive and responsive to the finding; implementation will be the focus of the 2009 Surveillance Audit.
 STATUS: Open AUDITOR/DATE: Mike Ferrucci, December 17, 2008

AUDITOR REVIEW OF COMPANY’S COMPLETED ACTION:
Significant progress has been made, but much of the work has not been brought to logical conclusion: development of final documents and posting or other forms of communication to staff and to the public.
 STATUS: Elevated to Major Non-conformance SFI-2009-01 AUDITOR/DATE: Mike Ferrucci, August 14, 2009

STATUS LEGEND:

OPEN = CA Plan Accepted **CLOSED** = CA implemented, verified & accepted **REJECTED** = C/A Plan or Implementation rejected

2008 Corrective and Preventive Action Request (CAR)

Company/Location: <u>Wisconsin State Forest System</u>	Date: <u>September 19, 2008</u> FRS # <u>1Y941</u>
Auditor: <u>Mike Ferrucci</u>	CAR Number: <u>SFI-2008-02</u>
Location of Finding: <u>Administrative</u>	Previous CAR Number/Date: <u>N.A.</u>
Discussed with: <u>Wisconsin DNR staff at closing meeting</u>	Nonconformance Type (underline): Major <u>Minor</u>

AUDITOR FINDING: Standard Number and Clause: 2005-2009 Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard® Indicator 10.1.2 requires “Assignment and understanding of roles and responsibilities for achieving SFI Standard objectives.”

Description: Roles and responsibilities for achieving SFI Standard Objectives are not well understood, particularly in field positions within the Land Division.

IF NECESSARY, PLEASE ATTACH A SEPARATE REPORT ADDRESSING THE FOLLOWING THREE ITEMS:

1) ROOT CAUSE ANALYSIS BY COMPANY—Include potential causes & assurance problem does not exist in other areas. DNR certification scope expansion from State Forests to most DNR-managed land is a recent development. While Division of Forestry and Division of Land personnel associated with State Forests had a longer exposure since 2003 to forest certification, other Department staff have not been involved until now. Online certification orientation materials were offered to Land Division staff prior to the field audit, but the short lead time prevented wide coverage or discussion.

2) CORRECTIVE ACTION BY COMPANY – Based on the Root Cause Analysis, the following action has been planned/taken to correct the problem. Please include expected completion date.
By May 15, 2009, the Department will expand forest certification orientation to all field managers using a combination of informational tools including newsletters, meetings and web pages. The Department will develop a manual code and relevant handbook revisions to clearly lay out a commitment to SFI and FSC forest certification criteria and indicators, including a description of roles for various teams and individuals. [See the November DNR FLT/LLT issue brief on forest certification policy development.]

3) PREVENTIVE ACTION BY COMPANY – Based on the Root Cause Analysis, the following action has been planned/taken to correct the problem. Please include expected completion date.
This non-conformance will be addressed through ongoing training and oversight by Department management teams.

AUDITOR REVIEW OF COMPANY’S PLAN:
The plan is comprehensive and responsive to the finding; implementation will be reviewed during the 2009 Surveillance Audit.
 STATUS: Open AUDITOR/DATE: Mike Ferrucci, December 17, 2008

AUDITOR REVIEW OF COMPANY’S COMPLETED ACTION:
A Forest Certification Implementation Team has been developed to work on certification issues (CAR responses) and to coordinate all aspects of certification. Active participation has included staff from all involved agencies across both DNR Divisions, Lands and Forests.
 STATUS: Closed AUDITOR/DATE: Mike Ferrucci, August 14, 2009

STATUS LEGEND:

OPEN = CA Plan Accepted **CLOSED** = CA implemented, verified & accepted **REJECTED** = C/A Plan or Implementation rejected

2008 Corrective and Preventive Action Request (CAR)

<p>Company/Location: <u>Wisconsin State Forest System</u></p> <p>Auditor: <u>Mike Ferrucci</u></p> <p>Location of Finding: <u>determined in field, confirmed centrally</u></p> <p>Discussed with: <u>Wisconsin DNR staff at closing meeting</u></p>	<p>Date: <u>September 19, 2008</u> FRS # <u>1Y941</u></p> <p>CAR Number: <u>SFI-2008-03</u></p> <p>Previous CAR Number/Date: <u>N.A.</u></p> <p>Nonconformance Type (underline): Major <u>Minor</u></p>
<p>AUDITOR FINDING: Standard Number and Clause: 2005-2009 Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard® Indicator 6.1.1 requires “Use of existing natural heritage data and expert advice in identifying or selecting sites for protection because of their ecologically, geologically, historically, or culturally important qualities.”</p> <p>Description: Natural Heritage Inventory (NHI) forms a critical part of the WDNR system for planning all projects and timber sales, but data entry for the NHI database is backlogged, and it is not clear that known sites are protected despite the backlog.</p>	

IF NECESSARY, PLEASE ATTACH A SEPARATE REPORT ADDRESSING THE FOLLOWING THREE ITEMS:

1) ROOT CAUSE ANALYSIS BY COMPANY—Include potential causes & assurance problem does not exist in other areas. The Natural Heritage Inventory (NHI) Program is responsible for managing data on the locations of rare species, natural communities, and other select natural features in Wisconsin. For Other State Lands (OSL), state-managed lands that are not state forests, records are mapped according to these priorities: 1) federal and state threatened and endangered species, 2) state properties that are in the process or are about to undergo master planning, and 3) other records as resources allow. (Mapping includes everything needed to incorporate data into the NHI database: both GIS and tabular components as well as quality control using standardized methodology).

Due to personnel and funding shortages, a “backlog” of unmapped records, comprised mainly of data that do not fall into categories 1 and 2 above, exists for several properties. The backlog includes data from surveys conducted or coordinated by BER, as well as: updates to existing / historical records; records submitted by department staff and others (especially natural communities and Special Concern species); and records from various reports and larger survey initiatives such as the Wisconsin Breeding Bird Atlas that will require further investigation, synthesis, and quality control work.

Backlogged records are not available in the NHI Portal, the official department tool for screening for potential impacts to rare species. Often, the backlogged data require interpretation to verify species identification, location, and other associated information before being mapped.

2) CORRECTIVE ACTION BY COMPANY – Based on the Root Cause Analysis, the following action has been planned/taken to correct the problem. Please include expected completion date.

To inform adaptive management on OSL prior to mapping in the NHI database, the Bureau of Endangered Resources will notify property managers of new species / community hits that have been identified during current inventory efforts but are not yet in the NHI database. Managers are encouraged to work with their Regional Ecologists to interpret this information.

The department has started pre-master planning work for a number of OSL, including biotic inventory work conducted by NHI. Thirteen properties were surveyed in 2008 and another 23 are scheduled for 2009-2010. Backlogged records will be mapped along with new records for these properties. This work is planned to continue concurrent with the department master planning schedule.

3) PREVENTIVE ACTION BY COMPANY – Based on the Root Cause Analysis, the following action has been planned/taken to correct the problem. Please include expected completion date.

As part of a larger budget request, BER submitted a request outlining a strategy for reducing the backlog. However, this initiative was not part of the budget request submitted by the department, and we do not anticipate additional funds being made available for this work, given the state’s \$5.4 billion anticipated shortfall. The budget request will be resubmitted at the next opportunity.

AUDITOR REVIEW OF COMPANY’S PLAN:

The plan is responsive to the finding; implementation will be reviewed during the 2009 Surveillance Audit.

STATUS: Open AUDITOR/DATE: Mike Ferrucci, December 17, 2008

AUDITOR REVIEW OF COMPANY’S COMPLETED ACTION:

The actions described above have been substantially completed. The audit team is comfortable with the current approach to ensuring that heritage data is available to land managers and decision-makers in a timely fashion. Challenges in updating the heritage database appear to be back to normal levels; some delays are to be expected in this continuously-expanding database.

STATUS: Closed AUDITOR/DATE: Mike Ferrucci, August 14, 2009

STATUS LEGEND:

OPEN = CA Plan Accepted **CLOSED** = CA implemented, verified & accepted **REJECTED** = C/A Plan or Implementation rejected

2009 NSF-ISR SFI Corrective Action and Preventative Action Request (CAR)

Company/Location: <u>Wisconsin DNR State Lands</u>	Date: <u>August 14, 2009</u> FRS # <u>1Y941</u>
Auditor: <u>Mike Ferrucci</u>	CAR Number: <u>SFI-2009-01</u>
Location of Finding: <u>Overall</u>	Previous CAR Number/Date: <u>2008.1</u>
Discussed with: <u>Paul Pingrey, others</u>	Nonconformance Type (underline): <u>Major</u> Minor

AUDITOR FINDING: Standard Number and Clause: 2005-2009 Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard® Indicator 1.1.1 requires “A long-term resource analysis to guide forest management planning at a level appropriate to the size and scale of the operation, including: a. periodic or ongoing forest inventory; b. a land classification system; c. soils inventory and maps, where available; d. access to growth-and-yield modeling capabilities; e. up-to-date maps or a geographic information system (GIS); f. recommended sustainable harvest levels; and g. a review of nontimber issues (e.g., pilot projects and economic incentive programs to promote water protection, carbon storage, or biological diversity conservation).”

Description: While much progress has been made in compiling property-specific objectives, this information has not been adequately compiled nor made available to the public or to staff in useful format. The approved 2008.1 SFI CAR plan specified “the Department will develop preliminary land management objectives for all DNR-managed properties”. This has not been done. Note: Must be closed by 12.30.09.

IF NECESSARY, PLEASE ATTACH A SEPARATE REPORT ADDRESSING THE FOLLOWING THREE ITEMS:

1) ROOT CAUSE ANALYSIS BY COMPANY—Include potential causes & assurance problem does not exist in other areas.

As was described for CAR SFI-2008-01, state property master planning efforts have been affected by many factors including budget, staffing, and other high priority work. As noted above, substantial work was made during Jan-Aug 2009 to address CAR 2008.1, but only eight months had transpired between issuance of the SFI certificate in January and the annual review in August. Considering the number of DNR properties involved, WI DNR needs a few more months to complete the related tasks.

2) CORRECTIVE ACTION BY COMPANY – Based on the Root Cause Analysis, the following action has been planned/taken to correct the problem. Please include expected completion date.

By December 30, 2009, DNR will:

- a) Post property Internet pages with land management objective information for most Tier 1 and Tier 2 DNR properties. (Small Tier 3 property objectives that are not individually listed on the Internet would be covered by the program-wide statements described under “c”, below.)
- b) Develop a timely schedule for updating the remainder.
- c) Provide program-wide statements of objectives for each Land bureau's property and post them on the Internet.

3) PREVENTIVE ACTION BY COMPANY – Based on the Root Cause Analysis, the following action has been planned/taken to correct the problem. Please include expected completion date.

The Department has adopted streamlined state master planning policies. Significant progress is being made to complete plans for DNR properties over the next ten-fifteen years. State budget cuts due to a state tax revenue crisis will, however, be a constraining factor.

