



# Surveillance Audit Report

Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Standard

September 1, 2010

**A. Wisconsin DNR State Lands**

**FRS #: 1Y941**

**B. Scope:**

No Change       Changed

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

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

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

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

**C. NSF Audit Team:**

Lead Auditor: Mike Ferrucci    Auditors: Dr. Robert Hrubes, JoAnn Hanowski

**D. Audit Dates: August 15-19, 2010**

**E. Reference Documentation:**

SFI 2005-2009 Standard® - primary focus

2010-2014 SFI Standard® - considered progress in updating by 12.31.10

**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

No significant changes, many minor changes:

**Changes to overall program of management of state lands and state forests:**

- New BMPs to be followed in 2011; have added filter-strip recommendations for streams and vernal pools; can be stipulated in a TS contract.
- CAR-related improvements
- Paul Pingrey retirement, higher priority vacancy, no yet approved, may take awhile; transition plan: Teague Pritchard –state lands; Jeff Barkley – County; Cathy Nelson – private lands certification duties
- State Forests: formerly 3% vacancy rate; now up to 12% vacancy; 8 furlough days per person per year
- Reduced from 4 Bureaus to 3; certification moved to into Bureau of Services; Bureau of Sciences closed
- Parks 25% vacancy rate
- Black River new plan Jan 2010; Flambeau River SF plan to NR Board next month
- Struggling to get Master Plans done in the other divisions
- New position Wildlife Planner; new LTE on planning in Division of Lands
- Closing 1 SF Nursery production (will close in 2 years or so); moving from 3 nurseries to 2
- Emphasis on general government downsizing; with new governor coming in 2011 more changes are due
- 10% cut on general government dollars; could still do contracting, did more of it out of timber receipts; tried a wide variety of services and currently evaluating
- Completed statewide forestry strategy in June 2010 (what is state’s forestry niche?); using this to develop a Forest Division strategy (what is the Forestry Division’s niche?)
- Reauthorized land acquisition program (stewardship); counties now eligible, but counties must pay half
- ICIT “Integrated Certification Implementation Team” met at least 10 times in past year, most active prior to December, hiatus in winter, busy again since spring

**H. Other Issues Reviewed:**

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

Yes No N.A.

SFI and other relevant logos or labels are utilized correctly.  
If no, document on CAR forms.

### **I. Corrective Action Requests:**

Corrective Action Requests issued this visit (through NSF's on-line OASIS audit tool):

1. Minor Non-conformance SFI-2010-01: An improperly located main skid trail in the Hoffman Hills SRA Tract #1-09 has led to erosion and sedimentation.
2. Transitional Minor Non-conformance SFI-2010-2: Available information is being monitored, but not all managers are knowledgeable about climate change impacts for the forests they manage. There is no plan for meeting this requirement by 12.31.10 as required by the SFI Transition Guidelines.

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.

Your Corrective Action Plans should be provided through your NSF On-line Interface. Any questions should be directed to DeMarrio Boles - Phone: 734-827-5634 or [Dboles@nsf-isr.org](mailto:Dboles@nsf-isr.org)

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

MAJOR(S): 0            MINOR(S): 1 (plus 1 transitional)

In addition, 5 Opportunities for Improvement (OFIs) were identified.

### **Appendices:**

Appendix I: Surveillance Notification Letter and Audit Schedule

Appendix II: Public Surveillance Audit Report

Appendix III: Audit Matrix

Appendix IV: CAR Form (closure for 2009 CAR only; 2010 and beyond using NSF On-line)

Appendix V: SFI Reporting Form (if needed)

**Appendix I**



**Surveillance Notification Letter  
and Audit Schedule**



August 5, 2010; Revised August 9, 2010

Teague Prichard, Forestry Planner  
Bureau of Forest Management  
WI Department of Natural Resources  
PO Box 7921, Madison, WI 53707-7921

Re: Confirmation of SFI and FSC Surveillance Audits, Wisconsin State Lands

Dear Mr. Prichard:

As previously arranged, we are scheduled to conduct the Surveillance Audit for the certified Wisconsin State Lands on August 16 to 19 as provided on the attached itinerary.

This is a partial review of your SFI Program to confirm that it continue to be in conformance with the requirements of the SFI 2005-2009 Standard as well as a transitional review of the additional requirements of the SFI 2010-2014 Standard. The focus will be on SFI requirements that are changing, and on your organization's progress towards implementing the changed requirements by the end of 2010. The SFI requirements for a "transitional audit" are attached.

During the audit I will also review that progress being made in closing the remaining open Minor Non-conformance (credentials for persons applying pesticides) and the Major Non-conformance previously closed (management planning), as well as focus on issues involved in past non-conformances previously closed.

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

The enclosed tentative schedule (previously agreed to) should be reviewed by all participants. It can be adapted either in advance or on-site to accommodate any special circumstances, particularly the locations of actively harvested sites. If you have any questions regarding this planned audit, please contact either of us.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Michael Ferrucci".

Mike Ferrucci  
SFI Program Manager, NSF-ISR  
26 Commerce Drive, North Branford, CT 06471  
[mferrucci@iforest.com](mailto:mferrucci@iforest.com) Office and Mobile: 203-887-9248

Attachments: Transitional rules; Draft Itinerary

Portions highlighted are most relevant to the upcoming surveillance audit.

## 10. TRANSITION TO THE SFI 2010-2014 STANDARD

*Changes adopted by the SFI Inc. Board of Directors to the SFI Standard must be incorporated into a Program Participant's policies, plans, and management activities within one year of adoption and publication. Similarly, changes to certification procedures and qualifications for certification bodies must be accomplished within one year of adoption and publication.*

It is the *Program Participant's* responsibility to work with the certification body to establish a surveillance audit schedule that meets the requirements outlined in the SFI 2010-2014 Audit Procedures and Auditor Qualifications and Accreditation document. Additional guidance regarding the transition is included below:

- The *SFI 2010-2014 Standard* replaces the *SFI 2005-2009 Standard*, which is the current standard implemented by organizations within their forest operations in United States and Canada.
- *SFI Inc.* developed the *SFI 2010-2014 Standard*, but does not conduct auditing and certification. All certification, recertification and surveillance audits to the *SFI 2010-2014 Standard* shall be conducted by *certification bodies* accredited by the Standards Council of Canada (SCC) or the ANSI-ASQ National Accreditation Board (ANAB) to conduct SFI certification.
- Accredited *certification bodies* are required to maintain audit processes consistent with the requirements of International Organization for Standardization (ISO) 17021:2006 conformity assessment — requirements for bodies providing audit and certification of management systems; and conduct audits in accordance with the principles of auditing contained in the ISO 19011:2002 Guidelines for Quality and/or Environmental Management Systems Auditing.
- ANAB- and SCC-accredited certification to the *SFI 2010-2014 Standard* shall not be granted until it is published as a standard.
- *SFI Program Participants* have one year from the time the *SFI 2010-2014 Standard* takes effect on Jan. 1, 2010 to implement all new and revised requirements, and *certified program participants* must demonstrate conformance to the new requirements at their first surveillance audit following the implementation period. Earlier adoption is encouraged.
- Initial registration audits in 2010 must be conducted against the *SFI 2010-2014 Standard*.
- After March 31, 2010 all re-registrations must be conducted against the *SFI 2010-2014 Standard*. For re-registrations against the *SFI 2010-2014 Standard* nonconformities against changes made in the revised *SFI 2010-2014 Standard* shall be reported but will not adversely affect re-registration until after December 31, 2010.
- Surveillance audits through December 31, 2010 may be conducted against either the *SFI 2005-2009 Standard* or *SFI 2010-2014 Standard* at the auditee's choice. For surveillance audits after March 31, 2010, *nonconformities* against changes made in the revised *SFI 2010-2014 Standard* shall be reported but will not adversely affect certification status until December 31, 2010; these audits shall also include an assessment of action plans to fully transition to the *SFI 2010-2014 Standard* by December 31, 2010.
- After December 31, 2010 all surveillance audits must be conducted against the *SFI 2010-2014 Standard*.

Source: Section 6, Guidance to SFI 2010-2014 Standard, "Requirements for the SFI 2010-2014 Program: Standards, Rules for Label Use, Procedures, and Guidance".

**WDNR All Lands Forest Certification Audit**  
**FINAL -- 2010 FSC & SFI Audit Schedule -**

August 15 (Sunday) – August 19 (Thursday)

**Kick off & CAR  
Review Team**

---

**August 15<sup>th</sup> (Sunday)**

**Location: Superior, WI**

**6:00 pm** Certification Kick-off and CAR Report review  
Barker's Island Inn – “Erie Room”

Auditors and Integrated Certification Implementation Team (Teague Prichard, John Gritt, Kristin Lambert)  
Overnight Location: Superior Barkers Island Inn Hotel

**Materials**

2009 CAR Progress Report & Audit Schedule

---

**August 16<sup>th</sup> (Monday)**

**Team #1 – West Team**

Auditors: Robert Hrubes and Joanne Hanowski  
ICIT Team: Teague Prichard

**Visit #1: 7:30 am – 9:30 am** (30 minute drive from Superior)

**Property Name:** Brule River State Forest (visit 3-4 sales out of 30)

**Property Type:** State Forest

**Property Acres:** 41,576

**Location:** Meet at State Forest Headquarters Conference Room  
(6250 South Ranger Rd. - Brule, WI 54820)

**Contact:** FR Area Leader - Jay Gallagher 715-372-8539 ext 111 (Confirmed)  
*Property Manager - Dave Schulz, (715)-372-5678 ext 105 (Will not attend)*

**Visit #2: 10:30 am – 11:00 am** (1 hour drive from Brule River S.F.)

**Property Name:** Bean Brook Fishery Area (2 sales)

**Property Type:** Fishery Area

**Property Acres:** 1,531

**Location:** SE, SW of Section 27, T40N-R11W - parking lot on south side of Willers Rd.

**Contact:** Property Manager - Nancy Christel (Confirmed) (715)-645-0072 cell  
Forester – Brad Johnson

**Visit #3 (3 props): 12:00 pm – 5:00 pm** (1 hour drive from Bean Brook)

**\*\*All attendees for the next 3 properties meet at CREX station**

**LUNCH at Crex (12 - 12:30) – Lunch provided by Gov Knowles Staff**

**Property Name:** Crex Meadows (2 sales)

**Property Type:** Wildlife Management

**Property Acres:** 28,087

**Location:** **110 East Crex Avenue – Grantsburg, WI 54840**

**Contact:** Property Manager - Pete Engman (715) 463-2896 (Confirmed)  
Forester – Ross Larson (Confirmed)

**Property Name:** Governor Knowles State Forest (visit 2-4 sales out of 12)

**Property Type:** State Forest

**Property Acres:** 20,461

**Contact:** Dan Thill (Superintendent) 715-463-2897 (Confirmed)  
Mike Wallis (Forester) 715-463-2897 (Confirmed)

**Property Name:** Danbury Wildlife Area (visit 1-3 sales out of 4)

**Property Type:** Wildlife Management

**Property Acres:** 2,231

**Contact:** Property Manager - Pete Engman (715) 463-2896 (Confirmed)  
Forester – Jim Becker (Confirmed)

**Overnight Spooner, WI (Best Western)**

---

**August 16<sup>th</sup> (Monday)**

## **Team #2 – East Team**

Auditor: Mike Ferrucci

ICIT Team: John Gritt, Kristin Lambert, Randy Hoffman

### **Visit #1: 7:30 am – 9:30 am** (30 minute drive from Superior)

**Property Name:** Brule River State Forest (visit 3-4 sales out of 30)

**Property Type:** State Forest

**Property Acres:** 41,576

**Location:** Meet at State Forest Headquarters Conference Room  
(6250 South Ranger Rd. - Brule, WI 54820)

**Contact:** FR Area Leader - Jay Gallagher 715-372-8539 ext 111 (Confirmed)  
*Property Manager - Dave Schulz, (715)-372-5678 ext 105 (Will not attend)*

### **Visit #2: 10:15 am – 11:00 am** (30 min drive from Brule River SF)

**Property Name:** White River Fishery Area – Bayfield (2 sales)

**Property Type:** Fisheries Management

**Property Acres:** 3,258

**Location:** Meet at: Intersection of Delta/Drummond Road and Cut Off Road (Just south of H)

**Contact:** Prop Manager - Dave Lindsley 715-685-2931 (Confirmed)

Prop Manager – Scott Toshner (Confirmed)

Forester - Brian Klobuchar 715-795-2565 (Confirmed)

### **Visit #3 (2 PROPERTIES): 12:00 pm – 2:00 pm** (1 hour drive from White River Fishery Area)

**\*\*All attendees for both properties should meet at the parking area on W. Chief River Road (1/2 mi east of North Fork Chief River)\*\***