AUDITOR REVIEW OF COMPANY’S PLAN:

This plan resolves the issues identified in the CAR. Proof of appropriate corrective actions needed by December 20, 2009.

STATUS: Open AUDITOR/DATE: September 18, 2009

AUDITOR REVIEW OF COMPANY’S COMPLETED ACTION:

STATUS: _____ AUDITOR/DATE: _____

STATUS LEGEND:

OPEN = CA Plan Accepted **CLOSED** = CA implemented, verified & accepted **REJECTED** = C/A Plan or Implementation Rejected

2009 NSF-ISR SFI Corrective Action and Preventative Action Request (CAR)

Company/Location: <u>Wisconsin DNR State Lands</u>	Date: <u>August 14, 2009</u> FRS # <u>1Y941</u>
Auditor: <u>Mike Ferrucci</u>	CAR Number: <u>SFI-2009-02</u>
Location of Finding: <u>Lands Division</u>	Previous CAR Number/Date: <u>N.A.</u>
Discussed with: <u>Paul Pingrey, others</u>	Nonconformance Type (underline): Major <u>Minor</u>

AUDITOR FINDING: Standard Number and Clause: SFI Indicator 2.2.5 “Supervision of forest chemical applications by state-trained or certified applicators.”

Description: Lands Division policies regarding staff who apply general use chemicals but who may not be Certified Pesticide Applicators (and thus may not be trained) are unclear. Not all employees applying chemicals are trained or working under a trained supervisor.

IF NECESSARY, PLEASE ATTACH A SEPARATE REPORT ADDRESSING THE FOLLOWING THREE ITEMS:

1) ROOT CAUSE ANALYSIS BY COMPANY–Include potential causes & assurance problem does not exist in other areas. Wisconsin DNR establishes pesticide use training requirements in Manual Code 4230.1. Unfortunately, wording of the Manual Code is vague, requiring staff to research regulations from the Wisconsin Dept. of Agriculture to determine who needs to be a licensed applicator. The Manual Code also does not describe simpler, basic pesticide training the Department should provide to applicators that are not required to be licensed.

2) CORRECTIVE ACTION BY COMPANY – Based on the Root Cause Analysis, the following action has been planned/taken to correct the problem. Please include expected completion date.

By December 30, 2009, WI DNR will:

- a) Revise Manual Code 4230.1 in respect to consistent pesticide training requirements and implement the changes by Land and Forestry Division Administrator directives pending the DNR Secretary signing the revision.
- b) Create a DNR Intranet page with training requirements and pesticide use information.
- c) Inform DNR managers and staff of the pesticide use training policy through an internal newsletter.

3) PREVENTIVE ACTION BY COMPANY – Based on the Root Cause Analysis, the following action has been planned/taken to correct the problem. Please include expected completion date.

WI DNR is also working on other comprehensive changes to chemical and pesticide use Manual Codes and a related training plan. Those efforts are described in the report for FSC CAR 2008.6.

AUDITOR REVIEW OF COMPANY’S PLAN:

This plan resolves the issues identified in the CAR. Proof of appropriate corrective actions needed by the next annual audit.

STATUS: Open AUDITOR/DATE: September 18, 2009

AUDITOR REVIEW OF COMPANY’S COMPLETED ACTION:

STATUS: _____ AUDITOR/DATE: _____

STATUS LEGEND:

OPEN = CA Plan Accepted

CLOSED = CA implemented, verified & accepted

REJECTED = C/A Plan or Implementation Rejected

Appendix III



Draft: SFI Public Surveillance Audit Report

The SFI Program of the Wisconsin DNR has achieved continuing conformance with the SFI Standard®, 2005-2009 Edition, according to the NSF-ISR SFIS Certification Audit Process.

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

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

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

Audit Procedure

This report describes the first annual follow-up Surveillance Audit designed to focus on changes in the standard, changes in operations, the management review system, and efforts at continuous improvement. In addition, a subset of SFI requirements were selected for detailed review. The Surveillance Audit was performed by NSF-ISR on August 12-14 by an audit team headed by Mike Ferrucci, SFI Lead Auditor. The other members of the audit team included Robert Hrubes, FSC Lead Auditor and Forester, and JoAnn Hanowski, Wildlife Biologist/Avian Ecologist. Audit team members fulfill the qualification criteria for conducting SFIS Certification Audits contained in the Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Audit Procedures and Qualifications (SFI APQ) 2005–2009 Edition. The Wisconsin DNR’s management

representative is Paul E. Pingrey, Forest Certification Coordinator, Wisconsin DNR - Division of Forestry.

The objective of the audit was to assess ongoing conformance of the firm's SFI Program to the requirements of the Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Standard, 2005-2009 Edition. The audit was conducted in conjunction with an FSC audit covering the same lands and organization and by the same audit team. The two processes (SFI and FSC) shared teams and reviewed much of the same evidence, but each program had a different team leader and audit objectives. This report is intended to describe the SFI portion of the evaluation only (more information about the FSC portion of the evaluation is available from WDNR).

The Indicators and Performance Measures of the 2005-2009 Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard ® were utilized without modification or substitution. As with the initial certification, SFI Performance Measures and indicators involving wood procurement (Objective 8) were outside of the scope of the Wisconsin DNR's SFI program and were excluded from the scope of the SFI Certification Audit.

The audit was governed by an audit plan and accompanying NSF audit protocols designed to enable the audit team determine conformance with the applicable SFI requirements. The process included the assembly and review of audit evidence consisting of documents, interviews, and on-site inspections of ongoing or completed forest practices. Documents describing these activities and lists of management activities were provided to the auditors in advance, and a sample of the available field sites was designated by the lead auditor for review. The selection of field sites for inspection based upon the risk of environmental impact, likelihood of occurrence, special features, and other criteria outlined in the NSF-ISR SFI-SOP.

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

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

An Overview of Forest Management on Wisconsin State Forests

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

“Wisconsin DNR lands are managed for multiple-use objectives. Along with non-timber objectives, the DNR lands are used to demonstrate various forest practices to the public, while meeting a variety of habitat objectives. Resource managers within the Department of Natural Resources use these objectives in conjunction with other demands to manage each state forest as a healthy ecosystem. Each year about 1 % of the land under DNR ownership is actively managed according to a 2007 report to the Wisconsin Legislature. In the last three years, an average of 14,985 acres were established for harvest per year. Of this, two-thirds of the harvests occur on State Forests (which constitute 1/3 of the DNR land base). Reflecting a greater focus on non-timber objectives, other DNR land such as wildlife areas and state parks (with 2/3 of the land base) produce 1/3 of the average annual harvest acreage.

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

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

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

Audit Findings

Wisconsin DNR's SFI Program was found to be in overall conformance with the SFIS Standard. The NSF-ISR SFI Certification Audit Process determined that there were two non-conformances as detailed below.

Major Non-conformance SFI-2009-01:

Indicator 1.1.1 requires "A long-term resource analysis to guide forest management planning at a level appropriate to the size and scale of the operation, including: a. periodic or ongoing forest inventory; b. a land classification system; c. soils inventory and maps, where available; d. access to growth-and-yield modeling capabilities; e. up-to-date maps or a geographic information system (GIS); f. recommended sustainable harvest levels; and g. a review of nontimber issues (e.g., pilot projects and economic incentive programs to promote water protection, carbon storage, or biological diversity conservation)."

In 2008 the audit team found that Master Planning for lands administered by the Lands Division (Parks, Wildlife Areas, Fisheries Areas, Recreation Corridors, other misc. categories) is out-of-date or incomplete. Sub-requirements a. through f. are met by regularly updated documents or programs. WDNR is seeking additional resources to meet a 10 to 12 year timeline for completion of Tier 1 and Tier 2 Master Plans. Interim provisions for meeting the overall intent of the SFI requirements ("A long-term resource analysis to guide forest management planning at a level appropriate to the size and scale of the operation...") were incomplete for most areas without a recent Master Plan.

While much progress has been made in compiling property-specific objectives, this information has not been adequately compiled nor made available to the public or to staff in useful format. The approved 2008.1 SFI CAR plan specified "the Department will develop preliminary land

management objectives for all DNR-managed properties”. At the time of the audit this had not been completed. **Note: Must be closed by 12.30.09.**

Minor Non-conformance SFI-2009-02:

SFI Indicator 2.2.5 requires “Supervision of forest chemical applications by state-trained or certified applicators.”

Lands Division policies regarding staff who apply general use chemicals but who may not be Certified Pesticide Applicators (and thus may not be trained) are unclear. Not all employees applying chemicals are trained or working under a trained supervisor.

Wisconsin DNR has developed corrective action plans to address these non-conformances. Progress in implementing these actions will be reviewed in subsequent surveillance audits.

The following non-conformances from 2008 were closed:

Minor Non-conformance SFI-2008-02:

Indicator 10.1.2 requires “Assignment and understanding of roles and responsibilities for achieving SFI Standard objectives.”

Roles and responsibilities for achieving SFI Standard Objectives are now understood, consistent with participant’s role in the overall program.

Minor Non-conformance SFI-2008-03:

SFI Indicator 6.1.1 requires “Use of existing natural heritage data and expert advice in identifying or selecting sites for protection because of their ecologically, geologically, historically, or culturally important qualities.”

Natural Heritage Inventory (NHI) data forms a critical part of the WDNR system for planning all projects and timber sales, but data entry for the NHI database is somewhat backlogged, and it was not clear in 2008 that known sites are protected despite the backlog. An increased emphasis has been placed on timely use of NHI information sufficient to close this non-conformance.

One **opportunity for improvement was also identified, and included:**

1. SFI Indicator 3.2.5 requires “Where regulations or BMPs do not currently exist to protect riparian areas, use of experts to identify appropriate protection measures.”
There is an opportunity to improve by developing BMPs for vernal pools.

These later findings do not indicate a current deficiency, but serve to alert Wisconsin DNR to areas that could be strengthened or which could merit future attention.

NSF-ISR also identified the following areas where forestry practices and operations on Wisconsin DNR’s lands exceed the basic requirements of the SFI Standard:

1. Indicator 4.1.1 requires “*Program to promote the conservation of native biological diversity, including species, wildlife habitats, and ecological or natural community types, at stand and landscape levels.*” Strong cooperation among the Division of Forestry and the Bureau of Endangered Resources and Wildlife Management has led to an exceptional program for the conservation of native biological diversity.

2. Indicator 4.1.5 requires “*Assessment, conducted individually or collaboratively, of forest cover types and habitats at the individual ownership level and, where credible data are available, across the landscape, and incorporation of findings into planning and management activities, where practical and when consistent with management objectives.*”
The development and increasing use of the Wisconsin Wildlife Action Plan throughout the programs is an exceptional practice.
3. Indicator 6.1.2 requires “*Appropriate mapping, cataloging, and management of identified special sites.*” Programs for identification and management of special sites are superb.
4. Indicator 12.1.1 requires “*Support for efforts of SFI Implementation Committees.*”
Wisconsin DNR, through its Forest Certification Coordinator and other efforts, has exceeded the standard for promoting the principles of sustainable forest management.
5. Indicator 12.2.3 requires “*Recreation opportunities for the public, where consistent with forest management objectives*” The recreational and educational programs and facilities on state forests are very well designed and maintained, with recreational use given a high priority. Increases in demand for off-road vehicle use, absent budget increases, may compromise this current program strength.
6. Indicator 12.3.2 requires “*Appropriate contact with local stakeholders over forest management issues through state, provincial, federal, or independent collaboration.*” DNR’s efforts to involve and inform the public regarding management programs through use of the web, mailings, public meetings, and newsletters clearly exceed the standard.

The next surveillance audit will occur in August, 2009.

Relevance of Forestry Certification

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

1. Sustainable Forestry

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

2. Responsible Practices

To use and to promote among other forest landowners sustainable forestry practices that are both scientifically credible and economically, environmentally, and socially responsible.

3. Reforestation and Productive Capacity

To provide for regeneration after harvest and maintain the productive capacity of the forestland base.

4. Forest Health and Productivity

To protect forests from uncharacteristic and economically or environmentally undesirable wildfire, pests, diseases, and other damaging agents and thus maintain and improve long-term forest health and productivity.

5. Long-Term Forest and Soil Productivity

To protect and maintain long-term forest and soil productivity.

6. Protection of Water Resources

To protect water bodies and riparian zones.

7. Protection of Special Sites and Biological Diversity

To manage forests and lands of special significance (biologically, geologically, historically or culturally important) in a manner that takes into account their unique qualities and to promote a diversity of wildlife habitats, forest types, and ecological or natural community types.

8. Legal Compliance

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

9. Continual Improvement

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

Source: Sustainable Forestry Initiative® (SFI) Standard, 2005–2009 Edition

For additional information please contact

Paul E. Pingrey, Forest Certification Coordinator, Wisconsin DNR - Division of Forestry
ph. 608-267-7595 e-mail paul.pingrey@wisconsin.gov

END OF PUBLIC REPORT

Appendix IV



Audit Matrix

NSF-ISR auditors use this document to record their findings for each SFIS Performance Measure and Indicator. If a non-conformance is found the auditor shall fully document the reasons on the Corrective Action Request (CAR) form. The first portion of the matrix provides an overall record of audit findings over time. This ensures that all requirements are audited within the five-year life of the certificate. The “Audit Notes” portion provides the detailed findings.

Surveillance audits involve a partial review, so not all requirements are audited each visit.

- NA in the Auditor column indicates that the associated Performance Measure or Indicator does not apply; otherwise the Auditor column is optional.
- Findings codes: C=Conformance; EXR=Exceeds the SFI requirement; Maj= Major Non-conformance; Min=Minor Non-conformance; OFI= Opportunity for Improvement (OFI may be combined with other findings)
- Findings are indicated by a date or date code: Audit Date : August, 2009 Date Code: 9

Objective 1: To broaden the implementation of sustainable forestry by ensuring long-term harvest levels based on the use of the best scientific information available.

Performance Measure/ Indicator	<u>Audit- or</u>	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				<u>OFI</u>
		<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
1.1 <i>Program Participants shall ensure that long-term harvest levels are sustainable and consistent with appropriate growth and-yield models and written plans.</i>						
1.1.1 A long-term resource analysis to guide forest management planning at a level appropriate to the size and scale of the operation, including: a. a periodic or ongoing forest inventory; b. a land classification system; c. soils inventory and maps, where available; d. access to growth-and-yield modeling capabilities; e. up-to-date maps or a geographic information system (GIS); f. recommended sustainable harvest levels; and g. a review of nontimber issues (e.g., pilot projects and economic incentive programs to promote water protection, carbon storage, or biological diversity conservation).				9		
1.1.2 Documentation of annual harvest trends in relation to the sustainable forest management plan.		9				
1.1.3 A forest inventory system and a method to calculate growth.		9				
1.1.4 Periodic updates of inventory and recalculation of planned harvests.		9				
1.1.5 Documentation of forest practices (e.g., planting, fertilization, and thinning) consistent with assumptions in harvest plans.		9				

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

Performance Measure/ Indicator		Audit -or	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				OFI
			C	EXR	Maj	Min	
2.1	<i>Program Participants shall reforest after final harvest, unless delayed for site-specific environmental or forest health considerations, through artificial regeneration within two years or two planting seasons, or by planned natural regeneration methods within five years.</i>						
2.1.1	Designation of all management units for either natural or artificial regeneration.						
2.1.2	Clear Requirements to judge adequate regeneration and appropriate actions to correct under-stocked areas and achieve desired species composition and stocking rates for both artificial and natural regeneration		9				
2.1.3	Minimized plantings of exotic tree species and research documentation that exotic tree species, planted operationally, pose minimal risk.		9				
2.1.4	Protection of desirable or planned advanced natural regeneration during harvest.		9				
2.1.5	Artificial reforestation programs that consider potential ecological impacts of a different species or species mix from that which was harvested.						
2.2	<i>Program Participants shall minimize chemical use required to achieve management objectives while protecting employees, neighbors, the public and the forest environment.</i>						
2.2.1	Minimized chemical use required to achieve management objectives.		9				
2.2.2	Use of least toxic and narrowest spectrum pesticide narrowest spectrum and least toxic pesticides necessary to achieve management objective.		9				
2.2.3	Use of pesticides registered for the intended use and applied in accordance with the label requirements.						
2.2.4	Use of Integrated Pest Management where feasible.		9				
2.2.5	Supervision of forest chemical applications by state-trained or certified applicators.					9	
2.2.6	Use of best management practices appropriate to the situation; for example: adjoining landowners or nearby residents notified of applications and chemicals used; appropriate multi-lingual signs or oral warnings used; public road access controlled during and after applications; streamside and other needed buffer strips appropriately designated; positive shut-off and minimal drift spray valves used; drift minimized by aerially applying forest chemicals parallel to buffer zones; water quality monitored or other methods used to assure proper ...						

Performance Measure/ Indicator		<u>Audit</u> <u>-or</u>	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				<u>OFI</u>
			<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
2.2.6	...equipment use and stream protection of streams, lakes and other waterbodies; chemicals stored at appropriate locations; state reports filed as required; or methods used to ensure protection of federally listed threatened & endangered species		9				
2.3	<i>Program Participants shall implement management practices to protect and maintain forest and soil productivity.</i>		9				
2.3.1	Use of soils maps where available.		9				
2.3.2	Process to identify soils vulnerable to compaction and use of appropriate methods to avoid excessive soil disturbance.		9				
2.3.3	Use of erosion control measures to minimize the loss of soil and site productivity.		9				
2.3.4	Post-harvest conditions conducive to maintaining site productivity (e.g., limited rutting, retained down woody debris, minimized skid trails).		9				
2.3.5	Retention of vigorous trees during partial harvesting, consistent with silvicultural norms for the area.		9				
2.3.6	Criteria that address harvesting and site preparation to protect soil productivity.		9				
2.3.7	Minimized road construction to meet management objectives efficiently.		9				
2.4	<i>Program Participants shall manage so as to protect forests from damaging agents such as environmentally or economically undesirable wildfire, pests and diseases to maintain and improve long-term forest health, productivity and economic viability.</i>		9				
2.4.1	Program to protect forests from damaging agents.		9				
2.4.2	Management to promote healthy and productive forest conditions to minimize susceptibility to damaging agents.		9				
2.4.3	Participation in, and support of, fire and pest prevention and control programs.		9				
2.5	<i>Program Participants that utilize genetically improved planting stock including those derived through biotechnology shall use sound scientific methods and follow all applicable laws and other internationally applicable protocols.</i>						
2.5.1	Program for appropriate research, testing, evaluation and deployment of genetically improved planting stock including trees derived through biotechnology.						

Objective 3: To protect water quality in streams, lakes and other water bodies.

Performance Measure/ Indicator		<u>Audit</u> <u>-or</u>	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				<u>OFI</u>
			<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
3.1	<i>Program Participants shall meet or exceed all applicable federal, provincial, state and local water quality laws and meet or exceed Best Management Practices developed under Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)-approved state water quality programs other applicable federal, provincial, state or local programs.</i>		9				
3.1.1	Program to implement state or provincial equivalent BMPs during all phases of management activities.		9				
3.1.2	Contract provisions that specify BMP compliance.		9				
3.1.3	Plans that address wet weather events (e.g., inventory systems, wet weather tracts, defining acceptable operational conditions, etc.).		9				
3.1.4	Monitoring of overall BMP implementation.		9				
3.2	<i>Program Participant shall have or develop, implement, and document, riparian protection measures based on soil type, terrain, vegetation and other applicable factors.</i>		9				
3.2.1	Program addressing management and protection of streams, lakes and other water bodies and riparian zones.		9				
3.2.2	Mapping of streams, lakes and other water bodies and riparian zones, and where appropriate, identification on the ground.		9				
3.2.3	Implementation of plans to manage or protect streams, lakes and other water bodies.		9				
3.2.4	Identification and protection of nonforested wetlands, including bogs, fens, vernal pools and marshes of significant size.		9				
3.2.5	Where regulations or BMPs do not currently exist to protect riparian areas, use of experts to identify appropriate protection measures.						9

Objective 4: Manage the quality and distribution of wildlife habitats and contribute to the conservation of biological diversity by developing and implementing stand- and landscape- level measures that promote habitat diversity and the conservation of forest plants and animals including aquatic fauna.

Performance Measure/ Indicator		<u>Audit</u> <u>-or</u>	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				<u>O</u> <u>F</u> <u>I</u>
			<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
4.1	<i>Program participants shall have programs to promote biological diversity at stand- and landscape- scales.</i>			9			
4.1.1	Program to promote the conservation of native biological diversity, including species, wildlife habitats, and ecological or natural community types, at stand and landscape levels.			9			
4.1.2	Program to protect threatened and endangered species.		9				
4.1.3	Plans to locate and protect known sites associated with viable occurrences of critically imperiled and imperiled species and communities. Plans for protection may be developed independently or collaboratively and may include Program Participant management, cooperation with other stakeholders, or use of easements, conservation land sales, exchanges, or other conservation strategies		9				
4.1.4	Development and implementation of criteria, as guided by regionally appropriate science, for retention of stand-level wildlife habitat elements (e.g., snags, mast trees, down woody debris, den trees, nest trees).		9				
4.1.5	Assessment, conducted individually or collaboratively, of forest cover types and habitats at the individual ownership level and, where credible data are available, across the landscape, and incorporation of findings into planning and management activities, where practical and when consistent with management objectives.			9			
4.1.6	Support of and participation in plans or programs for the conservation of old-growth forests in the region of ownership.		9				
4.1.7	Participation in programs and demonstration of activities as appropriate to limit the introduction, impact, and spread of invasive exotic plants and animals that directly threaten or are likely to threaten native plant and animal communities.		9				
4.1.8	Program to incorporate the role of prescribed or natural fire where appropriate.		9				
4.2	<i>Program Participants shall apply knowledge gained through research, science, technology, and field experience to manage wildlife habitat and contribute to the conservation of biological diversity.</i>		9				
4.2.1	Collection of information on critically imperiled and imperiled species and communities and other biodiversity-related data through forest inventory processes, mapping, or participation in external programs, such as NatureServe, state or provincial heritage programs, or other credible systems. Such participation may include providing nonproprietary scientific information, time, and assistance by staff, or in-kind or direct financial support.		9				

Performance Measure/ Indicator		<u>Audit</u> <u>-or</u>	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				<u>OFI</u>
			<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
4.2.2	A methodology to incorporate research results and field applications of biodiversity and ecosystem research into forest management decisions.		9				

Objective 5: To manage the visual impact of harvesting and other forest operations.