#### **LUNCH 12:00 - 12:30 – Provided by Kim (Confirmed)**

**Property Name:** Chief River Wildlife Area (1 sale)

**Property Type:** Wildlife Management

**Property Acres:** 1,189

**Location:** Meet at parking area on W. Chief River Road (1/2 mi east of North Fork Chief River)

**Contact:** Forester - Kim Lemke (Confirmed) 715-296-5248 -cell

Wildlife Technician – Mike Bulgrin 715-558-0648 -cell (Confirmed)

*Prop Manager – Ken Jonas 715-634-9658 Ext.3534 (Will not Attend)*

**Property Name:** Chippewa Flowage (visit 2-3 sales out of 9)

**Property Type:** Water Resources (Lands & Facilities)

**Property Acres:** 7,029

**Contact:** Prop Manager – Neal Kephart (Confirmed)

Forester - Kim Lemke 715-634-9658 ext 3506 (Confirmed)

**Randy Hoffman will join us here**

### **Visit #4: 3:00 pm – 5:00 pm** (1 hour drive from Chippewa Flowage)

**Property Name:** Flambeau River State Forest (visit 3-4 sales out of 30 sales)

**Property Type:** State Forest

**Property Acres:** 91,619

**Location:** W1613 Co. Rd. W - Winter, WI 54896

**Contact:** State Forest Superintendent - Jim Halvorson (715) 332-5271 (Confirmed)

\* Carmen Wagner (Forestry Hydrologist) will meet here

## **Overnight Spooner, WI (Best Western)**

---

---

## **August 17<sup>th</sup> (Tuesday)**

### **Team #1 – West Team**

Auditors: Mike Ferrucci and Joanne Hanowski

ICIT Team: John Gritt & Kristin Lambert

### **Visit #1: 7:30 am – 8:30 am** (30 minute drive from Spooner)



**Property Name:** Mc Kenzie Creek Wildlife Area (visit 1-3 sales out of 3)  
**Property Type:** Wildlife Management  
**Property Acres:** 161  
**Location:** Just north of CTH W on CTH O, Parking Area. SESE Sec. 31 T37N R15W  
**Contact:** Prop Manager - Kevin Morgan 715-637-6867 (Confirmed)  
Forester - Paul Heimstead 715-485-3518 (Confirmed)  
FR Area Leader - Steve Runstrom

**Visit #2: 9:45 am – 10:30 am** (1 hour drive from McKenzie Creek WL Area)

**Property Name:** Casey Lake Wildlife Area (1 sale)  
**Property Type:** Wildlife Management  
**Property Acres:** 209  
**Location:** Parking Lot on 130<sup>th</sup> Ave (Just before you cross 190<sup>th</sup> St.) Baldwin, WI  
**Contact:** Prop Manager - Mike Soergel (Confirmed)  
Prop Manager – Harvey Halvorsen 715-684-2914 ext 113 (Confirmed)  
FR Area Leader - Mark Kubler (Confirmed)  
Dahn Bohr – Forester (Confirmed)

**Visit #3 (4 PROPERTIES): 11:00 am – 5:00 pm**

**\*\*Attendees for the next 4 properties meet at 11 am**

**Menomonie DNR Station: 921 Brickyard Road - Menomonie, WI 54751**

**LUNCH (11-11:30 am) – Provided by Mark Kubler (Confirmed)**

**Property Name:** Hoffman Hills Recreation Area (1 sale)  
**Property Type:** Parks  
**Property Acres:** 706  
**Contact:** Prop Manager – Scott Erickson 715-382-4574  
Forester – Rob Strand 715-232-6980 / Jay Jordan

**Property Name:** Muddy Creek Wildlife Area (1 sale)  
**Property Type:** Wildlife Management  
**Property Acres:** 3,382  
**Contact:** Prop Manager – Jess Carstens 715-232-1519 (Confirmed)  
Forester – Jay Jordan 715-232-1516

**Property Name:** Elk Creek Fishery Area (1 sale)  
**Property Type:** Fisheries Management  
**Property Acres:** 273  
**Contact:** Prop Manager – Bob Hujik 715 781-7971-cell - *will be at McCann from 12-2, will meet at Elk Creek*  
(Confirmed)  
Forester – Jim Skorczewski 715-726-7885 (Confirmed)  
Forester - Mike Rankin

**Property Name:** Lower Chippewa River State Natural Area (no sales)  
**Property Type:** Natural Area  
**Property Acres:** 1,701  
**Contact:** Prop Manager – Jess Carstens 715-232-1519 (Confirmed)  
Forester – Rob Strand / Jay Jordan (Confirmed)

**OVERNIGHT STOP: Eau Claire, WI (Heartland Inn)**

---

**August 17<sup>th</sup> (Tuesday)**

**Team #2 – East Team**

Auditor: Robert Hrubes  
ICIT Team: Randy Hoffman & Teague Prichard

**Visit #1: 7:30 am – 8:15 am** (10 minute drive from Spooner)

**Property Name:** Beaver Brook Wildlife Area (1 sale)  
**Property Type:** Wildlife Management  
**Property Acres:** 1,904

**Location:** DNR station - 810 W. Maple. St. - Spooner, WI 54801  
**Contact:** Prop Manager – Nancy Christel (Confirmed) (715)-645-0072 cell  
Forester – Brad Johnson

**Visit #2 : (2 PROPERTIES) 9:00 am – 10:30 am**(30 minute drive from Beaver Brook WL Area)

**Property Name:** Yellow River Fishery Area (1 sale) / Engle Creek Springs Fishery Area (1 sale)

**Property Type:** Fisheries Management

**Property Acres:** 681 / 180

**Location:** Meet at the junction of State Highways 48 & 25 at the Town Hall parking lot. The Stanfold Town Hall is in the SE corner of that intersection - meet in the hall parking lot.

**Contact:** Prop Manager - Ronald Komro 715-637-6866 (Confirmed)  
Forester - Chris Rucinski 715-637-6865 (Confirmed)

**Visit #3 : (2 PROPERTIES) 12:00pm – 2:00 pm** (1 hour drive from Engle Creek FA)

**LUNCH \*\* (Lunch will be picked up in Barron on the drive over) \*\***

**Property Names:** Chippewa Moraine State Recreation Area “Ice Age Reserve” (No Sales)

**Property Type:** Parks

**Property Acres:** 3,305

**Location:** Meet at: 13394 County Highway M - New Auburn, WI 54757

**Contact:** Forester – Jim Skorczewski 715-559-2251- cell (Confirmed)  
Property Contact - Rod Gont (Confirmed)  
*Prop Manager – Brenda Rederer (will meet at Lake Wissota SP)*

**Property Names:** McCann Creek Fishery Area (1 sale)

**Property Type:** Fisheries Management

**Property Acres:** 322

**Contact:** Prop Manager – Bob Hujik 715 781-7971 (cell) (Confirmed)  
Forester – Jim Skorczewski 715-559-2251- cell (Confirmed)

**Visit #4 : (2 PROPERTIES) 2:30 pm – 5:00 pm**(15 minute drive from McCann)

**Property Name:** Tom Lawin Wildlife Area (Sale 1 sale)

**Property Type:** Wildlife Management

**Property Acres:** 2,318

**Location:** Meet at corner of CTH S & CTH K – from McCann - Hwy. 40 south to Hwy. 64. Take 64 east to Hwy. 124. Take 124 south to CTH Y just south of Eagleton. Take Y east to Hwy. 178. Take Y/178 east and cross the Chippewa River at Jim Falls and take CTH S east(right after you get across the river turn left on S) to where it intersects CTH K

**Contact:** Prop Manager – John Dunn (Confirmed) – (715)-225-9404 \*\*call when at McCann Cr\*\*  
Forester – Jim Skorczewski 715-559-2251- cell (Confirmed)

**Property Name:** Lake Wissota State Park (no sales)

**Property Type:** Parks

**Property Acres:** 1,031

**Location:** 18127 Cty Hwy O, Chippewa Falls

**Contact:** Prop Manager – Scott Erickson 715-382-4574  
Forester – Jim Skorczewski 715-559-2251- cell (Confirmed)

**OVERNIGHT STOP: Eau Claire, WI (Heartland Inn)**

**August 18<sup>th</sup> (Wednesday)**

**Team #1 – West Team**

Auditors: Robert Hrubes and Mike Ferrucci

ICIT Team: Randy Hoffman & Teague Prichard

**Visit #1: 7:30 am – 8:15 am**(30 minute drive from Eau Claire)

**Property Name:** Buffalo River State Trail (1 sale)

**Property Type:** Parks

**Property Acres:** 285

**Location:** Hardees in Osseo, ¼ mile east of I-94

**Contact:** Property Manager - Jim Thompson (Confirmed)

Forester – Dan Dehmer (Confirmed)

**Visit #2 (2 PROPERTIES) : 10:00 am – 12:00 pm**(2 hour drive from Buffalo River State Trail)

**LUNCH 11:30 – 12 Lunch provided by Buckhorn Staff – (Confirmed)**

**Property Name:** Buckhorn Wildlife Area (3 sales) / Buckhorn State Park (1 sale)

**Property Type:** Wildlife Management / Parks

**Property Acres:** 3,741 / 1,575

**Location:** Meet at: W8450 Buckhorn Park Ave - Necedah, WI 54646

**Contact:** Prop Manager - Joe Stecker-Kochanski 608-565-2789 (Confirmed)

WL Manager - Jon Robaidek - 715-498-2338 - cell (Confirmed)

Forester – Kris Wimme (Confirmed)

**Final Stop Madison : 2:00 pm**(1 hr 45 min drive to Madison from Buckhorn)

**3:00pm – 5:00 pm – Room 413**

Auditors, ICIT Team & Other Staff

Overnight at the Concourse Hotel (1 W. Dayton St – Madison, WI 53703)

---

**Team #2 – East Team**

Auditor: Joanne Hanowski

ICIT Team: Kristin Shy & John Gritt

**Visit #1 : 7:30 am – 8:15 am**(30 minute drive from Eau Claire)

**Property Name:** Augusta Wildlife Area (1 sale)

**Property Type:** Wildlife Management

**Property Acres:** 2,318

**Location:** Field staff will meet at the Heartland Inn

**Contact:** Prop Manager – John Dunn (Confirmed)

Forester – Chris Widstrand 715-839-3782 (Confirmed)

**Visit #2: 8:45 am – 9:30 am** (30 minute drive from Augusta)

**Property Name:** Buffalo River Fishery Area - Jackson (visit 2-3 sales out of 6)

**Property Type:** Fisheries Management

**Property Acres:** 1,168

**Location:** Meet at the corner of County Hwy B & County Hwy G

**Contact:** Forester – Russ Kind 715-284-1415 (Confirmed)

*Prop Manager – Dan Hatleli (Will Not Attend)*

**Visit #3 : 10:30 am – 11:30 pm**(1 hour drive from Buffalo River FA)

**Property Name:** Sandhill Wildlife Area (visit 2-3 sales out of 5)

**Property Type:** Wildlife Management

**Property Acres:** 10,058

**Location:** 1715 County Highway X – Babcock, WI 54413

**Contact:** Prop Manager – Neal Paisley 715-884-2437 (Confirmed)

Forester – Mark Chryst 715-884-2437 office / 715-459-2650 (cell) (Confirmed)

**Visit #4 : Meet team #1 at Buckhorn State Park**

**LUNCH 11:30 – 12 Lunch provided by Buckhorn Staff – (Confirmed)**

**Final Stop Madison : 2:00 pm** (1 hour 45 min drive to Madison from Buckhorn)

**3:00pm – 5:00 pm – Room 413**

Auditors, & Other Staff

ICIT Team - Jeff Prey, Alan Crossley, JoAnne Farnsworth, Teague Prichard, Kristin Lambert, John Gritt

Overnight at the Concourse Hotel (1 W. Dayton St – Madison, WI 53703)

---

August 19 (Thursday)

WDNR All lands Forest Certification Exit Report

8 am – 10 am

Exit Report

Madison, GEF 2 G09  
Auditors, ICIT, DNR staff, Bureau Directors and Division Administrators  
Purpose: Preliminary Findings from the field audit and status of CARS

---

**Contacts:**

Dr Robert Hrubes	510-913-0696
Mike Ferrucci	203-887-9248
JoAnn Hanowski	
Teague Prichard	608-628-5606 (cell)
John Gritt	920-912-8007 (cell)
Kristin Lambert	414-322-7755 (cell)
Randy Hoffman	
Jeff Prey	
Paul Cunningham	
Alan Crossley	608-575-2291 (cell)

***Field Staff***

Jim Skorczewski	715-559-2251 (cell)
Jon Robaidek	715-498-2338 (cell)
Mark Chryst	715-459-2650 (cell)
Bob Hujik	715 781-7971 (cell)
Kim Lemke	715-296-5248 (cell)
Mike Bulgrin	715-558-0648 (cell)
John Dunn	715 225-9404 (cell)

## 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 II



### 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 program is also well-positioned to complete the transition to the SFI 2010-2014 Standard, required by 2011.

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

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

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

#### An Overview of Forest Management on Wisconsin State Forests

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

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

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

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

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

### **An Overview of Forest Management on Wisconsin State Park Lands**

Source: Managing Forests on Wisconsin State Park Lands

#### **“Overall Management Priorities**

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

- **Aesthetics:** Protect scenic views and allow forest cover to provide settings for solitude and privacy.
- **Recreation:** Sustain large canopy cover and shade in picnic areas, campgrounds, along nature trails, and high use areas.
- **Habitat:** Provide habitat for a wide variety of wildlife and plants, including endangered and threatened species.
- **Forest Health:** Allow for regeneration of the forest through quality forest management and seek opportunities that enhance or maintain the overall health and vigor of the forest ecosystem.
- **Pest management:** Manage invasive plant and animal species, pests, diseases, and nuisance wildlife through prevention, control, and eradication activities.
- **Education and research:** Provide opportunities for interpretation, education, and scientific research.
- **Water quality:** Sustain and enhance local watersheds and water resources including erosion control along waterways, trails, and other property features.”

### **An Overview of Forest Management on Wisconsin Wildlife Areas**

Source: to be provided by Wisconsin DNR.

## Audit Procedure

This report describes the second annual follow-up Surveillance Audit designed to focus on the program's progress in conforming to changes in the SFI 2010-2014 Standard required by December 31, 2010, 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 11-19 by an audit team headed by Mike Ferrucci, SFI Lead Auditor. The other members of the audit team included Robert Hrubec, 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 Teague Pritchard, Public Land Specialist and Acting 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. In addition, the audit was designed to assess readiness to conform to the requirements of the Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Standard, 2010-2014 Edition by the deadline of December 31, 2010.

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. Further, any additional requirements under the new SFI 2010-2014 Standard were reviewed to determine conformance. Although the program was being audited to the old standard the audit team assessed the program's plans to implement the new requirements by the end of 2010.

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

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

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



## **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 non-conformances as detailed below.

### **One New Minor Non-conformance**

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

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

### **One Transitional Minor Non-conformance**

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

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

Wisconsin DNR will develop 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 2009 were closed:

### **Major Non-conformance SFI-2009-01 was closed by 12.30.09 as required.**

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. 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)."

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 2009 audit this had not been completed, but objectives were completed and posted on-line, satisfying the requirement. During the 2010 audit, selected management plans and objectives were reviewed and conformance confirmed.

### **Minor Non-conformance SFI-2009-02:**

SFI Indicator 2.2.5 requires "Supervision of forest chemical applications by state-trained or certified applicators." At the time of the 2009 audit Lands Division policies regarding staff who apply general use chemicals but who may not be Certified Pesticide Applicators (and thus may not be trained) were unclear. Not all employees applying chemicals were trained or working under a trained supervisor. The Wisconsin DNR has clarified these policies and communicated them through a Divisional Directive from both Lands and Forestry Divisions as well as agency-specific internal communication tools.

In 2009 one opportunity for improvement was also identified, and this has been addressed: 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.” BMPs for vernal pools have been developed in conjunction with a major revision of the Wisconsin’s BMP standards.

Several Opportunities for Improvement were identified:

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 ...

There is an opportunity to improve the depth and clarity of objectives for Tier 1 and Tier 2 properties lacking an up-to-date, detailed master plan.

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

Closed Minor Non-conformance SFI 2009-02: The detailed and complex Corrective Action Plan was substantially and effectively completed. Instead of a complete Manual Code revision a Joint Divisional Directive was issued by the Directors of the Lands and the Forestry Division.

There is an opportunity to improve knowledge of policies for supervision of pesticide applications, including restricted use pesticides and general use pesticides. Note: NSF interprets the standard as requiring supervision for either type of pesticide.

Indicator 4.1.4 requires “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).”

There is an opportunity on the Governor Knowles State Forest to improve retention of appropriate trees for wildlife habitat as per the habitat guidelines.

Indicator 10.1.4 requires “Contractor education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities.”

There is an opportunity to improve by offering formal (FISTA or other) BMP training to road building or road maintenance personnel or contractors.

Indicator 13.1.3 requires “Annual review of progress by management and determination of changes and improvements necessary to continually improve SFI conformance.”

There is an opportunity to improve annual review of the SFI by management to ensure that issues are covered annually by both divisions involved in the certification.

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 Bureaus 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 12.2.3 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.
5. 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.
6. Indicator 1.1.1 involves management planning. Management planning work continues, with investments in templates and streamlined planning approaches beginning to show important productivity improvements.

The next surveillance audit will occur in August, 2010.

### **General Description of Evidence of Conformity**

NSF’s audit team used a variety of evidence to determine conformance. A general description of this evidence is provided below, organized by SFI 2010-2014 Objective. (Note: This audit was to the SFI 2005-2009 Standard, with a review of progress towards SFI 2010-2014.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Summary of Evidence** – Field observations of completed operations and policies/procedures for visual quality were assessed during the evaluation. Further maps of recreation sites, combined with field visits, helped confirm a strong recreation program. Recreational use and esthetics were priority concerns where appropriate.

**Objective 6. Protection of Special Sites** - To manage lands that are ecologically, geologically, or culturally important in a manner that takes into account their unique qualities.

**Summary of Evidence** – Field observations of completed operations, records of special sites, training records, and written protection plans were all assessed during the evaluation. The strong program of Scientific Natural Areas contributed to the conclusions.

**Objective 7. Efficient Use of Forest Resources** - To promote the efficient use of forest resources.

**Summary of Evidence** – Field observations of completed operations, contract clauses, harvest inspection reports, and discussions with supervising field foresters and with loggers provided the key evidence.

**Objective 14. Legal and Regulatory Compliance** -

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

**Summary of Evidence** – Field reviews of ongoing and completed operations were the most critical evidence.

**Objective 15. Forestry Research, Science, and Technology** - To support forestry research, science, and technology, upon which sustainable forest management decisions are based.

**Summary of Evidence** – Financial records were confirmed, and some field research sites were visited.

**Objective 16. Training and Education** -To improve the implementation of sustainable forestry practices through appropriate training and education programs.

**Summary of Evidence** – Training records of selected personnel, records associated with harvest sites audited, and logger and stakeholder interviews were the key evidence for this objective.

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

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

**Summary of Evidence** – Recently completed property master plans were sufficient to assess the requirements. These plans describe a comprehensive public input process, comments received, and changes to plans in response to those comments where feasible. Further, the Wisconsin DNR answers to the Wisconsin Natural Resources Board, providing regular opportunities for citizen input and a long-term and very knowledgeable governing board of citizens as well.

**Objective 18: Public Land Management Responsibilities** -

To support and implement sustainable forest management on public lands.

**Summary of Evidence** – Interviews and review of documents were used to confirm the requirements.

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

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

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

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

### **Relevance of Forestry Certification**

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

#### **1. Sustainable Forestry**

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

#### **2. Forest Productivity and Health**

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

#### **3. Protection of Water Resources**

To protect water bodies and riparian zones, and to conform with best management practices to protect water quality.

#### **4. Protection of Biological Diversity**

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

#### **5. Aesthetics and Recreation**

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

#### **6. Protection of Special Sites**

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

#### **7. Responsible Fiber Sourcing Practices in North America**

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

#### **8. Avoidance of Controversial Sources including Illegal Logging in Offshore Fiber Sourcing**

To avoid wood fiber from illegally logged forests when procuring fiber outside of North America, and to avoid sourcing fiber from countries without effective social laws.

#### **9. Legal Compliance**

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

#### **10. Research**

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

### **11. Training and Education**

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

### **12. Public Involvement**

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

### **13. Transparency**

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

### **14. Continual Improvement**

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

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

### **For Additional Information Contact:**

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

Teague Prichard  
State Lands Specialist, Division of Forestry  
101 S. Webster Street PO BOX 7921  
Madison, WI 53707  
608-264-8883  
[teague.prichard@wisconsin.gov](mailto:teague.prichard@wisconsin.gov)

**Appendix III**



**Audit Matrix**

**Wisconsin DNR 2010 Surveillance Audit – Matrix for SFIS 2005-2009**

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) NR=Not Reviewed
- Findings are indicated by a date or date code: Audit Date10 Date Code August 2010

**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		Audit- or	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				OFI
			C	EXR	Maj	Min	
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>		10				
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).		10		9		10
1.1.2	Documentation of annual harvest trends in relation to the sustainable forest management plan.		9, 10				
1.1.3	A forest inventory system and a method to calculate growth.		9, 10				
1.1.4	Periodic updates of inventory and recalculation of planned harvests.		9, 10				
1.1.5	Documentation of forest practices (e.g., planting, fertilization, and thinning) consistent with assumptions in harvest plans.		9, 10				



**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
			<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
<b>2.1</b>	<b><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></b>		10				
2.1.1	Designation of all management units for either natural or artificial regeneration.		10				
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, 10				
2.1.3	Minimized plantings of exotic tree species and research documentation that exotic tree species, planted operationally, pose minimal risk.		9, 10				
2.1.4	Protection of desirable or planned advanced natural regeneration during harvest.		9, 10				
2.1.5	Artificial reforestation programs that consider potential ecological impacts of a different species or species mix from that which was harvested.						
<b>2.2</b>	<b><i>Program Participants shall minimize chemical use required to achieve management objectives while protecting employees, neighbors, the public and the forest environment.</i></b>						
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, 10				
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, 10				
2.2.5	Supervision of forest chemical applications by state-trained or certified applicators.		10			9	10
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		Audit -or	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				OFI
			C	EXR	Maj	Min	
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				
<b>2.3</b>	<b><i>Program Participants shall implement management practices to protect and maintain forest and soil productivity.</i></b>		9, 10				
2.3.1	Use of soils maps where available.		9, 10				
2.3.2	Process to identify soils vulnerable to compaction and use of appropriate methods to avoid excessive soil disturbance.		9, 10				
2.3.3	Use of erosion control measures to minimize the loss of soil and site productivity.		9, 10				
2.3.4	Post-harvest conditions conducive to maintaining site productivity (e.g., limited rutting, retained down woody debris, minimized skid trails).		9		10		
2.3.5	Retention of vigorous trees during partial harvesting, consistent with silvicultural norms for the area.		9, 10				
2.3.6	Criteria that address harvesting and site preparation to protect soil productivity.		9, 10				
2.3.7	Minimized road construction to meet management objectives efficiently.		9, 10				
<b>2.4</b>	<b><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></b>		9, 10				
2.4.1	Program to protect forests from damaging agents.		9, 10				
2.4.2	Management to promote healthy and productive forest conditions to minimize susceptibility to damaging agents.		9, 10				
2.4.3	Participation in, and support of, fire and pest prevention and control programs.		9, 10				
<b>2.5</b>	<b><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></b>		10				
2.5.1	Program for appropriate research, testing, evaluation and deployment of genetically improved planting stock including trees derived through biotechnology.		10				

**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>	
<b>3.1</b>	<b><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></b>		9, 10				
3.1.1	Program to implement state or provincial equivalent BMPs during all phases of management activities.		9, 10				
3.1.2	Contract provisions that specify BMP compliance.		9, 10				
3.1.3	Plans that address wet weather events (e.g., inventory systems, wet weather tracts, defining acceptable operational conditions, etc.).		9, 10				
3.1.4	Monitoring of overall BMP implementation.		9, 10				
<b>3.2</b>	<b><i>Program Participant shall have or develop, implement, and document, riparian protection measures based on soil type, terrain, vegetation and other applicable factors.</i></b>		9, 10				
3.2.1	Program addressing management and protection of streams, lakes and other water bodies and riparian zones.		9, 10				
3.2.2	Mapping of streams, lakes and other water bodies and riparian zones, and where appropriate, identification on the ground.		9, 10				
3.2.3	Implementation of plans to manage or protect streams, lakes and other water bodies.		9, 10				
3.2.4	Identification and protection of nonforested wetlands, including bogs, fens, vernal pools and marshes of significant size.		9, 10				
3.2.5	Where regulations or BMPs do not currently exist to protect riparian areas, use of experts to identify appropriate protection measures.		10				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		Audit -or	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				OFI
			C	EXR	Maj	Min	
<b>4.1</b>	<b><i>Program participants shall have programs to promote biological diversity at stand- and landscape- scales.</i></b>	JH	10	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.		10	9			
4.1.2	Program to protect threatened and endangered species.		9, 10				
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, 10				
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, 10				10
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.		10	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, 10				
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, 10				
4.1.8	Program to incorporate the role of prescribed or natural fire where appropriate.		9, 10				
<b>4.2</b>	<b><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></b>		9, 10				
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, 10				