Performance Measure/ Indicator		<u>Audit</u> <u>-or</u>	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				<u>OFI</u>
			<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
5.1	<i>Program Participants shall manage the impact of harvesting on visual quality.</i>		9				
5.1.1	Program to address visual quality management.		9				
5.1.2	Incorporation of aesthetic considerations in harvesting, road, landing design and management, and other management activities where visual impacts are a concern.		9				
5.2	<i>Program Participants shall manage the size, shape, and placement of clearcut harvests.</i>						
5.2.1	Average size of clearcut harvest areas does not exceed 120 acres, except when necessary to respond to forest health emergencies or other natural catastrophes.						
5.2.2	Documentation through internal records of clearcut size and the process for calculating average size.						
5.3	<i>Program Participants shall adopt a green-up requirement or alternative methods that provide for visual quality.</i>						
5.3.1	Program implementing the green-up requirement or alternative methods.						
5.3.2	Harvest area tracking system to demonstrate compliance with the green-up requirement or alternative methods.						
5.3.3	Trees in clearcut harvest areas are at least 3 years old or 5 feet high at the desired level of stocking before adjacent areas are clearcut, or as appropriate to address operational and economic considerations, alternative methods to reach the performance measure are utilized by the Program Participant.						

Objective 6: To manage Program Participant lands that are ecologically, geologically, historically, or culturally important in a manner that recognizes their special qualities.

Performance Measure/ Indicator		<u>Audit</u> <u>-or</u>	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				<u>OFI</u>
			<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
6.1.	<i>Program Participants shall identify special sites and manage them in a manner appropriate for their unique features.</i>		9				
6.1.1	Use of existing natural heritage data and expert advice in identifying or selecting sites for protection because of their ecologically, geologically, historically, or culturally important qualities.		9				
6.1.2	Appropriate mapping, cataloging, and management of identified special sites.			9			

Objective 7: To promote the efficient use of forest resources.

Performance Measure/ Indicator		<u>Audit</u> <u>-or</u>	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				<u>OFI</u>
			<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
7.1	<i>Program Participants shall employ appropriate forest harvesting technology and “in-woods” manufacturing processes and practices to minimize waste and ensure efficient utilization of harvested trees, where consistent with other SFI Standard objectives.</i>		9				
7.1.1	Program or monitoring system to ensure efficient utilization, which may include provisions to ensure a. landings left clean with little waste; b. residues distributed to add organic and nutrient value to future forests; c. training or incentives to encourage loggers to enhance utilization; d. cooperation with mill managers for better utilization of species and low-grade material; e. merchandizing of harvested material to ensure use for its most beneficial purpose; f. development of markets for underutilized species and low-grade wood; g. periodic inspections and reports noting utilization and product separation; or h. exploration of alternative markets (e.g., energy markets).		9				

Objective 8: To broaden the practice of sustainable forestry through procurement programs. N.A.

Objective 9: To improve forestry research, science, and technology, upon which sound forest management decisions are based.

Performance Measure/ Indicator		<u>Audit</u> <u>-or</u>	<i>- - - Indicate Only One - - -</i>				<u>O</u> <u>F</u> <u>I</u>
			<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
9.1	<i>Program Participants shall individually, through cooperative efforts, or through associations provide in-kind support or funding, in addition to that generated through taxes, for forest research to improve the health, productivity, and management of forest resources.</i>						
9.1.1	Current financial or in-kind support of research to address questions of relevance in the region of operations. The research will include some or all of the following issues: a. forest health, productivity, and ecosystem functions; b. chemical efficiency, use rate, and integrated pest management; c. water quality; d. wildlife management at stand or landscape levels; e. conservation of biological diversity; and f. effectiveness of BMPs.						
9.2	<i>Program Participants shall individually, through cooperative efforts, or through associations develop or use state, provincial, or regional analyses in support of their sustainable forestry programs.</i>						
9.2.1	Participation, individually or through cooperative efforts or associations at the state, provincial, or regional level, in the development or use of a. regeneration assessments; b. growth-and-drain assessments; c. BMP implementation and compliance; and d. biodiversity conservation information for family forest owners.						

Objective 10: To improve the practice of sustainable forest management by resource professionals, logging professionals, and contractors through appropriate training and education programs.

Performance Measure/ Indicator		<u>Audit</u> <u>-or</u>	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				<u>OFI</u>
			<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
10.1	<i>Program Participants shall require appropriate training of personnel and contractors so that they are competent to fulfill their responsibilities under the SFI Standard.</i>		9				
10.1.1	Written statement of commitment to the SFI Standard communicated throughout the organization, particularly to mill and woodland managers, wood procurement staff, and field foresters.		9				
10.1.2	Assignment and understanding of roles and responsibilities for achieving SFI Standard objectives.		9				
10.1.3	Staff education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities.		9				
10.1.4	Contractor education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities.		9				
10.2	<i>Program Participants shall work closely with state logging or forestry associations, or appropriate agencies or others in the forestry community, to foster improvement in the professionalism of wood producers.</i>						
10.2.1	Participation in or support of SFI Implementation Committees to establish criteria and identify delivery mechanisms for wood producers' training courses that address a. awareness of sustainable forestry principles and the SFI Program; b. BMPs, including streamside management and road construction, maintenance, & retirement; c. regeneration, forest resource conservation, and aesthetics; d. awareness of responsibilities under the U.S. Endangered Species Act, the Canadian Species at Risk Act, and other measures to protect wildlife habitat; e. logging safety; f. U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration regulations, wage and hour rules, and other employment laws; g. transportation issues; h. business management; and i. public policy and outreach.		9				

Objective 11: Commitment to comply with applicable federal, provincial, state, or local laws and regulations.

Performance Measure/ Indicator	<u>Audit</u> <u>-or</u>	<i>- - - Indicate Only One - - -</i>				<u>OFI</u>
		<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
11.1	<i>Program Participants shall take appropriate steps to comply with applicable federal, provincial, state, and local forestry and related environmental laws and regulations.</i>					
11.1.1	Access to relevant laws and regulations in appropriate locations.					
11.1.2	System to achieve compliance with applicable federal, provincial, state, or local laws and regulations.					
11.1.3	Demonstration of commitment to legal compliance through available regulatory action information.					
11.1.4	Adherence to all applicable federal, state, & provincial regulations and international protocols for research & deployment of trees derived from improved planting stock & biotechnology.					
11.2	<i>Program Participants shall take appropriate steps to comply with all applicable social laws at the federal, provincial, state, and local levels in the country in which the Program Participant operates.</i>					
11.2.1	Written policy demonstrating commitment to comply with social laws, such as those covering civil rights, equal employment opportunities, antidiscrimination and anti-harassment measures, workers' compensation, indigenous peoples' rights, workers' and communities' right to know, prevailing wages, workers' right to organize, and occupational health and safety.					

Objective 12: To broaden the practice of sustainable forestry by encouraging the public and forestry community to participate in the commitment to sustainable forestry and publicly report progress.

Performance Measure/ Indicator		<u>Audit</u> <u>-or</u>	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				<u>O</u> <u>F</u> <u>I</u>
			<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
12.1	<i>Program Participants shall support and promote efforts by consulting foresters, state and federal agencies, state or local groups, professional societies, and the American Tree Farm System® and other landowner cooperative programs to apply principles of sustainable forest management.</i>						
12.1.1	Support for efforts of SFI Implementation Committees.			9			
12.1.2	Support for the development and distribution of educational materials, including information packets for use with forest landowners.						
12.1.3	Support for the development and distribution of regional or statewide information materials that provide landowners with practical approaches for addressing biological diversity issues, such as specific wildlife habitat, critically imperiled or imperiled species, and threatened and endangered species.						
12.1.4	Participation in efforts to support or promote conservation of working forests through voluntary market-based incentive programs (e.g., current-use taxation programs, Forest Legacy, or conservation easements).						
12.1.5	Program Participants are knowledgeable about credible regional conservation planning and priority-setting efforts that include a broad range of stakeholders. Consider the results of these efforts in planning where practical and consistent with management objectives.						
12.2	<i>Program Participants shall support and promote, at the state, provincial or other appropriate levels, mechanisms for public outreach, education, and involvement related to forest management.</i>						
12.2.1	Support for the SFI Implementation Committee program to address outreach, education, and technical assistance (e.g., toll-free numbers, public sector technical assistance programs).		9				
12.2.2	Periodic educational opportunities promoting sustainable forestry, such as a. field tours, seminars, or workshops; b. educational trips; c. self-guided forest management trails; or d. publication of articles, educational pamphlets, or newsletters; or e. support for state, provincial, and local forestry organizations and soil and water conservation districts.						
12.2.3	Recreation opportunities for the public, where consistent with forest management objectives.			9			

Performance Measure/ Indicator		Audit -or-	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				OFI
			C	EXR	Maj	Min	
12.3	<i>Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall participate in the development of public land planning and management processes.</i>						
12.3.1	Involvement in public land planning and management activities with appropriate governmental entities and the public.		9				
12.3.2	Appropriate contact with local stakeholders over forest management issues through state, provincial, federal, or independent collaboration.			9			
12.4	<i>Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall confer with affected indigenous peoples.</i>						
12.4.1	Program that includes communicating with affected indigenous peoples to enable Program Participants to a. understand and respect traditional forest related knowledge; b. identify and protect spiritually, historically, or culturally important sites; and c. address the sustainable use of nontimber forest products of value to indigenous peoples in areas where Program Participants have management responsibilities on public lands.						
12.5	<i>Program Participants shall establish, at the state, provincial, or other appropriate levels, procedures to address concerns raised by loggers, consulting foresters, employees, the public, or Program Participants regarding practices that appear inconsistent with the SFI Standard principles and objectives.</i>		C				
12.5.1	Support for SFI Implementation Committee efforts (toll-free numbers and other efforts) to address concerns about apparent nonconforming practices.		C				
12.5.2	Process to receive and respond to public inquiries.		C				
12.6	<i>Program Participants shall report annually to the SFI Program on their compliance with the SFI Standard.</i>						
12.6.1*	Prompt response to the SFI annual progress report. (*Note: This indicator will be reviewed in all audits.)		C				
12.6.2	Recordkeeping for all the categories of information needed for SFI annual progress reports.		C				
12.6.3	Maintenance of copies of past reports to document progress and improvements to demonstrate conformance to the SFI Standard						

Objective 13: To promote continual improvement in the practice of sustainable forestry and monitor, measure, and report performance in achieving the commitment to sustainable forestry.