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, 10				

**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>	
<b>5.1</b>	<b><i>Program Participants shall manage the impact of harvesting on visual quality.</i></b>		9, 10				
5.1.1	Program to address visual quality management.		9, 10				
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, 10				
<b>5.2</b>	<b><i>Program Participants shall manage the size, shape, and placement of clearcut harvests.</i></b>		10				
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.		10				
5.2.2	Documentation through internal records of clearcut size and the process for calculating average size.		10				
<b>5.3</b>	<b><i>Program Participants shall adopt a green-up requirement or alternative methods that provide for visual quality.</i></b>						
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, 10				
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, 10				
6.1.2	Appropriate mapping, cataloging, and management of identified special sites.			9, 10			

**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, 10				
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, 10				

**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>	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				<u>OFI</u>
			<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
<b>9.1</b>	<b><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></b>		10				
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.		10				
<b>9.2</b>	<b><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></b>						
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		Audit -or-	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				OFI
			C	EXR	Maj	Min	
<b>10.1</b>	<b><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></b>		9, 10				
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				
10.1.2	Assignment and understanding of roles and responsibilities for achieving SFI Standard objectives.		9, 10				
10.1.3	Staff education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities.		9, 10				
10.1.4	Contractor education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities.		9, 10				10
<b>10.2</b>	<b><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></b>						
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>	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				<u>OFI</u>
		<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
<b>11.1</b>	<b><i>Program Participants shall take appropriate steps to comply with applicable federal, provincial, state, and local forestry and related environmental laws and regulations.</i></b>					
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.					
<b>11.2</b>	<b><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></b>		10			
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.		10			

**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		Audit -or-	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				OFI
			<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>		10				
12.1.1	Support for efforts of SFI Implementation Committees.		10	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.		10				
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>		10				
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, 10				
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, 10			

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>		10				
12.3.1	Involvement in public land planning and management activities with appropriate governmental entities and the public.		9, 10				
12.3.2	Appropriate contact with local stakeholders over forest management issues through state, provincial, federal, or independent collaboration.			9, 10			
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>		9				
12.5.1	Support for SFI Implementation Committee efforts (toll-free numbers and other efforts) to address concerns about apparent nonconforming practices.		9				
12.5.2	Process to receive and respond to public inquiries.		9				
12.6	<i>Program Participants shall report annually to the SFI Program on their compliance with the SFI Standard.</i>		10				
12.6.1*	Prompt response to the SFI annual progress report. (*Note: This indicator will be reviewed in all audits.)		9, 10				
12.6.2	Recordkeeping for all the categories of information needed for SFI annual progress reports.		9, 10				
12.6.3	Maintenance of copies of past reports to document progress and improvements to demonstrate conformance to the SFI Standard		10				

**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>	
<i>13.1*</i>	<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>		9, 10				
13.1.1	System to review commitments, programs, and procedures to evaluate effectiveness.		9, 10				
13.1.2	System for collecting, reviewing, and reporting information to management regarding progress in achieving SFI Standard objectives and performance measures.		9, 10				
13.1.3	Annual review of progress by management and determination of changes and improvements necessary to continually improve SFI conformance.		9, 10				10

**Auditor Notes**

Requirement	Auditor	Notes
1.1	C	<b><i>“Program Participants shall ensure that long-term harvest levels are sustainable and consistent with appropriate growth and-yield models and written plans.”</i></b>
1.1.1	C, OFI	<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>There is an opportunity to improve the depth and clarity of objectives for Tier 1 and Tier 2 properties lacking an up-to-date, detailed master plan.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Management planning work continues, with investments in templates and streamlined planning approaches beginning to show important productivity improvements.</li> <li>• The program is on a reasonable time-line for completion of Tier 1 and Tier 2 Management Plans, with guidance documents in place for all other (small) properties.</li> </ul>
1.1.2, 1.1.3	C	<p>1.1.2: “Documentation of annual harvest trends in relation to the sustainable forest management plan.” And 1.1.3: “A forest inventory system and a method to calculate growth.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Also see 2010-2014 Matrix.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Harvest levels over the past three years have been increased to more nearly match growth and harvest plans in response to directives from the state legislature and reallocation of resources.</li> </ul>
1.1.4	C	<p>“Periodic updates of inventory and recalculation of planned harvests.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See 2010-2014 Matrix.</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• All forest practices are carefully documented; harvests documentation on Form 2460 is particularly detailed; project work is also well documented.</li> <li>• Harvest plans are updated based on actual forest conditions in response to these treatments.</li> </ul>
2.1	C	<b><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></b>
2.1.1	C	<p>“Designation of all management units for either natural or artificial regeneration.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Silviculture Handbook describes regeneration options for all stand types; in some cases planting is one option. Where there is an option the sale narrative and prescription describes the planned approach.</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• Confirmed systems to track regeneration harvests and records indicating the status of</li> </ul>

		regeneration. Requirements for regeneration are outlined in Wisconsin DNR 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> <p>No exotic trees are planted.</p> <p>Verbiage below, from an official Parks Bureau document, was explained as allowing for landscaping use of non-tree exotics (grasses) near buildings as needed:</p> <p><b>Invasive Species Management:</b> In general, new exotic (and potentially invasive) species will not be introduced into WSPS properties. In rare situations, an exotic species may be introduced or maintained to meet specific, identified management needs (i.e. to control an invasive species or recreate an historical landscape) and when all feasible measures to minimize potential harm have been taken. All exotic/invasive plant and animal species that are not maintained for the above purposes will be managed, and possibly eradicated, if control is feasible and the species:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• interferes with natural processes and the stewardship of natural features, native species, or natural habitats</li> <li>• disrupts the genetic integrity of native species</li> <li>• disrupts the accurate presentation of a cultural landscape</li> <li>• damages cultural resources</li> <li>• significantly hampers the management of property or adjacent lands</li> <li>• poses a public health hazard</li> <li>• creates a hazard to public safety</li> <li>• interferes with quality recreational experiences for property visitors”</li> </ul> <p>Source: <i>Managing Heritage Resources in State Parks</i></p>
2.1.4	C	<p>“Protection of desirable or planned advanced natural regeneration during harvest.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Field observations confirm that advance regeneration is protected.</li> </ul>
2.2		<b><i>“Program Participants shall minimize chemical use required to achieve management objectives while protecting employees, neighbors, the public and the forest environment.”</i></b>
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"> <li>• 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: <a href="http://wiatri.net/projects/chemuse/">http://wiatri.net/projects/chemuse/</a>. The most toxic and potentially dangerous pesticides are not used, per FSC requirements.</li> </ul>
2.2.4	C	<p>“Use of Integrated Pest Management where feasible.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IPM is the approach taken in this program. Forest management efforts focus on maintaining healthy stand conditions so as to minimize the need for chemical treatments; stands visited were generally healthy.</li> <li>• Forest management on forests visited is strongly focused on maintaining healthy, vigorous stands through stocking control and use of moderately short rotations.</li> <li>• Stands are regularly assessed formally (RECON) and informally for presence of insects or diseases, and treatments are applied in a timely manner before outbreaks widen. The initial treatment approach is commonly salvage or sanitation.</li> </ul>
2.2.5	C, OFI	<p>“Supervision of forest chemical applications by state-trained or certified applicators.”</p> <p><u>There is an opportunity to improve knowledge of policies for supervision of pesticide applications, including restricted use pesticides and general use pesticides. Note: NSF interprets the standard as requiring supervision for either type of pesticide.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Closed Minor Non-conformance SFI 2009-02: The detailed and complex Corrective Action Plan was substantially and effectively completed. Instead of a complete Manual Code revision a Joint Divisional Directive was issued by the Directors of the Lands and the Forestry Division.</li> <li>• All managers confirmed that when chemicals are used they are applied by or under the supervision of Wisconsin Certified Pesticide Applicators. However not all</li> </ul>

		<p>managers were aware of the Division Directive on MC 4230.1 which clarifies and slightly modified the training requirements. More awareness efforts, possibly up to formal training, would be helpful.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Forestry Newsletter throughout the Forestry Division; Wildlife Updates went to Wildlife and Facilities and Lands.</li> <li>• Two projects were checked to be certain that a certified applicator was involved.</li> <li>• Confirmed pesticide applicators license for forester at Flambeau River State Forest.</li> <li>• Reviewed the pesticide records for site visited by the Hrubes/Ferrucci team on August 18<sup>th</sup> (Wednesday) at Tract# 01-08 Yellow River Wildlife Area. Records appear to be in order. There was a chemical application of Element 4 to a small patch of Black Locust which was on the site of Tract 01-08.</li> <li>• Also reviewed “the inventory report that was sent in at the end of last year for the location where we (Adams and Juneau County wildlife) store chemicals. It is storage shared by the Griffith Nursery and several wildlife staff from the Wisconsin Rapids area and is just reflective of what the area wildlife staff stored there”.</li> </ul>
2.3	C	<b><i>“Program Participants shall implement management practices to protect and maintain forest and soil productivity.”</i></b>
2.3.1	C	<p>“Use of soils maps where available.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Soil maps are available and are used by foresters (see next indicator). For example, habitat types and/or 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.</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• Field observations confirm that erosion control methods employed on timber harvests have effectively controlled erosion.</li> <li>• Some erosion observed on forest roads. Northern Wisconsin has had record rainfall levels over the past 2 months, with recent 4-6 inch storms on top of already saturated soils. Considering this the roads assessed during the audit had modest erosion levels.</li> </ul>
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> <p><u>Non-conformance SFI-2010-01: An improperly located main skid trail in the Hoffman Hills SRA Tract #1-09 has led to erosion and sedimentation.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Field observations confirm post harvest conditions with limited rutting, minimized skid trails, and ample down woody debris with one important exception (next bullet).</li> <li>• Tract #1-09: Red Pine thinning not completed White Pine plantation thinning harvested August 2009; heavier thinning near the X-country ski trails to allow more snow to reach the ground, lighted in the interior portions. One of two main skid trails traverses much of the length of a swale, instead of being placed on higher ground. There were no water bars, as the improper location of the trail precluded any method to drain the trail. Heavy recent rainfall event has led to erosion along significant portions of the trail and sedimentation into the ephemeral drainage. Revised (in new standard) SFI Indicator 2.3.7 “Road construction and skidding layout to minimize impacts to soil productivity and water quality” provides a better description of the problem.</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• The majority of sites where partial harvests had been conducted meet the requirement.</li> </ul>

		<p>Wisconsin’s Silviculture Manual is very detailed and up-to-date; foresters rely on it for all prescriptions. The Northern Hardwood chapter is particularly complex; in some cases foresters don’t yet fully understand its provisions; provisions for creating gaps as part of conversion to multi-aged stands have been challenging to implement, particularly making gaps consistent with recommendations (foresters prescribe gaps consistent with the chapter but then create smaller gaps than intended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One sale on the Governor Knowles State Forest had most or all of the large, vigorous red pine marked for removal, with residual red pine being the least desirable trees. This treatment appeared inconsistent with the Silviculture Manual, but the team was not able to determine with certainty whether there is a challenge or OFI.</li> <li>• Adding chapters to the BER’s Old Growth Handbook.</li> </ul>
2.3.6	C	<p>“Criteria that address harvesting and site preparation to protect soil productivity.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BMPs and policies provide these criteria. Confirmed that rutting criteria are in the contracts.</li> </ul>
2.3.7	C	<p>“Minimized road construction to meet management objectives efficiently.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New roads are not commonly constructed</li> </ul>
<b>2.4</b>	C	<p><b><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></b></p>
2.4.1	C	<p>“Program to protect forests from damaging agents.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirmed increased emphasis on timely RECON, leading to forest prescriptions and treatments which are designed to protect forests (see next indicator).</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• Confirmed by field observations; WDNR Forestry Division has provided significantly more support for forest management practices on lands managed by the WDNR 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Rotations in most cases are set short enough to prevent many pest problems (for example Jack Pine rotations of 50 years).</li> </ul>
2.4.3	C	<p>“Participation in, and support of, fire and pest prevention and control programs.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews confirmed Wisconsin DNR management of forest fire protection programs on most Wisconsin forestlands and all lands within the scope of certification.</li> </ul>
<b>2.5</b>	C	<p><b><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></b></p>
2.5.1	C	<p>“Program for appropriate research, testing, evaluation and deployment of genetically improved planting stock including trees derived through biotechnology.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirmed “Wisconsin DNR Forest Genetics Program Strategic Plan 2009-2019”. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Wisconsin DNR has had a Forest Genetics program since 1948</li> <li>○ 2004 Statewide Forest Plan (Div. of Forestry 2004) Objective 30 “Maintain an adequate supply of quality nursery seedlings for Wisconsin’s conservation needs” and other objectives speak to quality and conservation of native tree species and biodiversity.</li> <li>○ The program had a climate change component; the program’s manager is the</li> </ul> </li> </ul>