Performance Measure/ Indicator		<u>Audit</u> <u>-or</u>	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				<u>O</u> <u>F</u> <u>I</u>
			<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
13.1*	<i>Program Participants shall establish a management review system to examine findings and progress in implementing the SFI Standard, to make appropriate improvements in programs, and to inform their employees of changes. (*This Performance Measure will be reviewed in all audits.)</i>						
13.1.1	System to review commitments, programs, and procedures to evaluate effectiveness.						
13.1.2	System for collecting, reviewing, and reporting information to management regarding progress in achieving SFI Standard objectives and performance measures.						
13.1.3	Annual review of progress by management and determination of changes and improvements necessary to continually improve SFI conformance.						

Auditor Notes (Note to Auditors: The requirements are repeated here {in part or fully} to facilitate the use of this form. The Lead Auditor may choose to delete the requirement partially or fully to shorten the document, and/or to remove any requirements listed above as being “Not Applicable”. The full requirements are listed in the first section of the matrix above, which is not to be so edited.)

Requirement	Auditor	Notes
1.1		<i>“Program Participants shall ensure that long-term harvest levels are sustainable and consistent with appropriate growth and-yield models and written plans.”</i>
1.1.1	Major	<p>“A long-term resource analysis to guide forest management planning at a level appropriate to the size and scale of the operation, including: a periodic or ongoing forest inventory; b. a land classification system; c. soils inventory and maps, where available; d. access to growth-and-yield modeling capabilities; e. up-to-date maps or a geographic information system (GIS); f. recommended sustainable harvest levels; and g. a review of nontimber issues (e.g., pilot projects and economic incentive programs to promote water protection, carbon storage, or biological diversity conservation).”</p> <p><u>Major CAR 2009.01: While much progress has been made in compiling property-specific objectives, this information has not been adequately compiled nor made available to the public or to staff in useful format. The approved 2008.1 SFI CAR plan specified “the Department will develop preliminary land management objectives for all DNR-managed properties”. This has not been done.</u> Note: Must be closed by 12.30.09.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internet based fact sheets or property narratives are being updated to meet the planning requirements. These updates are in various stages depending on the bureau involved, but not sufficiently implemented to meet the corrective action plan. For example, one audit team on 8.13.09 visited a State Park, a fisheries area and a wildlife area and not one of the fact sheets included management objectives, yet all three sites had previous or proposed sales. Three other wildlife areas randomly selected for review in the Northeast Region did have updated fact sheets, with two of the three (Holland WMA and CD (Buzz) Besadny Fish and Wildlife Area) having clear and explicit objectives. The Green Bay West Shores Sensiba Unit did not have explicit objectives listed, although an informed reader could deduce the objectives. • Confirmed “Proposed Master Plan for the State Wildlife Areas and Red Cedar Lake State Natural Area” aka Draft Master Plan for Glacial Heritage Property. This is the first or pilot Tier 2 plan. • Reviewed copies of “Rapid Ecological Assessment for the Lower Chippewa River system Planning Group December 2008” and “Regional Property Analysis for the Lower Chippewa River April 24, 2009”. Expect to complete draft master plan for this Tier 2 group by September, final approval by January 2010. • Confirmed Master Plans for: Peshtigo River State Forest (2007), Menominee Natural Resources Area (2000), Black River State Forest (nearing completion of update). These covered the required elements and much more. • Reviewed “Mullet Creek Wildlife Area” 2-page web description and plan overview, an example of the interim approach being used; it includes location, property description, habitat types and natural resources, history of property, management objectives and prescriptions, recreation opportunities, unique considerations (special sites), other information, and contacts; “There are 277 properties listed on the wildlife website that are managed by wildlife staff; We have narrative descriptions for all but 19 properties” • The wildlife program has laid out a schedule to have all tier 1 and tier 2 master plans completed for wildlife properties by 2017. Existing documentation covers the required areas, but written statements of property-specific goals and objectives are often out-of-date and inconsistent with current management policies and programs.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmed “Wisconsin State Park System - Guidance for Managing Forest Lands” and reviewed “Managing the Heritage Resources of the Wisconsin State Park System” cover the requirements for the Wisconsin State Park System. • Reviewed overall management guidance for fisheries lands “Program Goals & Strategies for Fisheries Management and Fisheries Research” and “Fish, Wildlife and Habitat Management Plan”. The documents provide guidance for work plans and expenditures between 2007 and 2013.
1.1.2	C	<p>“Documentation of annual harvest trends in relation to the sustainable forest management plan.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each harvest is documented on a Form 2460-001 “Timber Sale Notice and Cutting Report” and this information is compiled into a database. WisFIRS allows managers to easily develop reports and graphs by cover type or other sorts, at the stand, compartment, or forest level, or statewide. • Each state forest (excepting those undergoing updates to their Master Plans which included Black River SF, Coulee Experimental SF, and Flambeau River SF) annually prepares a monitoring report which compares accomplishments to objectives, forest-wide, at the management area level, and for other resource management issues. Harvesting accomplishments are included. State forest monitoring reports are available on the WDNR web site. • Harvest levels over the past two years have been increased to more nearly match growth and harvest plans in response to directives from the state legislature and reallocation of resources.
1.1.3 1.1.4	C	<p>“A forest inventory system and a method to calculate growth.” “Periodic updates of inventory and recalculation of planned harvests.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmed by interviews with field foresters and property managers and review of records (Peshtigo Area) that annual inventory goals (RECON) are being met. The core goal is to inventory about 20% of the lands each year, and reduce the “backlog” of older inventory data. • Confirmed property list by county for Peshtigo Area that links to the inventory needs analysis; 13,000 acres of 39,264 are “backlogged” for inventory, meaning recon was done more than 15 years ago. Foresters are continuing to work towards eliminating the backlog, with 1,322 acres of older recon completed in 2009 to date. • Harvest levels are determined by harvest year data, target rotation ages, and age class distribution goals. WisFIRS and associated tools are used to update harvest goals each year after RECON updates are entered. • In addition to the RECON inventory data, measurements for a permanent plot system (i.e., CFI) on the state forests are in their third year. However, as described below, this system has not yet had sufficient time to provide useful growth data, so FIA data are still used. Note that the area control method does not rely on detailed growth data. <p>From: Prichard, Teague - DNR [mailto:Teague.Prichard@Wisconsin.gov] Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2009 2:41 PM Growth calculations will not be available until after the first year of re- measurement. The State Forest CFI system is on a 5-year cycle consistent with FIA. WI State Forests first year for re-measurement is scheduled for 2012. At that time we will be able to report with a fairly high confidence for the combined state forest system (500,000 acres). Every year after our confidence will increase for growth calculations and we will have the ability to report at a finer level with the goal of a minimal reporting unit of 3,000 acres, our smallest state forest.</p>

1.1.5	C	<p>“Documentation of forest practices (e.g., planting, fertilization, and thinning) consistent with assumptions in harvest plans.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All forest practices are carefully documented. Harvest plans are updated based on actual forest conditions in response to these treatments (see 1.1.4 above).
2.1		<p><i>“Program Participants shall reforest after final harvest, unless delayed for site-specific environmental or forest health considerations, through artificial regeneration within two years or two planting seasons, or by planned natural regeneration methods within five years.”</i></p>
2.1.2	C	<p>“Clear Requirements to judge adequate regeneration and appropriate actions to correct understocked areas and achieve desired species composition and stocking rates for both artificial and natural regeneration.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirmed systems to track regeneration harvests and records indicating the status of regeneration. Requirements for regeneration are outlined in WiDNR Manual Codes and/or the Silviculture and Aesthetics Manual.
2.1.3	C	<p>“Minimized plantings of exotic tree species and research documentation that exotic tree species, planted operationally, pose minimal risk.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirmed that exotics are not planted except for landscaping, and then only if there is an assessment of low risk.
2.1.4	C	<p>“Protection of desirable or planned advanced natural regeneration during harvest.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Field site reviews confirmed.
2.2		<p><i>“Program Participants shall minimize chemical use required to achieve management objectives while protecting employees, neighbors, the public and the forest environment.”</i></p>
2.2.1	C	<p>“Minimized chemical use required to achieve management objectives.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews and observations confirm that property managers use chemicals only after all alternative methods have been considered, or where there is a chance they can be effective, attempted. Invasive Species Fact Sheets have been developed. These include alternative control techniques that can be used instead of pesticides. Bio-control programs for purple loosestrife, spotted knapweed, leafy spurge and garlic mustard are attempted before chemical treatments. Post prescribed burn reports can be used to determine effectiveness of burning.
2.2.2	C	<p>“Use of least toxic and narrowest spectrum pesticide narrowest spectrum and least toxic pesticides necessary to achieve management objective.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The department maintains an up-to-date list of all chemical pesticides being used on WDNR-managed properties. The existing database tracks chemical use and can be queried by chemical name: http://wiatri.net/projects/chemuse/. The most toxic and potentially dangerous pesticides are not used, per FSC requirements.
2.2.4	C	<p>“Use of Integrated Pest Management where feasible.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pesticides are applied after analysis and preparation of written prescriptions. Manual Code 4230.1 describes and requires IPM techniques. Department silvicultural practices and property management practices include procedures to prevent and avoid pest problems that might require pesticide treatment. For example, see practices related to EAB and Gypsy moth “slow the spread”.
2.2.5	Min	<p>“Supervision of forest chemical applications by state-trained or certified applicators.”</p> <p><u>Minor Non-Conformance SFI.2009.02: Lands Division policies regarding staff who apply general use chemicals but who may not be Certified Pesticide Applicators (and thus may not be trained) are unclear. Not all employees applying chemicals are trained or working under a trained supervisor.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All DATCP requirements for certification and licensing are followed, but these do not