		<p>Wisconsin DNR's representative on the broad climate change effort "Wisconsin Initiative on Climate Change Impacts (WICCI).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The plan is consistent with science and up-to-date protocols.</li> <li>○ There are many partner organizations, all providing valuable science-based support or collaboration.</li> </ul>
3.1	C	<b>"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."</b>
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"> <li>• Foresters and loggers are trained; foresters layout and inspect all jobs.</li> <li>• Field inspections of numerous completed or ongoing timber harvests confirmed that BMPs are integrated into the program and applied consistently, with the exception of road BMPs.</li> </ul>
3.1.2	C	<p>"Contract provisions that specify BMP compliance."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirmed by checking selected contracts at harvest sites.</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
3.1.4	C	<p>"Monitoring of overall BMP implementation."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
3.2	C	<b>"Program Participant shall have or develop, implement, and document, riparian protection measures based on soil type, terrain, vegetation and other applicable factors."</b>
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"> <li>• Confirmed by reviews of completed and partially completed timber harvests and road and trail improvement efforts that this program continues to operate effectively.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• Confirmed these are mapped and marked on the ground as appropriate.</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• Field observations confirm that these aquatic resources are protected as planned.</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• 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".</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Most sites with significant areas of included wetlands (forested and/or nonforested) are designated for winter harvest only.</li> </ul>
3.2.5	C	<p>"Where regulations or BMPs do not currently exist to protect riparian areas, use of experts to identify appropriate protection measures."</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wisconsin has BMPs covering riparian areas and many forestry practices.</li> <li>• Currently there are no formal BMP for Vernal Pools and isolated pocket wetlands. However, revisions to the Wisconsin Best Management Practices will take effect January 1, 2011; these specify additional protection for all wetlands, particularly seasonal wetlands, many of which are small but some of which are ecologically significant.</li> </ul>
4.1	C	<b><i>“Program participants shall have programs to promote biological diversity at stand- and landscape- scales.”</i></b>
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 and the Bureaus of Endangered Resources and Wildlife Management has led to an exceptional program for the conservation of native biological diversity.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State continues to make progress in the implementation of the Wildlife Action Plan, identification of and designation SNA’s , old-growth forest and HCVF habitats and forests.</li> </ul>
4.1.2	C	<p>“Program to protect threatened and endangered species.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wisconsin DNR has a program that protects threatened and endangered species from the planning phase (Master Plans) to implementation of management activities (timber sales and other land management activities).</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• The 2010 audit confirmed that checks of NHI database are part of sale planning.</li> <li>• NHI backlog issue is being addressed, with significant progress since 2008; the Zoology Backlog status was provided as an example: 2009: 104 records /reports ready to enter and 140 reports not ready to be mapped 2008: 272 records /reports ready to enter and 122 reports not ready to be mapped</li> <li>• Expect by the end of 2010 to further reduce the backlog. Funding for mapping efforts in 2010 were 160% higher than the 2009 budget.</li> <li>• DNR plans to protect SNA’s identified in Florence County by conducting land swaps with the County. The State continues to identify and purchase new properties that meet their SNA, old-growth or HCVF criteria.</li> </ul>
4.1.4	C, OFI	<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, nest trees).”</p> <p><u>There is an opportunity on the Governor Knowles State Forest to improve retention of appropriate trees for wildlife habitat as per the habitat guidelines.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New State wide silvicultural guidelines for retaining structural diversity in even-aged management systems have been implemented and foresters attended State wide training to gain understanding and application of the new green tree retention standards. Awareness of revised wildlife retention guidelines is vastly improved.</li> <li>• There is an opportunity on the Governor Knowles State Forest to improve retention of appropriate trees for wildlife habitat as per the habitat guidelines. Awareness of revised wildlife retention guidelines is very strong, and implementation is very good across the properties visited in 2010.</li> </ul>
4.1.5	C	<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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wisconsin DNR has assessed regional forest cover and age/size classes and used this information to formulate Master Plans for individual forests and properties.</li> </ul>

		Conservation Opportunity Areas identified in the State Wildlife Action Plan are recognized and used by the DNR to coordinate and plan management on a landscape scale.
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"> <li>• Flambeau River State Forest’s draft Master Plan (nearing approval) contains provisions for protecting older growth remnants (hemlock) and for managing to create more old-growth (old-growth management study).</li> <li>• The State just recently acquired 2,500 acres of old growth in Iron County which brings the total to 10-12,000 acres State wide.</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• DNR has State guidelines that limit the introduction and spread of both aquatic and terrestrial invasive species in forest stands, along waterways and trails. Appropriate actions to remove invasive species with pesticides are employed as well as actions to prevent the spread of invasive species (cleaning equipment etc.)</li> </ul>
4.1.8	C	<p>“Program to incorporate the role of prescribed or natural fire where appropriate.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The DNR prescribes and uses fire to manage fire dependent habitats (primarily barrens) to maintain open conditions and also in forests where fire is required to enhance forest regeneration.</li> </ul>
<b>4.2</b>	C	<b>“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.”</b>
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 information, time, and assistance by staff, or in-kind or direct financial support.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NHI data are catalogued and employees are encouraged to participate by reporting locations of ETS to the State.</li> <li>• State personnel provide locations and identification of both forests and habitats of exceptional conservation value. New SNA’s are being identified and are often purchased by the State.</li> <li>• The DNR participates in Important Bird Area programs.</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• Crex Meadows is incorporating regional, science-based habitat management plans for the Sharp-tailed grouse in their habitat management plan.</li> </ul>
<b>5.1</b>	C	<b>“Program Participants shall manage the impact of harvesting on visual quality.”</b>
5.1.1	C	<p>“Program to address visual quality management.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For state parks, the document Managing Forests on Wisconsin State Park Lands provides three levels of visual sensitivity to be applied to forested lands: most sensitive, moderately sensitive, and least sensitive. Management practices and visual management tools for each level are provided in the Silviculture and Aesthetics Manual.</li> <li>• Confirmed by field observations and discussions with foresters.</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• Field observations confirm that aesthetic considerations are incorporated in harvesting, road, landing design and management, and other management activities</li> </ul>
<b>5.2</b>	C	<b>“Program Participants shall manage the size, shape, and placement of clearcut harvests.”</b>

5.2.1	C	<p>“Average size of clearcut harvest areas does not exceed 120 acres, except when necessary to respond to forest health emergencies or other natural catastrophes.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confirmed by field observations that most clearcuts are quite small; records indicate an average of 15.4 acres.</li> </ul>
5.2.2	C	<p>“Documentation through internal records of clearcut size and the process for calculating average size.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In 2009 the average was 15.4 acres.</li> </ul>
6.1.	C	<p><b><i>“Program Participants shall identify special sites and manage them in a manner appropriate for their unique features.”</i></b></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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Special sites receive the highest priority for location and protection. Foresters, biologists, and planners have access to various databases and specialists prior to developing or implementing treatment plans.</li> </ul>
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"> <li>“Each WSPS property develops a Heritage Resources Management Plan that is compatible with the property’s master plan and guides all resource management and development efforts on the property. The plan will be presented for public comment at an annual property management plan meeting.”</li> </ul> <p><b>“Planning for Resource Management:</b> Each WSPS property must complete a comprehensive inventory of natural and cultural heritage resources. To accomplish this goal, resource experts from WDNR, other agencies, universities, and nonprofit organizations may be consulted and involved in inventory efforts. In addition, each property must develop and periodically update a written “Heritage Resources Management Plan.” This document will include long-range goals and strategies needed to achieve the desired future condition for the property’s heritage resources. It will integrate the best available science and will prescribe activities such as inventories, research, monitoring, restoration, mitigation, protection, and management of resources. Each property’s resources management plan <b>must be consistent with the property’s master plan.</b> Ongoing monitoring and research activities will evaluate the effectiveness of prescribed activities and identify the effects of management actions.</p> <p><i>Source Managing the Heritage Resources of the Wisconsin State Park System</i></p>
7.1	C	<p><b><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></b></p>
7.1.1	C	<p>“Program or monitoring system to ensure efficient utilization, which may include...”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Foresters monitor utilization on all harvests.</li> <li>Observed good utilization at all sites viewed during the audit.</li> </ul>
9.1	C	<p><b><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, &amp; management of forest resources.”</i></b></p>
9.1.1	C	<p>“Current financial or in-kind support of research to address questions of relevance in the region of operations. The research will include ...”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of SFI Annual Survey confirmed substantial support for research.</li> </ul>
10.1	C	<p><b><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></b></p>
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"> <li>Awareness of certification throughout the organization is high.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Wisconsin DNR's commitment is documented in policy memos.</li> </ul>
10.1.2	C	<p>"Assignment and understanding of roles and responsibilities for achieving SFI Standard objectives."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The certification coordinator position is vacant; duties have been temporarily reassigned as additional duties to two individuals.</li> <li>The Integrated Certification Implementation Team (ICIT) developed in 2009 to implement the certification requirements continues to operate effectively.</li> </ul>
10.1.3	C	<p>"Staff education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Employees interviewed demonstrated remarkable depth and breadth of knowledge.</li> <li>Upper Chippewa Area: Larry G, 3 Team Leaders, staff specialist, dispatcher, and 12-15 other foresters and forester rangers: Past 12 months training – Summer 2009 cultural resources training for burial mounds, old roads (LCO); later summer green tree retention training, fall biomass training; June 2010 invasive species.</li> </ul>
10.1.4	C, OFI	<p>"Contractor education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities."  <u>There is an opportunity to improve by offering formal (FISTA or other) BMP training to road building or road maintenance personnel or contractors.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Logging contractors are covered by a policy requiring at least one FISTA-trained (SFI approved logger training program in Wisconsin) to be on site at all times that harvest activities are occurring.</li> <li>Road building or road maintenance contractors on state forests, and most but not all on units managed by the Lands Division, are supervised by experienced foresters who have BMP training. Some units assign road work to managers lacking such training, and thus possibly unable to provide the traditional on-the-job training in BMPs to the contractors or other personnel.</li> <li>Road maintenance work may be done by loggers, by road contractors, by employees, or by other agencies (for example the Trempealeau County Highway Department does the maintenance work on the Buckhorn State Recreation Trail).</li> </ul>
<b>11.2</b>	C	<p><b><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></b></p>
11.2.1	C	<p>"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."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See 2010-2014 Matrix.</li> </ul>
<b>12.1</b>	C	<p><b><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></b></p>
12.1.1	C	<p>"Support for efforts of SFI Implementation Committees."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Jeff Barkley attends Wisconsin SFI Implementation Committee meetings and represents both the Wisconsin County Forest Program and the Wisconsin DNR.</li> <li>Confirmed financial support from Wisconsin DNR.</li> </ul>
12.1.5	C	<p>"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."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See 2010-2014 Matrix.</li> </ul>
<b>12.2</b>	C	<p><b><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></b></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"> <li>• Jeff Barkley attends Wisconsin SFI Implementation Committee meetings and represents both the Wisconsin County Forest Program and the Wisconsin DNR.</li> <li>• Private forestry program, extension, and financial support for many programs that provide outreach.</li> </ul>
12.2.3	EXR	<p>“Recreation opportunities for the public, where consistent with forest management objectives.”</p> <p><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"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• The trails, campgrounds, and visitor facilities on these lands are very well designed and generally well maintained. Funding cuts, however, are beginning to take a toll, particularly on efforts to restore or protect vegetation at the most popular recreation areas.</li> </ul>
<b>12.3</b>	C	<b>“Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall participate in the development of public land planning and management processes.”</b>
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"> <li>• WDNR has consistently been involved in planning efforts in national forests.</li> </ul>
12.3.2	EXR	<p>“Appropriate contact with local stakeholders over forest management issues through state, provincial, federal, or independent collaboration.”</p> <p><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"> <li>• State forest monitoring reports are available on the WDNR web site.</li> <li>• Friends groups in state parks provide many opportunities for involvement.</li> <li>• Confirmed that the department continues to maintain the public input process for the master plan revisions with links to comprehensive description of the planning process and opportunities for public input, as well as the draft master plans and completed plans.</li> </ul>
<b>12.6</b>	C	<b>“Program Participants shall report annually to the SFI Program on their compliance with the SFI Standard.”</b>
12.6.1*	C	<p>“Prompt response to the SFI annual progress report.”</p> <p>(*Note: This indicator will be reviewed in all audits.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirmed by Amy Doty of SFI, Inc. on August 17, 2010</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
12.6.3	C	<p>“Maintenance of copies of past reports to document progress and improvements to demonstrate conformance to the SFI Standard.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Past report provided to the Lead Auditor by Wisconsin DNR when requested.</li> </ul>
<b>13.1*</b>	C	<b>“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.”</b>
13.1.1	C	<p>“System to review commitments, programs, and procedures to evaluate effectiveness.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Master Plan Monitoring: All Tier 1 and Tier 2 state properties which had a NR 44 compliant master plan completed prior to 2009 completed a 2009 monitoring report.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Six state forest master plan monitoring reports were completed. Reports were posted <a href="#">online</a>.</li> <li>○ Twelve state park system master plan monitoring reports were completed and posted <a href="#">online</a>.</li> <li>○ Five monitoring reports were completed for Fisheries, Wildlife, and Natural Resource Areas and were posted <a href="#">online</a>.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 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 (triennial in wildlife; parks biennial; ER review 2 regions each year) 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. “</li> </ul>
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"> <li>● 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).</li> <li>● 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.</li> </ul>
13.1.3	C, OFI	<p>“Annual review of progress by management and determination of changes and improvements necessary to continually improve SFI conformance.”</p> <p><u>There is an opportunity to improve annual review of the SFI by management to ensure that issues are covered annually by both divisions involved in the certification.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Forest Leadership Team (FLT) is the entity that reviews certification performance and formulates overall responses to issues affecting the state forest system, with considerable overlap into the other state lands due to provision of forestry services. Reviewed the agenda for the FLT meeting: “Forestry Leadership Team, November 30, 2009, Conference Call Summary” and the associated document “Forestry Leadership Team Issue Brief <i>Certification CAR Updates</i> Author: Paul Pingrey Date Presented: Nov. 30; Expected Outcomes: Awareness of the Corrective Action Requests from the 2009 forest certification audits and Assignments as needed</li> <li>● 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. In the past, the DNR Forest Certification Coordinator had provided certification issue briefs developed by the ICIT to both the Forestry and Land Division leadership Teams. Reviewed the agenda for LLT meeting of September, 2009. This meeting covered certification in some detail, and could be considered the “Annual Review”.</li> <li>● No records were available of more recent LLT meetings where certification was discussed.</li> <li>● 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. The most recent meeting was in the fall of 2009; another review is needed soon to meet the “annual” requirement.</li> </ul>