		<p>include training requirements for application of general use pesticides. The Forestry Division currently has a comprehensive training requirement that is being considered for incorporation into a Department-wide policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Department Integrated Certification Implementation Team (ICIT) has developed an Intranet webpage as an easily accessible resource on DNR pesticide use issues. • The ICIT ad hoc pesticide team developed a draft training plan. There have been two regional (SER, NER) training sessions that covered safety, certification, and details of specific herbicides. There are no firm plans to conduct similar training in the other regions. • Discussion of training in pesticide use; excerpts from response to FSC CAR: DNR Pesticide Use Training Plan <i>Draft by K. Kearns 7/13/09</i> <i>(Note: Where possible tie in with upcoming trainings on NR 40 Invasive Species Rule and Invasive Species Best Management Practices)</i> Target Audiences: All DNR land management staff and their supervisors - Field staff in WM, FH, SS, WT, LF, FR, ER and PR Cooperating partners who use pesticides on DNR certified lands (e.g., Friends Groups, volunteers, contractors, adjacent landowners?)
2.3	C	<i>“Program Participants shall implement management practices to protect and maintain forest and soil productivity.”</i>
2.3.1	C	<p>“Use of soils maps where available.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Soil maps are available and are used by foresters (see next indicator). For example, soils and soil moisture are generally documented for each proposed harvest on a Form 2460-001 “Timber Sale Notice and Cutting Report” and this information is reflected in the sale provisions.
2.3.2	C	<p>“Process to identify soils vulnerable to compaction and use of appropriate methods to avoid excessive soil disturbance.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Foresters use soil and topographic maps, habitat type classifications, and/or field reviews as appropriate to identify soils vulnerable to compaction and use a variety of methods to avoid excessive soil disturbance, including designation of harvesting only with frozen ground or very dry conditions for all or a portion of a harvest area.
2.3.3	C	<p>“Use of erosion control measures to minimize the loss of soil and site productivity.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmed at field sites
2.3.4	C	<p>“Post-harvest conditions conducive to maintaining site productivity (e.g., limited rutting, retained down woody debris, minimized skid trails).”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmed at field sites.
2.3.5	C	<p>“Retention of vigorous trees during partial harvesting, consistent with silvicultural norms for the area.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmed at field sites.
2.3.6	C	<p>“Criteria that address harvesting and site preparation to protect soil productivity.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BMPs and policies provide these criteria. Confirmed that rutting criteria are in the contracts.
2.3.7	C	<p>“Minimized road construction to meet management objectives efficiently.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New roads are not commonly constructed; one new temporary logging road inspected on the Peshtigo River State Forest was designed to access a large area of forest in an efficient manner.
2.4	C	<i>“Program Participants shall manage so as to protect forests from damaging agents such as environmentally or economically undesirable wildfire, pests and diseases to maintain and improve long-term forest health, productivity and economic viability.”</i>

2.4.1	C	<p>“Program to protect forests from damaging agents.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmed increased emphasis on timely RECON, leading to forest prescriptions and treatments which are designed to protect forests (see next indicator). • Robust efforts to detect, and where feasible, suppress or delay infestations of exotic pests (Emerald ash borer, Gypsy moth). For example, EAB quarantine provisions are found in logging contracts as appropriate.
2.4.2	C	<p>“Management to promote healthy and productive forest conditions to minimize susceptibility to damaging agents.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmed by field observations; WiDNR Forestry Division has provided significantly more support for forest management practices on lands managed by the WiDNR Lands Division. This increasing involvement is primarily due to mandates by the state legislature, initiatives by all involved agencies, and an expanded awareness of the ability of forestry to provide forest management services which support the varied missions and mandates. • This increased attention to forest vegetation management has improved stocking levels and the timeliness of forest treatments which can minimize damage from insects and diseases. • Rotations in most cases are set short enough to prevent many pest problems (for example Jack Pine rotations of 50 years).
2.4.3	C	<p>“Participation in, and support of, fire and pest prevention and control programs.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews confirmed WiDNR management of forest fire protection programs on most Wisconsin forestlands and all lands within the scope of certification.
3.1	C	<p>“Program Participants shall meet or exceed all applicable federal, provincial, state and local water quality laws and meet or exceed Best Management Practices developed under Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)-approved state water quality programs other applicable federal, provincial, state or local programs.”</p>
3.1.1	C	<p>“Program to implement state or provincial equivalent BMPs during all phases of management activities.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All harvests are supervised by trained foresters. • Specialists are consulted for difficult projects, especially road construction or activities near major streams or wetlands. • The timber sale program has consistently designed and implemented harvests in accordance with Wisconsin Best Management Practices. • Additional emphasis has been placed on funding for road maintenance.
3.1.2	C	<p>“Contract provisions that specify BMP compliance.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmed in all contracts reviewed (about 10).
3.1.3	C	<p>“Plans that address wet weather events (e.g., inventory systems, wet weather tracts, defining acceptable operational conditions, etc).”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmed by interviews with foresters and review of records that timber harvest planning considers weather events, with some sites on dry sands intended for the wet time of year, other sites identified for only dry weather, and other sites only for frozen ground.
3.1.4	C	<p>“Monitoring of overall BMP implementation.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BMP monitoring is part of regular harvest inspections and all timber sale closeout inspections. These inspections are well-documented in Form 2460-000 Timber Sale Contractor Checklist pre-Sale Meeting; Form 2460-02 Harvest Inspection Report.
3.2	C	<p>“Program Participant shall have or develop, implement, and document, riparian protection measures based on soil type, terrain, vegetation and other applicable factors.”</p>

3.2.1	C	<p>“Program addressing management and protection of streams, lakes and other water bodies and riparian zones.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmed by reviews of completed and partially completed timber harvests and road and trail improvement efforts that this program continues to operate effectively. • Water quality considerations including lakes or rivers potentially affected by the harvest are documented for each proposed harvest on a Form 2460-001 “Timber Sale Notice and Cutting Report” and this information is reflected in the harvesting requirements.
3.2.2	C	<p>“Mapping of streams, lakes and other water bodies and riparian zones, and where appropriate, identification on the ground.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmed these are mapped and marked on the ground as appropriate.
3.2.3	C	<p>“Implementation of plans to manage or protect streams, lakes and other water bodies.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmed by field observations that wetlands and riparian zones are protected.
3.2.4	C	<p>“Identification and protection of nonforested wetlands, including bogs, fens, vernal pools and marshes of significant size.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nonforested 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”. • Very small nonforested wetlands are generally protected; loggers try to avoid these, and foresters work to communicate their locations, but some are entered on occasion. • Most sites with significant areas of included wetlands (forested and/or nonforested) are designated for winter harvest only.
3.2.5	OFI	<p>“Where regulations or BMPs do not currently exist to protect riparian areas, use of experts to identify appropriate protection measures.”</p> <p>There is an opportunity to improve by developing BMPs for vernal pools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wisconsin has BMPs covering riparian areas and more. • There are no formal BMP for Vernal Pools; FSC CAR sufficient.
4.1	EXR	<p><i>“Program participants shall have programs to promote biological diversity at stand- and landscape- scales.”</i></p>
4.1.1	EXR	<p>“Program to promote the conservation of native biological diversity, including species, wildlife habitats, and ecological or natural community types, at stand and landscape levels.”</p> <p><u>Strong cooperation among the Division of Forestry, Bureau of Endangered Resources, and Wildlife Division has led to an exceptional program for the conservation of native biological diversity.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DNR has great SNA program that currently includes over 500 properties. The wildlife action plan identifies areas of global, national, and state significance and opportunities to protect them. • DNR staff members consult with ecologists to provide guidance on management plans that will protect and enhance habitat for rare species.
4.1.2	C	<p>“Program to protect threatened and endangered species.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DNR has a mandate to protect all state and federal threatened and endangered species. • Efforts towards protection of Karner Blue Butterfly and to protect and enhance its habitat are superb. • DNR personnel are aware of mandate to protect ETS species and check NHI database in the process of setting up timber sales.

4.1.3	C	<p>“Plans to locate and protect known sites associated with viable occurrences of critically imperiled and imperiled species and communities. Plans for protection may be developed independently or collaboratively and may include Program Participant management, cooperation with other stakeholders, or use of easements, conservation land sales, exchanges, or other conservation strategies.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DNR has identified private properties to acquire to fill gaps in the SNA program. Where appropriate, conservation easements with private landowners that hold embedded properties within existing SNA’s are pursued and acquired. • DNR cooperates with adjacent landowners to protect and manage habitat for ETS species and habitats (e.g., TNC).
4.1.4	C	<p>“Development and implementation of criteria, as guided by regionally appropriate science, for retention of stand-level wildlife habitat elements (e.g., snags, mast trees, down woody debris, den trees, and nest trees).”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DNR has written guidelines to retain snags, mast trees, den, and nest trees. Biomass guidelines were recently adopted and have been included in new timber sales that will protect coarse and fine woody debris. Guideline education and training has been scheduled within the next month.
4.1.5	EXR	<p>“Assessment, conducted individually or collaboratively, of forest cover types and habitats at the individual ownership level and, where credible data are available, across the landscape, and incorporation of findings into planning and management activities, where practical and when consistent with management objectives.”</p> <p><u>The development and increasing use of the Wisconsin Wildlife Action Plan throughout the programs is an exceptional practice.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Wisconsin Wildlife Action Plan has identified conservation opportunity areas across the State within all land ownership types.
4.1.6	C	<p>“Support of and participation in plans or programs for the conservation of old-growth forests in the region of ownership.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wisconsin DNR has a program for creation of ecological reserves that include old growth. • Master plans for state forests include targets for managing forest acres for current and future old growth conditions. • Wisconsin DNR has developed and is implementing provisions of the “Old Growth and Old Forests” handbook; a revision is underway.
4.1.7	C	<p>“Participation in programs and demonstration of activities as appropriate to limit the introduction, impact, and spread of invasive exotic plants and animals that directly threaten or are likely to threaten native plant and animal communities.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wisconsin’s Forestry BMPs for Invasive Species: A Field Manual for Foresters, Landowners, and Loggers has been finalized and training has commenced.
4.1.8	C	<p>“Program to incorporate the role of prescribed or natural fire where appropriate.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WDNR uses prescribed fire frequently and should be lauded for their significant use of this valuable land management tool; field staff would like to do more. • DNR uses fire as often as practical to manage habitats that require fire disturbance.
4.2	C	<p><i>“Program Participants shall apply knowledge gained through research, science, technology, and field experience to manage wildlife habitat and contribute to the conservation of biological diversity.”</i></p> <p>Staff is using known and accepted scientific methods to manage habitats for two federally endangered species (Karner Blue Butterfly and Kirtland’s Warbler).</p>
4.2.1	C	<p>“Collection of information on critically imperiled and imperiled species and communities and other biodiversity-related data through forest inventory processes, mapping, or participation in external programs, such as NatureServe, state or provincial heritage programs, or other credible systems. Such participation may include providing nonproprietary scientific</p>