## NSF-ISR SFI 2010-2014 MATRIX INCLUDING GUIDANCE FOR TRANSITION REQUIREMENTS

The “transition rules” outlined in Section 9 of “Requirements for the SFI 2010-2014 Program: Standards, Rules for Label Use, Procedures, and Guidance” have been considered in the design of this checklist. During 2010 the option exists of remaining under the 2005-2009 Standard. NSF will maintain a separate “2005-2009” checklist through 2010; the following checklist is used for audits against the SFI 2010-2014 Standard.

- Between April 1 and December 31, 2010 auditors conducting surveillance audits for customers choosing **not to transition yet** should complete the old checklist for all applicable requirements and the new checklist only for those items that are additional.

### Findings and Instructions:

<b>C</b>	Conformance
<b>Exr</b>	Exceeds the Requirements
<b>Maj</b>	Major Non-conformance
<b>Min</b>	Minor Non-conformance
<b>OFI</b>	Opportunity for Improvement (can also be in Conformance)
<b>NA</b>	Not Applicable
<b>Likely Gap *</b>	Likely GAP Against 2010-2014 SFIS*
<b>Likely Conf. *</b>	Likely Conformance With 2010-2014 SFIS*
	* for programs evaluated against 2005-2009 SFIS, likely conformance is assessed against the new requirements with SFIS 2010-2014; where there is a “Likely Gap” a “transitional non-conformance is issued; the program’s transition action plan (aka corrective plan) must be assessed.
<b>Auditor</b>	Optional; may be used for audit planning.
10, 11	Date Codes, for example: 10= July 2010; 11=Aug. 2011
Other	Words in <i>italics</i> are defined in the standard.
	Portions that are underlined are modified (and may be subject to transition rules); non-conformances against these for re-certifications will <b>not</b> adversely affect re-registration until after December 31, 2010. New certifications must be against the entire 2010-2014 SFI Standard.

**Only those requirements that have changed, are applicable to the Wisconsin County Forest Program are included here. To facilitate report review and understanding the many unchanged or inapplicable requirements have been deleted. Performance measures which have underlying “changed” indicators have been retained for clarity.**



**Objective 1. Forest Management Planning**

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

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
1.1	<b>Program Participants shall ensure that forest management plans include long-term harvest levels that are sustainable and consistent with appropriate growth-and-yield models.</b>								
Notes	<b>Performance measures (such as this one) which have underlying “changed” indicators have been retained for clarity.</b>								

	2010-2014 Requirement (Performance Measures bold)	Audit or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
1.1.1	Forest management planning at a level appropriate to the size and scale of the operation, including: a. <u>a long-term resources analysis;</u> b. <u>a periodic or ongoing forest inventory;</u> c. <u>a land classification system;</u> d. <u>soils inventory and maps, where available;</u> e. <u>access to growth-and-yield modeling capabilities;</u> f. <u>up-to-date maps or a geographic information system;</u> g. <u>recommended sustainable harvest levels for areas available for harvest; and</u> h. <u>a review of non-timber issues (e.g. recreation, tourism, pilot projects and economic incentive programs to promote water protection, carbon storage, bioenergy feedstock production, or biological diversity conservation, or to address climate-induced ecosystem change).</u>	MF	10						
Notes	<p>Management plans have previously been confirmed as including all required items a through h above; those reviewed in the 2010 SA also conform. Item h (a review of non-timber issues) was also previously confirmed, but the revised indicator has some new examples. Management plans for the larger (Tier 1 and Tier 2) properties have extensive reviews of recreation and wildlife/biodiversity conservation. Recently completed “Master Plans” provide a particularly comprehensive review of a wide range of non-timber issues. Reviewed Final Draft of the FRSF Master Plan and the Lower Chippewa River SNA Master Plan.</p> <p>For State Parks (which include many of the categories of lands) the document “Managing Forests on Wisconsin State Park Lands” provides overall guidance, policy, and the following statement of objectives: “All management actions must be consistent with the ecological capability of the landscape, optimize forest health and maintain or enhance the recreational, aesthetic, and other social aspects of the property.” Further, The Wisconsin State Park System Strategic Plan 2008 identifies the following goal: “Actively manage, restore, enhance, and protect the natural, cultural, and scenic heritage of the Wisconsin State Park System.”</p>								

1.1.2	Documentation of annual harvest trends in relation to the sustainable forest management plan <u>in a manner appropriate to document past and future activities.</u>	MF	10						
<b>Notes</b>	<p>15-year harvest schedules (re-run each year) document planned future activities for parcels larger than 400 acres. For smaller properties the “foresters’ call” or year of next activity is used to develop a treatment schedule. Both types of harvest schedules are presented to an IDT each year at the annual property meeting.</p> <p>White River Fishery Area: Confirmed agendas for the Integrated Property Management Meetings from 2010, 2009, and 2008. Also reviewed notes from the 2010 meeting. Wildlife areas were also covered in the same meeting.</p>								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<b><u>C</u></b>	<b><u>EXR</u></b>	<b><u>Maj</u></b>	<b><u>Min</u></b>	<b><u>OFI</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Gap *</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Conf. *</u></b>
1.1.4	Periodic updates of <u>forest</u> inventory and recalculation of planned harvests <u>to account for changes in growth due to productivity increases or decreases (e.g. improved data, long-term drought, fertilization, climate change, forest land ownership changes, etc.).</u>								
<b>Notes</b>	RECON inventory updates have been a very high priority, with pressure from the Wisconsin legislature. The results go into a state-wide database (WisFIRs) used to develop harvest schedules (see 1.1.2 above).								

**Objective 2. Forest Productivity.**

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

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<b><u>C</u></b>	<b><u>EXR</u></b>	<b><u>Maj</u></b>	<b><u>Min</u></b>	<b><u>OFI</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Gap *</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Conf. *</u></b>
2.1	<b>Program Participants shall promptly reforest after final harvest.</b>								
<b>Notes</b>	<b>Performance measures (such as this one) which have underlying “changed” indicators have been retained for clarity.</b>								
	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<b><u>C</u></b>	<b><u>EXR</u></b>	<b><u>Maj</u></b>	<b><u>Min</u></b>	<b><u>OFI</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Gap *</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Conf. *</u></b>
2.1.7	<u>Afforestation programs that consider potential ecological impacts of the selection and planting of tree species in non-forested landscapes.</u>	MF	NA						
<b>Notes</b>	NA: Non-forested landscapes are maintained as non-forested or restored (removing a portion of the invading trees and scrub). There is no afforestation in non-forested landscapes.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.3	<b>Program Participants shall implement forest management practices to protect and maintain forest and soil productivity.</b>								
<i>Notes</i>	Performance measures (such as this one) which have underlying “changed” indicators have been retained for clarity.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.3.5	Retention of vigorous trees during partial harvesting, consistent with <u>scientific silvicultural standards</u> for the area.	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	<p>The program uses the “Silviculture and Aesthetics Handbook” to guide silviculture. This is a peer-reviewed science-based document.</p> <p>Interviews of foresters who develop and implement silvicultural prescriptions and observations of marked, ongoing, and completed harvests confirm that practices are consistent with scientific standards.</p> <p>Foresters are attempting to meet the gap-size recommendations within the Northern Hardwood chapter, but gaps in completed harvests are often smaller than intended or than recommended. Some foresters have begun to observe results in gaps that do not match predictions in the manual (too much Ash recruitment, invasive plants) and are testing alternative approaches, which is to be commended.</p>								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.3.7	<u>Road construction and skidding layout to minimize impacts to soil productivity and water quality.</u>	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	The Minor Non-conformance SFI-2010-1 noted under this indicator in the 2005-2009 matrix (involving skidding layout) is an example of the relevance of this revised indicator in the new standard. The Wisconsin DNR’s goals and standards for timber harvests include layout to minimize soil productivity impacts. The corrective action plan for SFI-2010-1 should address the issue of effective skidding layout.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.4	<b>Program Participants shall manage so as to protect forests from damaging agents, such as environmentally or economically undesirable wildfire, pests, diseases <u>and invasive exotic plants and animals</u>, to maintain and improve long-term forest health, productivity and economic viability.</b>	MF	10						

<b>Notes</b>	<p>Confirmed continued emphasis on timely RECON, leading to forest prescriptions and treatments which are designed to protect forests (see next indicator). Invasive plants are one new item evaluated during RECON</p> <p>The state is working 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.</p> <p>Many efforts are underway to protect forests from invasive exotic plants and animals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BMPs for invasives (prevention)</li> <li>• Monitoring for invasives (RECON)</li> <li>• Treatment of invasives</li> </ul>
--------------	---

**Objective 3. Protection and Maintenance of Water Resources**

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

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
3.2	<b>Program Participants shall have or develop, implement and document riparian protection measures based on soil type, terrain, vegetation, ecological function, harvesting system and other applicable factors.</b>								
<b>Notes</b>	<b>Performance measures (such as this one) which have underlying “changed” indicators have been retained for clarity.</b>								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
3.2.4	Identification and protection of non-forested wetlands, including bogs, fens and marshes, and vernal pools <u>of ecological significance</u> .	MF	10						
<b>Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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”.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Most sites with significant areas of included wetlands (forested and/or nonforested) are designated for winter harvest only.</li> <li>• New Wisconsin BMP Manual to be released soon and effective January 2011 includes increased protections for vernal pools (temporary wetlands) and other wetlands, including a filter strip around wetlands not formerly required.</li> </ul>								

**Objective 4. Conservation of Biological Diversity including Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value.**

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

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
4.1	<b>Program Participants shall have programs to promote biological diversity <u>at stand- and landscape-levels</u>.</b>								
<i>Notes</i>	<b>Performance measures (such as this one) which have underlying “changed” indicators have been retained for clarity.</b>								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
4.1.1	Program to promote the conservation of native biological diversity, including species, wildlife habitats and <u>ecological</u> community types.	JH	10						
<i>Notes</i>	The State continues to make progress in the implementation of the Wildlife Action Plan, identification of and designation SNA’s , old-growth forest and HCVF habitats and forests.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
4.1.4	Development and implementation of criteria, as guided by regionally appropriate <u>best scientific information</u> , to retain stand-level wildlife habitat elements such as snags, <u>stumps</u> , mast trees, down woody debris, den trees and nest trees.	JH	10						
<i>Notes</i>	In the context of this audit the requirement has not changed; see 2005-2009 Matrix.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
4.1.5	Program for assessment, conducted either individually or collaboratively, of forest cover types, <u>age or size classes</u> , and habitats at the individual ownership level and, where credible data are available, across the landscape, <u>and take into account findings in planning and management activities</u> .	JH	10						

<b>Notes</b>	<p>The program has long had an objective of promoting biodiversity at stand and landscape levels (the over-riding PM). Managers interviewed and completed master plans confirm that assessments are conducted and findings are incorporated into plans and actions. The Draft Master Plan for the Flambeau River State Forest is one example.</p> <p>Wisconsin DNR has assessed regional forest cover and age/size classes and used this information to formulate Master Plans for individual forests and properties. Conservation Opportunity Areas identified in the State Wildlife Action Plan are recognized and used by the DNR to coordinate and plan management on a landscape scale.</p>
--------------	--

**Objective 5. Management of Visual Quality and Recreational Benefits.**

To manage the visual impact of forest operations and provide recreational opportunities for the public.