		<p>information, time, and assistance by staff, or in-kind or direct financial support.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DNR has a collection of historic and current locations of rare features in its natural heritage inventory. There is a backlog of data to be entered in the database, especially on State Land. DNR has decreased the number of observations in the backlog and will need to continue to make progress on decreasing the backlog in the data.
4.2.2	C	<p>“A methodology to incorporate research results and field applications of biodiversity and ecosystem research into forest management decisions.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The science supporting the draft biomass guidelines was well documented and supports the proposed guidelines.
5.1	C	<p><i>“Program Participants shall manage the impact of harvesting on visual quality.”</i></p>
5.1.1	C	<p>“Program to address visual quality management.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harvests are planned by trained foresters and reviewed by recreation specialists when needed, as well as by experienced supervisory foresters. • Foresters are trained in and/or experienced with visual management methods.
5.1.2	C	<p>“Incorporation of aesthetic considerations in harvesting, road, landing design and management, and other management activities where visual impacts are a concern.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harvests in visible areas, particularly near recreation facilities (campgrounds, trails) were carefully designed to minimize visual impacts. Harvests in those locations had good utilization, visual buffers, and care taken to minimize impacts on alternative activities. • Most contracts include multiple requirements for slash scattering and/or disposal; some of these provisions are for fire –related reasons, but most also help manage aesthetic impacts.
6.1.	C	<p><i>“Program Participants shall identify special sites and manage them in a manner appropriate for their unique features.”</i></p>
6.1.1	C	<p>“Use of existing natural heritage data and expert advice in identifying or selecting sites for protection because of their ecologically, geologically, historically, or culturally important qualities.”</p> <p>Closed “Minor Non-conformance SFI-2008-03: SFI Indicator 6.1.1 requires “Use of existing natural heritage data and expert advice in identifying or selecting sites for protection because of their ecologically, geologically, historically, or culturally important qualities.” Natural Heritage Inventory (NHI) forms a critical part of the WDNR system for planning all projects and timber sales, but data entry for the NHI database is backlogged, and it is not clear that known sites are protected despite the backlog.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See response to FSC CAR 2008.8 • 13 properties surveyed 2008 and another 23 properties to be surveyed in 2009 in preparation for Master Planning • “The department’s commitment to support master planning efforts, along with several new grants, has significantly increased DNR’s capacity to map new rare species and community records into the NHI database. Based on currently available staff and funding, mapping efforts for each of the next two fiscal years are projected to be 160% higher than FY09 mapping efforts. This is much better than previously anticipated, given the state’s severe budget deficit. Significant progress has already been made in reducing the backlog; for example, the backlog for animal records was reduced by 62% since this time last year. The future ability to incorporate NHI information in a timely manner will continue to depend on available funds.” • New grants have been secured to support heritage work including mapping, with a focus on most important sites and regions as identified in the Wisconsin Wildlife Action Plan. “The NHI Program secured several State Wildlife Grants, as well as

		other federal funds, to support further mapping and data backlog reduction.”
6.1.2	EXR	<p>“Appropriate mapping, cataloging, and management of identified special sites.” <u>Programs for identification and management of special sites are superb.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special sites are identified, mapped, and protected or managed appropriately. Significant resources are employed to do so; active management methods, when employed, are developed by interdisciplinary teams normally including at least a forester and an ecologist or wildlife biologist. • A dominant use zone titled “Native Community Management Areas” is available and is applied as appropriate. While vegetation management including timber harvesting is available in this zone any such treatment is carefully applied. Some of these areas have an overlay “State Natural Area” designation, which provides an additional level of care; the Bureau of Endangered Resources has an SNA program with extensive knowledge and experience available to local property managers for both categories.
7.1	C	<i>“Program Participants shall employ appropriate forest harvesting technology and “in-woods” manufacturing processes and practices to minimize waste and ensure efficient utilization of harvested trees, where consistent with other SFI Standard objectives.”</i>
7.1.1	C	<p>“Program or monitoring system to ensure efficient utilization, which may include...”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contracts reviewed contained a section on “Cutting and Utilization” that included provisions for efficient and thorough utilization including (in some cases) minimum tree or tip diameter that must be removed, removal of pulpwood trees with threshold number of pulpwood sticks, time of year provisions to avoid damage to logs from bark beetles, and other methods to ensure appropriate utilization. • Confirmed good utilization at field sites where harvests are complete or ongoing.
10.1	C	<i>“Program Participants shall require appropriate training of personnel and contractors so that they are competent to fulfill their responsibilities under the SFI Standard.”</i>
10.1.1	C	<p>“Written statement of commitment to the SFI Standard communicated throughout the organization, particularly to mill and woodland managers, wood procurement staff, and field foresters.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Wisconsin DNR’s commitment is documented in policy memos. • All DNR employees encountered were aware of certification goals for Forest Division and Lands Division lands.
10.1.2	C	<p>“Assignment and understanding of roles and responsibilities for achieving SFI Standard objectives.” <u>Closed SFI CAR 2008.02</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An Integrated Certification Implementation Team (ICIT) has been developed to implement the certification requirements. • CAR response by Wisconsin DNR: “By May 15, 2009, the Department will expand forest certification orientation to all field managers using a combination of informational tools including newsletters, meetings and web pages. The Department will develop a manual code and relevant handbook revisions to clearly lay out a commitment to SFI and FSC forest certification criteria and indicators, including a description of roles for various teams and individuals.” • Actions by WiDNR: Created a new Manual Code, which is awaiting signature by the DNR Secretary but has been approved by the two leadership teams and is being implemented, including certification training (on-line tools such as PowerPoint, web-based broadcasts): <p>“Manual Code 2406.1 State of Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, Forest Certification</p>

		<p>Implementation: PURPOSE: Define how the Divisions of Forestry, Land and Water shall coordinate implementation of forest certification under third-party standards. Applicable independent certification schemes include the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) and/or the Sustainable Forest Initiative (SFI) for public lands and the American Tree Farm System (ATFS) and/or FSC for private land enrolled in the Managed Forest Law Certified Group.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No mandatory training for specific personnel. • People on certification implementation team have good understanding of SFIS; field staff awareness is not as strong but is adequate
10.1.3	C	<p>“Staff education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmed training records for selected forestry division employees in one state forest. Good records exist of training going back at 6 or more years; some managers would like more training opportunities. One manager’s records indicated 50 hours of training per year on average, including new employee training. • Rolling out training on Invasive Species BMPs; will tie in pesticide training • Using Intranet web site to provide information on control of invasive species, including IPM methods • There are some gaps in training for pesticide application; see Indicator 2.2.5 above including related non-conformance. •
10.1.4	C	<p>“Contractor education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmed logger training requirements are in all timber sale contracts • Contractors who conduct pesticide application must be Wisconsin Certified Pesticide Applicators
10.2		<p><i>“Program Participants shall work closely with state logging or forestry associations, or appropriate agencies or others in the forestry community, to foster improvement in the professionalism of wood producers.”</i></p>
10.2.1 12.1.1, 12.2.1, and 12.5.1	EXR for 12.1.1, C for the other indi- cators	<p>“Participation in or support of SFI Implementation Committees to establish criteria and identify delivery mechanisms for wood producers’ training courses...”</p> <p>Note: Indicators 10.2.1, 12.1.1, 12.2.1, and 12.5.1 all relate to SFI Implementation Committee activities. Description of evidence is included here for all of these indicators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmed participation by the Wisconsin DNR’s Certification Coordinator in Wisconsin SIC as well as many certification activities at the national level. Notable among these are work with AFF on Tree Farm Standards and collaborative efforts (with other Midwestern organizations) to comment on proposed revisions to applicable forest certification standards. These efforts are helping Wisconsin maintain its position as a leader in forest certification.
12.1		<p><i>“Program Participants shall support and promote efforts by consulting foresters, state and federal agencies, state or local groups, professional societies, and the American Tree Farm System® and other landowner cooperative programs to apply principles of sustainable forest management.”</i></p>
12.1.1	EXR	<p>“Support for efforts of SFI Implementation Committees.”</p> <p><u>Wisconsin DNR, through its Forest Certification Coordinator and other efforts, has exceeded the standard for promoting the principles of sustainable forest management.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See also 10.2.1 above
12.2		<p><i>“Program Participants shall support and promote, at the state, provincial or other appropriate levels, mechanisms for public outreach, education, and involvement related to forest management.”</i></p>
12.2.1	C	<p>“Support for the SFI Implementation Committee program to address outreach, education, and technical assistance (e.g., toll-free numbers, public sector technical assistance programs).”</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See 10.2.1 above.
12.2.3	EXR	<p>“Recreation opportunities for the public, where consistent with forest management objectives.” <u>Exceeds the SFI Standard: The recreational and educational programs and facilities on state forests are very well designed and maintained, with recreational use given a high priority. Increases in demand for off-road vehicle use absent budget increases may compromise this current program strength.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmed by review of recreational facilities on all state forests that the provision of recreational opportunities is a major strength of the state forest management program. Recreational activities that are encouraged and supported include hunting, trapping, wildlife viewing, camping, swimming, picnicking, boating, canoeing, fishing, snowmobile riding, biking on paved trails and mountain biking, skiing, snowshoeing, and enjoyment of the forest’s scenic resources. • The trails, campgrounds, and visitor facilities on these lands are generally very well designed and maintained.
12.3		<i>“Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall participate in the development of public land planning and management processes.”</i>
12.3.1	C	<p>“Involvement in public land planning and management activities with appropriate governmental entities and the public.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WDNR has consistently been involved in planning efforts in national forests.
12.3.2	EXR	<p>“Appropriate contact with local stakeholders over forest management issues through state, provincial, federal, or independent collaboration.” <u>DNR’s efforts to involve and inform the public regarding management programs through use of the web, mailings, public meetings, and newsletters clearly exceed the standard.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State forest monitoring reports are available on the WDNR web site. • Friends groups in state parks provide many opportunities for involvement. • Confirmed that the monthly newsletter “Wisconsin Forestry Notes June 2009 Wisconsin DNR-Forestry Division includes a description of the public input process for the master plan revisions and a link (http://dnr.wi.gov/master_planning/BlackRiver/) to the web page with a comprehensive description of the planning process and opportunities for public input, as well as the complete draft master plan.
12.4		<i>“Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall confer with affected indigenous peoples.”</i>
12.5	C	<i>“Program Participants shall establish, at the state, provincial, or other appropriate levels, procedures to address concerns raised by loggers, consulting foresters, employees, the public, or Program Participants regarding practices that appear inconsistent with the SFI Standard principles and objectives.”</i>
12.5.1	C	<p>“Support for SFI Implementation Committee efforts (toll-free numbers and other efforts) to address concerns about apparent nonconforming practices.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See 10.2.1 above. Wisconsin DNR also submitted an inconsistent practices complaint regarding liquidation harvests, and pursued this issue to the national level, where it was resolved in favor of the department’s complaint, resulting in a significant clarification of the timber liquidation issue.
12.5.2	C	<p>“Process to receive and respond to public inquiries.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmed that WI DNR has many mechanisms for receiving public input. At the highest level any Wisconsin citizen can appear before the Natural Resources Board. There are web-based approaches and managers are readily available by phone or email, and often meet with concerned citizens or citizen groups.