**Objective 6. Protection of Special Sites.**

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

**Objective 7. Efficient Use of Forest Resources.** To promote the efficient use of forest resources.

No changes in Objectives 5, 6, 7

**Objectives 8 to 13 are not applicable because the Wisconsin DNR does not procure wood for mills.**

**Objective 14. Legal and Regulatory Compliance.**

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

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<b><u>C</u></b>	<b><u>EXR</u></b>	<b><u>Maj</u></b>	<b><u>Min</u></b>	<b><u>OFI</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Gap *</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Conf. *</u></b>
14.1	<b>Program Participants shall take appropriate steps to comply with applicable federal, provincial, state and local forestry and related social and environmental laws and regulations.</b>	MF	10						
<b>Notes</b>	Wisconsin has such policies in place; confirmed by review of bulletin boards and employee handbooks								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<b><u>C</u></b>	<b><u>EXR</u></b>	<b><u>Maj</u></b>	<b><u>Min</u></b>	<b><u>OFI</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Gap *</u></b>	<b><u>Likely Conf. *</u></b>
14.2.2	<u>Forestry enterprises will respect the rights of workers and labor representatives in a manner that encompasses the intent of the International Labor Organization (ILO) core conventions.</u>	MF	10						
<b>Notes</b>	There have not been any ILO-related complaints. If these occur please inform NSF, who must inform SFI Inc.								

**Objective 15. Forestry Research, Science, and Technology.**

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

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
15.1	<b>Program Participants shall individually and/or through cooperative efforts involving <u>SFI Implementation Committees</u>, associations or other partners provide in-kind support or funding for forest research to improve forest health, productivity, and <u>sustainable management of forest resources, and the environmental benefits and performance of forest products.</u></b>	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	Wisconsin SIC's 2009 progress report and interviews confirmed involvement with and support for the Wisconsin SIC. Jeff Barkley represents the Wisconsin DNR on the committee and attends all meetings.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
15.3	<b>Program Participants shall individually and/or through cooperative efforts involving <u>SFI Implementation Committees</u>, associations or other partners broaden the awareness of climate change impacts on forests, wildlife and biological diversity.</b>								
<i>Notes</i>	Wisconsin DNR has several initiatives underway under the umbrella of the Wisconsin Climate Initiative (WICCI).								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
15.3.1	Where available, monitor information generated from regional climate models on long-term forest health, productivity and economic viability.	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	The available information is being monitored by Wisconsin DNR, WCFA, and some but not all property managers, biologists, and foresters.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
15.3.2	<u>Program Participants are knowledgeable about climate change impacts on wildlife, wildlife habitats and conservation of biological diversity through international, national, regional or local programs.</u>	MF						10	

<i>Notes</i>	<p><u>Transitional Minor Non-conformance SFI-2010-2: Available information is being monitored, but not all managers are knowledgeable about climate change impacts for the forests they manage. There is no plan for meeting this requirement by 12.31.10 as required by the SFI Transition Guidelines.</u></p> <p>Wisconsin DNR specialists and some WDNR and County foresters are knowledgeable about such climate change impacts. This information has not been made available to all land managers.</p>								
--------------	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Objective 16. Training and Education.**

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

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
16.1	Program Participants shall require appropriate training of personnel and contractors so that they are competent to fulfill their responsibilities under the SFI 2010-2014 Standard.								
<i>Notes</i>	Performance measures (such as this one) which have underlying “changed” indicators have been retained for clarity.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
16.1.5	Forestry enterprises shall have a program for the use of certified logging professionals (where available) and qualified logging professionals.	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	Wisconsin DNR provides financial support to the Wisconsin Master Logger Program. Certified loggers are accepted in equal terms with SFI-trained loggers.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
16.2	Program Participants shall work <u>individually and/or with SFI Implementation Committees, logging or forestry associations, or appropriate agencies or others in the forestry community to foster improvement in the professionalism of wood producers.</u>	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	Performance measures (such as this one) which have underlying “changed” indicators have been retained for clarity.								

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



16.2.1	<p>Participation in or support of SFI Implementation Committees to establish criteria and identify delivery mechanisms for wood producers' training courses that address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. awareness of sustainable forestry principles and the SFI program;</li> <li>b. best management practices, including streamside management and road construction, maintenance and retirement;</li> <li>c. reforestation, <u>invasive exotic plants and animals</u>, forest resource conservation, aesthetics, and <u>special sites</u>;</li> <li>d. awareness of responsibilities under the U.S. Endangered Species Act, the Canadian Species at Risk Act, and other measures to protect wildlife habitat (e.g. <u>Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value</u>);</li> <li>e. logging safety;</li> <li>f. <u>U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety (COHS)</u> regulations, wage and hour rules, and other provincial, state and local employment laws;</li> <li>g. transportation issues;</li> <li>h. business management;</li> <li>i. public policy and outreach; and</li> <li>j. <u>awareness of emerging technologies</u>.</li> </ul>	MF	10						
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The County Forest Specialist does participate in the Wisconsin SFI Implementation Committee. A meeting is scheduled for mid-August to include a discussion of revisions to the training requirements.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
16.2.2	<p><u>Participation in or support of SFI Implementation Committees to establish criteria for recognition of logger certification programs, where they exist, that include:</u></p> <p>a. <u>completion of SFI Implementation Committee recognized logger training programs and meeting continuing education requirements of the training program;</u></p> <p>b. <u>independent in-the-forest verification of conformance with the logger certification program standards;</u></p> <p>c. <u>compliance with all applicable laws and regulations including responsibilities under the U.S. Endangered Species Act, the Canadian Species at Risk Act and other measures to protect wildlife habitat;</u></p> <p>d. <u>use of best management practices to protect water quality;</u></p> <p>e. <u>logging safety;</u></p> <p>f. <u>compliance with acceptable silviculture and utilization standards;</u></p> <p>g. <u>aesthetic management techniques employed where applicable; and</u></p> <p>h. <u>adherence to a management or harvest plan that is site specific and agreed to by the forest landowner.</u></p>	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	The County Forest Specialist does participate in the Wisconsin SFI Implementation Committee. A meeting is scheduled for mid-August to include a discussion of recognition of the Wisconsin Master Logger Program. There is a close working relationship among all parties involved, so such recognition is likely.								

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

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

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

<i>Notes</i>	<b>Performance measures (such as this one) which have underlying “changed” indicators have been retained for clarity.</b>								
--------------	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<i>17.1.1</i>	Support, <u>including financial</u> , for efforts of SFI Implementation Committees.	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	Wisconsin DNR provides significant in-kind support under an agreement with the Wisconsin SIC. In addition, in 2009 the department paid the Wisconsin SIC \$63,456.; confirmed through interviews and by review of the Wisconsin SIC’s 2009 progress report.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<i>17.1.3</i>	Support for the development of regional, state or provincial information materials that provide forest landowners with practical approaches for addressing <u>special sites</u> and biological diversity issues, such as <u>invasive exotic plants and animals</u> , specific wildlife habitat, <u>Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value</u> , and threatened and endangered species.	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	Wisconsin DNR has an extensive extension and private forestry program. Special sites, control of invasive plant and animal issues, and FECV (under different names) are all covered.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<i>17.1.5</i>	Program Participants are knowledgeable about credible regional conservation planning and priority-setting efforts that include a broad range of stakeholders and have a program to <u>take into account the results of these efforts in planning</u> .	MF	10						

<b>Notes</b>	<p>Master plans and many timber harvests and other projects have been influenced by or include elements of many different landscape-scale biodiversity protection projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1995 Statewide Biodiversity Report; Great lakes Assessment; US FS CN</li> <li>• 1990's assessments done for the Northern Region for state forest planning</li> <li>• Chequamegon Nicolet National Forest "Shared Landscape Initiative".</li> <li>• Ecological Landscapes of Wisconsin being used as the basis for an Ecosystems Management Handbook that will describe the Conservation Opportunities and practical management actions. Some draft chapters are already in use.</li> <li>• Wisconsin Wildlife Action Plan</li> </ul>
--------------	---

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<b>C</b>	<b>EXR</b>	<b>Maj</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>OFI</b>	<b>Likely Gap *</b>	<b>Likely Conf. *</b>
17.3	<b>Program Participants shall establish, at the state, provincial, or other appropriate levels, procedures to address concerns raised by loggers, consulting foresters, employees, unions, the public or other Program Participants regarding practices that appear inconsistent with the SFI Standard principles and objectives.</b>								
<b>Notes</b>	<b>Performance measures (such as this one) which have underlying "changed" indicators have been retained for clarity.</b>								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<b>C</b>	<b>EXR</b>	<b>Maj</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>OFI</b>	<b>Likely Gap *</b>	<b>Likely Conf. *</b>
17.3.2	Process to receive and respond to public inquiries. <u>SFI Implementation Committees shall submit data annually to SFI Inc. regarding concerns received and responses.</u>	MF	10						
<b>Notes</b>	Confirmed that the Wisconsin SIC provided a completed 2009 SIC survey to SFI, Inc.								

**Objective 19. Communications and Public Reporting.**

To broaden the practice of sustainable forestry by documenting progress and opportunities for improvement.

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<b>C</b>	<b>EXR</b>	<b>Maj</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>OFI</b>	<b>Likely Gap *</b>	<b>Likely Conf. *</b>
19.1	<b><u>A Certified Program Participant shall provide a summary audit report, prepared by the certification body, to SFI Inc. after the successful completion of a certification, recertification or surveillance audit to the SFI 2010-2014 Standard.</u></b>	MF	10						

<i>Notes</i>	Performance measures (such as this one) which have underlying “changed” indicators have been retained for clarity.
--------------	--

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	C	EXR	Maj	Min	OFI	Likely Gap *	Likely Conf. *
<i>19.1.1</i>	<p>The summary audit report submitted by the <i>Program Participant</i> (one copy must be in English), shall include, at a minimum,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. a description of the audit process, <i>objectives</i> and scope;</li> <li>b. a description of substitute <i>indicators</i>, if any, used in the audit and a rationale for each;</li> <li>c. the name of <i>Program Participant</i> that was audited, including its SFI representative;</li> <li>d. a general description of the <i>Program Participant’s</i> forestland and manufacturing operations included in the audit;</li> <li>e. the name of the <i>certification body</i> and <i>lead auditor</i> (names of the <i>audit team</i> members, including <i>technical experts</i> may be included at the discretion of the <i>audit team</i> and <i>Program Participant</i>);</li> <li>f. the dates the certification was conducted and completed;</li> <li>g. a summary of the findings, <u>including general descriptions of evidence of conformity</u> and any nonconformities and corrective action plans to address them, opportunities for improvement, and exceptional practices; and</li> <li>h. the certification decision.</li> </ul>	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	NSF will include all of this information in the report.								

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

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
20.1	<b>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.</b>								
<i>Notes</i>	Performance measures (such as this one) which have underlying “changed” indicators have been retained for clarity.								

	<b>2010-2014 Requirement</b>	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
20.1.1	System to review commitments, programs and procedures to evaluate effectiveness. <u>Note: For multi-site programs the auditing requirements of Section 9 or the ISO requirements must be followed; at a minimum internal audits or monitoring that spans all sites and addresses the relevant part of the SFI Standard is expected.</u>	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	See indicators under Objective 13 in the SFI 2005-2009 Matrix. The program may have sufficient monitoring and internal review efforts to meet this requirement. However the audit team will consider this issue again during the 2011 Surveillance Audit.								

## **Audit Sites and Participants**

### Sunday August 15

Evening: Team Meeting; Opening Meeting  
Teague Prichard, State Lands Specialist  
John Gritt, Public and Private Lands Forester  
Kristin Lambert, State Forest Planner

### August 16th (Monday)

#### **Team #1 – West Team**

Auditors: Robert Hrubes and Joanne Hanowski  
ICIT Team: Teague Prichard

#### **Team #2 – East Team**

Auditor: Mike Ferrucci  
ICIT Team: John Gritt, Kristin Lambert, Randy Hoffman

**Visit #1: 7:30 am – 9:30 am** (30 minute drive from Superior)  
Brule River State Forest (visit 3-4 sales out of 30)

#### **Local Participants:**

Kevin Feind, Ranger (law enforcement background)  
Chris Sutherland, Forester  
Greg Kessler, Wildlife Biologist  
Nikki Martin, Forest Ranger (forestry background)  
Jay Gallager, Wisconsin DNR  
Also full group from above list (Sunday evening)

Site #1: Motts' Ravine State Natural Area, including 2009 Mott's Ravine Fire Plan Units M-1 and M-2: long-term project to restore Jack Pine and grasses by reducing scrub oak coverage.

Site #2: Tract #7-08 (Old Yeller) 77 acre active harvest of overmature Aspen retaining all pine and some oak and red maple saplings; interviewed John Grube, Grube logging.

Site #3: Tract #10-09 (F. Willard Oak and Aspen): 60 acre regeneration harvest, seed tree retaining 50 square feet of basal area per acre, marked to leave, good esthetics.

White River Fishery Area – Bayfield (2 sales)  
Property Type: Fisheries Management Property Acres: 3,258

#### **Local Participants:**

Prop Manager - Dave Lindsley 715-685-2931 (Confirmed)  
Team Leader– Steve Coffin  
Forester - Brian Klobuchar 715-795-2565 (Confirmed)

Site #4: Tract# 02-09 Planned, set up harvest two types: White pine over hardwood RX remove hardwood to regenerate pine; Aspen RX clearcut retaining all conifers, part will go to Aspen, part to fir, maple, aspen mix. Large buffers around both the Sejak Springs State Natural Area and the White River and its tributary stream.

Site #5 Tract 01-08 Completed regeneration harvest of 122 acre oak, birch stand with aspen component and some softwoods. Sandy loam on rolling topography. Harvested all Aspen and birch, leaving most oak and all softwoods. Allowed biomass removal to a 2-inch top. Excellent green tree retention and woody debris; no residual damage or rutting. Discussed landscape level planning; forester focused mostly on stand-level issues, with an emphasis on the

need for oak regeneration and stating that the wildlife biologist likes Aspen (in the context of many acres of Oak-Birch. Confirmed buffer around wetland exclusion.

Chief River Wildlife Area (1 sale)

Property Type: Wildlife Management Property Acres: 1,189

Local Participants:

Forester - Kim Lemke 715-634-9658 ext 3506

Wildlife Technician – Mike Bulgrin

Larry Glodoski, Area Forestry Leader

Chippewa Flowage Prop Manager – Neal Kephart

Randy Hoffman, Bureau of Endangered Resources

Site 6 Tract #01-09 Marked Northern hardwood described by forester as uneven aged but actually even-aged; prescribed selection harvest with only a few gaps; otherwise marked poor quality stems.

Chippewa Flowage (visit 2-3 sales out of 9)

Property Type: Water Resources (Lands & Facilities) Property Acres: 7,029

**Local Participants:**

Prop Manager – Neal Kephart (Confirmed)

Forester - Kim Lemke 715-634-9658 ext 3506 (Confirmed)

Site 7 Tract #03-08 Moss Creek Sale, 65 acre Aspen stand clearcut with significant retention of White pine mostly; sale remediation complete but not officially closed out; portions of sale cut during the wet summer, used slash to armor roads, lighter loads, and moved to drier ground as needed; visual management a high priority.

Flambeau River State Forest (visit 3-4 sales out of 30 sales)

Property Type: State Forest Property Acres: 91,619

**Local Participants:**

State Forest Superintendent - Jim Halvorson

Heidi Brunkow, Assistant Superintendent

Maggie Hass, Forester

Carmen Wagner

Site 8 Tract # 13-06, Sale 653 (Bull Creek Sale): Mostly complete northern hardwoods with 2 age classes; RX NH conversion to uneven-aged crop tree release, improvement thinning, and gaps; retaining hemlock, yellow birch, White pine and inclusions of aspen. Gaps had lots of Ash trees, but sugar maple seedlings were browsed heavily.

Site 9 Tract #15-06, Sale 654 (Leftovers Sale): Completed northern hardwoods, maintained aspen inclusions by cutting patches; gaps could have been larger but are full of regeneration including ash, some maple, much oak, some black cherry.

Site 10: Old growth and gap study area: ongoing intensive research into methods to accelerate old-growth characteristics using varied size gaps, girdling to add CWD, and deer exclosures.

Site 11 Tract #15-06, Sale 654 (Leftovers Sale): Completed northern hardwoods, maintained aspen inclusions by cutting patches; made smaller gaps intentionally in places with Ironwood trees.

August 17th (Tuesday)

**Team #1 –West Team**

Auditors: Mike Ferrucci and Joanne Hanowski

ICIT Team: Alan Jones & Kristin Lambert



Mc Kenzie Creek Wildlife Area (visit 1-3 sales out of 3)  
Property Type: Wildlife Management Property Acres: 161

**Local Participants:**

Prop Manager - Kevin Morgan  
WDNR Forester - Paul Heimstead  
WDNR Forester – Janette Cain  
WDNR FR Area Leader - Steve Runstrom  
WDNR Team Leader – Bob Hartshorn

Site 1 Tract #3-08 Completed Aspen regeneration clearcut of 93 acres of overmature (80 years old) Aspen with superb GT retention; also 7 acre thinning removing Aspen from hardwood area, protected small seasonal wetland.

Site 2 Three-season public use access road: some minor surface erosion from recent heavy rainstorms (6 inches in the most recent storm, up to 20 inches over past 2 months); no dedicated road budget, instead most road work is accomplished through logging contracts.

Casey Lake Wildlife Area (1 sale)  
Property Type: Wildlife Management Property Acres: 209

**Local Participants:**

Prop Manager - Mike Soergel (Confirmed)  
Prop Manager – Harvey Halvorsen 715-684-2914 ext 113 (Confirmed)  
FR Area Leader - Mark Kubler (Confirmed)  
Dahn Bohr – Forester (Confirmed)

Site 3 Completed salvage harvest with very careful attention to protecting soils and the headwaters of a high-quality trout stream. Area managed primarily for prairie restoration and water quality.

**Menomonie DNR Station: 921 Brickyard Road - Menomonie, WI 54751**

Office discussions and lunch

**Hoffman Hills Recreation Area**

Property Type: Parks Property Acres: 706

**Local Participants:**

Prop Manager – Scott Erickson 715-382-4574  
Rob Strand, Forester  
Jay Jordan, Forester

Dominant use recreation, including education, nature hikes, observation tower, area is open for gun deer season; Mostly donated early 1980's by Hoffman family, with many restrictions somewhat akin to an unofficial master plan, but many of these restrictions have expired; Have a 1982 Master Plan and have recently updated forest inventory and new mapping. Will do pine thinning first (very carefully planned for esthetics and to help get snow on the trails. Will complete pine thinning then work on the hardwoods, which are over mature and changing to tolerant hardwoods. Have done prairie restoration work. Absent an up-to-date Master Plan the timber management has been conservative. Gradually losing the opportunity to regenerate the oak and aspen types, and shifting to basswood and maple, which is moving further away from pre-settlement on the south and west slopes, while north and east slopes were probably a mixture with the basswood and red maple.

**Site #4** Tract #1-09: Red Pine thinning not completed White Pine plantation thinning harvested August 2009; heavier thinning near the X-country ski trails to allow more snow to reach the ground, lighted in the interior portions. One of two main skid trails traverses much of the length of a swale, instead of being placed on higher ground. There were no water bars, as the improper location of the trail precluded any method to drain the trail. Heavy recent rainfall event has led to erosion along significant portions of the trail and sedimentation into the ephemeral drainage. Minor Non-

conformance SFI Indicator 2.3.7 “Road construction and skidding layout to minimize impacts to soil productivity and water quality.”

OR 2.3.4 “Post-harvest conditions conducive to maintaining site productivity.”

Site #5 Prairie

**Muddy Creek Wildlife Area**

Property Type: Wildlife Management Property Acres: 3,382 (Tier 2 Property)

Flat topography, straddles Muddy Creek, woods, lowland brush, swamp, and prairie restored from farm fields. Master Plan dated 1980: Managed for diverse habitat. Forests are changing and moving towards a maple/tolerant hardwood type. High deer population for many years. Goal 2009 15 per square mile was recently increased for political reasons to 25; current population 22.5; likely to go to 35 to 40. Regeneration challenges are only going to get worse. North end of area had several impoundments, also many lateral ditches that need to be managed; some invasive cattails, which are choking off the open water; also starting the see Phragmites locally but not on the tract. Wildlife technician is certified pesticide applicator. Haven been using beetles for bio-control for loosestrife. Not within a COA from the Wildlife Action Plan. Does have a small SNA.

Site #6 75% done, oak and aspen regen; maple/hardwood thinning (long walk through meadows and along dikes)

**Local Participants:**

Prop Manager – Jess Carstens 715-232-1519

Forester – Jay Jordan 715-232-1516

**Elk Creek Fishery Area (not visited, office discussions only)**

Property Type: Fisheries Management Property Acres: 273

**Local Participants:**

Prop Manager – Bob Hujik, Fisheries 715-839-3731

Forester – Jim Skorczewski 715-726-7885 (Confirmed)

Forester - Mike Rankin

Early 1980’s Master Plan; goal 670 acres; now 350+ including easement; most parcels are small Proposed TS on the largest parcel; skinny, “Y” shaped parcel; lots of in-stream habitat improvement to deal with incised banks, which are sloped back and armored with rip-rap; understands impacts of climate change on fisheries... warmer weather, but habitat work done would benefit warm water species also if this change occurs;

Issues include:

- many adjacent landowners, formerly maintained lots of fence, still need to keep the cattle out of the streams; allow neighbors to maintain their stream crossings
- hunting only allowed on fee lands (not on easements)

**Lower Chippewa River State Natural Area (no sales)**

Property Type: Natural Area Property Acres: 1,701

Local Participants:

Jess Carstens, Prop Manager

Rob Strand, Forester

Jay Jordan, Forester

**Team #2 – East Team**

Auditor: Robert Hrubes

ICIT Team: Randy Hoffman & Teague Prichard

August 18th (Wednesday)

**Team #1 –West Team**

Auditors: Robert Hrubes and Mike Ferrucci

ICIT Team: Kristin Shy & Teague Prichard

**Visit #1: 7:30 am – 8:15 am**

**Property Name:** Buffalo River State Trail (1 sale)  
**Property Type:** Parks Property Acres: 285  
**Location:** Hardees in Osseo, ¼ mile east of I-94

**Local Participants:**

Property Manager - Jim Thompson  
Forester – Dan Dehmer

Site 1: Completed Red Pine Thinning adjacent to the trail, 1 acre area part of a 110-acre timber sale along various parts of the trail; confirmed timber sale planning, set-up, and administration methods are the same as other areas.

Site 2: Buffalo River State Trail: inspected trail surface and discussed planned resurfacing project; some wear and some limited erosion.

**Property Name:** Buckhorn Wildlife Area (3 sales) / Buckhorn State Park (1 sale)  
**Property Type:** Wildlife Management/Parks Property Acres: 3,741 / 1,575  
**Location:** Meet at: W8450 Buckhorn Park Ave - Necedah, WI 54646

**Local Participants:**

Joe Stecker-Kochanski, Park Manager for both Buckhorn and Roche Creek State Parks  
WL Manager - Jon Robaidek - 715-498-2338  
Kris Wimme, WDNR Forester  
Steve Courtney, Area Forestry Leader, Central Wisconsin  
Jean Reagle, District Supervisor, Parks  
Jeremy Humel, Forest Technician

Site 3: Tract 03-09 Buckhorn Wildlife Area: 58 acre Barrens Restoration Project: marked leave trees based on spacing goals for restoration and fire-control (much wider spacing at outside edges); harvested for pulpwood using processor/forwarder; mulched using drum-flail mower; excellent results. Follow up planned fall frost-seeding, possible use of Garlon to treat invasives as needed, eventually fire rotation.

Site 4: Sandblow Area in Jack Pine Barrens: boardwalk, interpretative signs, and viewing platform.

Site 5: Tract# 01-08 Yellow River Wildlife Area Completed clearcut to regenerate 68-year old Jack Pine / black oak mix driven by health particularly oak wilt; retained Bur and White Oak and White Pine; also row thinning in a young red pine plantation. Pesticides applied; records provided.

Site 6: Tract 02-09 Yellow River Wildlife Area: Set up un-cut regeneration harvest in mixed Jack Pine/Oak stand to release existing natural regeneration and to get coppice regeneration Aspen. Discussed Level 1 Lupine survey and Level 2 Karner Blue Butterfly survey, neither of which showed presence.

**Team #2 – East Team**

Auditor: Joanne Hanowski  
ICIT Team: Kristin Shy & John Gritt

**Visit #1 : 7:30 am – 8:15 am** (30 minute drive from Eau Claire)

**Property Name:** Augusta Wildlife Area (1 sale)

**Final Stop Madison : 2:00 pm (1 hour 45 min drive to Madison from Buckhorn)**

3:00pm – 5:00 pm – Room 413

Auditors & Other Staff

ICIT Team - Jeff Prey, Alan Crossley, JoAnne Farnsworth, Teague Prichard, Kristin Lambert, John Gritt

**August 19 (Thursday)**

8 am – 10 am Madison, GEF 2 G09

WDNR All lands Forest Certification Exit Report

## Appendix IV



# 2009 CAR Form

## 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:**  
Reviewed during the 2010 Annual Audit. Item “a” resolved through a “Divisional Directive”; “b” and “c” were completed December, 2009. Interviews with field staff confirming training and awareness.  
STATUS: Closed AUDITOR/DATE: Mike Ferrucci, August 16, 2010

**Appendix V**



**SFI Reporting Form**

No changes to report.