12.6		<i>“Program Participants shall report annually to the SFI Program on their compliance with the SFI Standard.”</i>
12.6.1*	C	<p>“Prompt response to the SFI annual progress report.” (* This indicator will be reviewed in all audits.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmed with SFI Inc.
12.6.2	C	<p>“Recordkeeping for all the categories of information needed for SFI annual progress reports.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WisFIRS has custom SFI annual reports already set up for all DNR lands including Land Div. property. Forest management related data is tabulated and reported in a pre-formatted report available at a click of a button. Information related to research expenditures is provided by DNR Finance Specialists for all programs.
13.1*	C	<i>“Program Participants shall establish a management review system to examine findings and progress in implementing the SFI Standard, to make appropriate improvements in programs, and to inform their employees of changes.”</i>
13.1.1	C	<p>“System to review commitments, programs, and procedures to evaluate effectiveness.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Forests: The system for reviewing program effectiveness has two broad categories: performance reviews for staff with program-specific responsibilities, and program-focused reviews. Master plan monitoring, an FSC focus, also covers an important element of program effectiveness. Annual Reports provide a fairly comprehensive review of annual actions and activities on each forest, and in some cases managers are starting to link the annual report to the management plan. The department regularly conducts a comprehensive study of the effectiveness of major programs. • Lands Division: Each Land Division Program utilizes annual accomplishment reports that are evaluated by the program bureaus, the Land Division Leadership Team and federal agencies that provide part of the funding. The Land Division conducts periodic program reviews by function, and the results are used to development programmatic strategic plans (examples of which were provided to the auditor). The Land and Forestry Divisions regularly brief the Wisconsin Natural Resources Board, a statutory citizen board that oversees DNR operations. As a public agency, DNR operations are under constant scrutiny by the press and the State Legislature. The Department has a robust internal and external information and education program. Related to a FSC CAR, the Land Division is also developing a master plan implementation monitoring system similar to Forestry’s. • The report “STATEWIDE FOREST PLAN 2004-2009 ACCOMPLISHMENTS” provides additional context and listing of completed work in a broader context.
13.1.2	C	<p>“System for collecting, reviewing, and reporting information to management regarding progress in achieving SFI Standard objectives and performance measures.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DNR developed Manual Code 2406.1 on Forest Certification in 2009. The agency rule affirms commitment to certification conformance. The Manual Code formally establishes an Integrated Certification Implementation Team (ICIT), identifies the role of the Certification Coordinator, and explains the ICIT relation to the Division leadership teams (LLT and FLT). • Manual Code 2406.1 has been implemented by Division directives. The ICIT was staffed with program specialists from the Land and Forestry Divisions. It meets regularly to develop certification related strategies that are presented to the Division Leadership Teams and program operations teams as issue briefs.
13.1.3	C	<p>“Annual review of progress by management and determination of changes and improvements necessary to continually improve SFI conformance.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Forest Leadership Team (FLT) is the entity that reviews certification performance and formulates overall responses to issues affecting the state forest

		<p>system. Interviews with Paul DeLong, Wisconsin State Forester, and Mike Leudeke, Northern Regional Forester confirmed that certification issues have been covered regularly during FLT meetings. Review of agendas for FLT meetings confirmed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Land Leadership Team (LLT) is the management group responsible for guiding forest certification; it is the Lands Division’s counterpart to the Forestry Leadership Team. The DNR Forest Certification Coordinator (Paul Pingrey) provides certification issue briefs developed by the ICIT to both the Forestry and Land Division leadership Teams. • The DNR Forest Certification Coordinator advises the Forestry Operations Team (FOT) as an adjunct member, an important role since FOT carries out certification commitments through DNR forestry field staff that serve land management programs across the agency. • In addition to separate monthly meetings, FLT and LLT hold a joint meeting annually in the spring at which they receive and review forest certification reports and discuss topics of mutual concern. The annual reports include strategies for addressing CARs and progress thereon. The reports identify unique FSC and SFI issues.
--	--	---

Ferrucci Field Sites

Wednesday August 12, 2009

Stop 1: Glacial Habitat Restoration Area, Hull Property 44, Wetland Restoration

Stop 2: Glacial Habitat Restoration Area, Hull Property 44, Sale 7103 – Pending harvest mostly aspen with some green ash and box elder to regenerate aspen stands.

Stop 3: Mullet Creek Wildlife Area, Sale 2070-7 – Completed harvest including selection in mixed hardwood (Sugar Maple and Oak) and clearcut of Aspen.

Stop 4: Collins Marsh Wildlife Area, Sale 3622 – Planned harvest of a poletimber red maple stand on a seasonally-flooded site. Concerns about invasive reed canary grass.

Stop 5: Point Beach State Forest, Sale 3672 – Completed harvest in pine plantations, including removal of most Scotch pine, and thinning of extensive Red pine plantations.

Thursday August 13, 2009

Stop 1: Menominee Natural Resources Area – Old Growth Reserve and Managed Old Growth planned harvest – Planning for proposed harvest to enhance managed "old-growth"; pine plantation section

Stop 2: Menominee Natural Resources Area – Old Growth Reserve and Managed Old Growth planned harvest – Planning for proposed harvest to enhance managed "old-growth"; natural stand section

Stop 3: Pemene Falls Hiking Trail: trailhead, trails, Menominee River

Stop 4: Peshtigo River SF, Block House Sale 3810-05: partially completed harvest
4A – 20 acres completed clearcut with reserves in declining, poor quality scrub oak stand.
4B – Marked thinning surrounding the site of a group camp shelter to be built soon (funded)

Stop 5: Peshtigo River SF, Kirby Lake Harwoods: Area 8 (of 8 areas in the Peshtigo River SF Management Plan) is a "Native Community Management Area" most of which is a designated State Natural Area, and portions are to be actively managed as a comparison. The boundaries of the SNA include a red pine plantation (marked) that doesn't fit the SNA description; the boundary of the SNA will be adjusted to remove the plantation and allow it to be thinned.

Stop 6: Riverside Trail – ski trail and trailhead/parking.

Friday August 14, 2009 – Black River State Forest

Stop 5: Sale 1086 – East Clay School Jack Pine Sale – completed Jack Pine clearcut with reserves

Also reviewed documentation for Sale # 1087, 1079, 1080, 1081, 1085, 1080, 1092

All contracts included requirements for training (effective for sales sold after 1.1.2006), use of BMPs, and avoidance of excessive soil disturbance. Timber sale narratives described the sales and indicated goals or objectives of the harvests. Sale prospectus included clearly worded "Purpose of Sale".

Attendees:

Opening Meeting

Wednesday August 12, 2009

Glacial Habitat Restoration Area

Curt Wilson, Regional Forestry Leader
Jeff Pritzel, Regional Wildlife Supervisor
Ron Jones, Lakeshore Area Forestry Team Leader
Mark Randolph, Wildlife Biologist
Wade Oehmichen, Property Manager
Tom Vanden Elzen (FR Fond du lac)

Mullet Creek / Collins Marsh Wildlife Management Areas

Aaron Buchholz, Wildlife Biologist
Sue Crowley, Forester FR Manitowoc
Jack Kellerman, Wildlife LTE
Others from previous list continued on

Point Beach State Forest

Guy Willman, Superintendent
Bryon Woodbury (Wildlife Biologist)
Erin , Ranger PBSF

Thursday August 13, 2009

North East Regional Headquarters

Curt Wilson, Regional Forestry Leader
Jeff Pritzel, Regional Wildlife Supervisor
Joe Henry (Regional Ecologist),
Arnie Lindauer, Regional Park Supervisor
Shelley Wrzochaski, Forester
Dick Nikolai, Wildlife Biologist
Ron Jones, Lakeshore Area Forestry Team Leader
John Lubbers, Regional Forestry Staff Sup

Wausaukee Office

Mike Folgert, Area Forestry Leader)
Cole Couvillion, Forestry Team Leader-Wausaukee
Dave Halfmann, Wildlife Biologist),
Aaron McCullough, (Wildlife Tech),
Craig Leitzke, Facilities and Lands Tech LTE);
Bruce Djupstrom, Forester/Ranger Pembine
Kate , Area Forestry Specialist

Many individuals from the first two meetings continued on for the field sites:

Menominee Natural Resources Area

Peshigo River State Forest

Dan Mertz (PRSF Property Manager),

Friday August 14, 2009 – Black River State Forest

Peter Bakken, Superintendent

Adam Wallace, Forester

Jennifer Boice, Forester,

Randy Hoffman, WDNR, State Natural Areas

Armund Bartz, Conservation Biologist

Alan Crossley, WDNR, Wildlife Public Lands Specialist

Drew Feldkirchner, WDNR, Endangered Resources, Forestry Liaison

Kate Fitzgerald, WDNR, Chief, Land Management and Planning

Tom Duke, WDNR, Regional Staff Specialist

Bob Mather, WDNR

Paul Pingrey, Forest Certification Coordinator

Teague Prichard, WDNR, Forestry Planner

Appendix V



Reporting Form

COMPANY CONTACT INFORMATION

Name of Certified Company		Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources		
Address	Street, No.	PO Box 7921		
	City	Madison	Zip/Postal Code	53707
	State or Province	WI		
Contact person		Paul E. Pingrey, Forest Certification Coordinator		
Telephone		608-267-7595	Fax	(608) 266-8576
E-mail	paul.pingrey@wisconsin.gov	Company website	http://dnr.wi.gov/forestry/	

CERTIFICATE INFORMATION

Forest Certification achieved (SFI, CSA)		SFI	
Certificate number		NSF-SFIS-1Y941	
Certification Date (mm/dd/yy)		Certificate Expiry Date (mm/dd/yy)	
Text in Scope Line of Certificate		<p>SFI Program implementation and other related activities covered by the SFI Standard 2005-2009. The SFI Certification Number is NSF-SFIS-1Y941. Categories included in the DNR Lands forest certification review include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northern and Southern State Forests • State Parks • State Recreation Trails • State Wildlife Areas • State Fisheries Areas • State Natural Areas • Natural Resource Protection and Management Areas • Lower Wisconsin Riverway • State Wild Rivers • State Owned Islands • Stewardship Demonstration Forests <p>The following DNR properties (about 130,599 acres) are explicitly excluded from the certification project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agricultural fields (due to potential GMO issue) • Stream Bank Protection Areas (eased lands not under DNR management) • Forest Legacy Easements (eased lands not under DNR management) • States Fish Hatcheries and Rearing Ponds (intensive non-forest use) • State Forest Nurseries (intensive non-forest use) • Nonpoint Pollution Control Easements (eased lands not under DNR management) • Poynette Game Farm and McKenzie 	

	Environmental Center (intensive non-forest use) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Boat Access Sites (intensive non-forest use) • Fire Tower Sites (intensive non-forest use) • Radio Tower Sites (intensive non-forest use) • Ranger Stations (intensive non-forest use) • Administrative Offices and Storage Buildings (intensive non-forest use) 	
Certification Body Name	NSF-ISR	
Accreditation Body Name	ANAB	
Accreditation Number	NSF-ISR 1301672-071107	
Canada Only: Notification Fee Paid	Yes	No

CERTIFIED FOREST INFORMATION

Forest area (to which certification applies)	1,541,187 ACRES	HECTARES	
SFI Certification¹ Breakout by State/Province	State/Province Wisconsin 1,459,339 ACRES	State/Province	ac/ha
	State/Province	ac/ha	State/Province ac/ha
Land ownership	% 100 public	%	private
Is this same area certified to another forest management standard? (mark with an 'x')	X YES NO If Yes, to which standard: CSA SFI X FSC If Yes, what portion of the acres/hectares (and AAC for certificates in Canada) reported on this form was previously certified? acres OR ha AAC		
CANADA ONLY Is the certification located in the Boreal?	% Boreal (acres) % Boreal (m3)	% Boreal (hectares) % Boreal (m3)	
CANADA ONLY AAC in m ³ (to which certification applies)	(For private lands use annual average harvest.)		

¹ SFI certificates may be multi-site and cross state and country borders. For accounting and reporting services, please provide the break-down if the certified forestland is in more than one state/province.

² Please refer to Principle 6 for AAC reporting guidelines