



# Surveillance Audit Report

Sustainable Forestry Initiative® 2005-2009 Standard

By: Mike Ferrucci

A. Wisconsin DNR County Forest System

FRS #: 1Y943

**B. Scope:**

No Change       Changed

The sustainable forestry activities and land management operations of participating counties within the Wisconsin County Forest System, encompassing approximately 2,189,121 acres of forestland in the following 25 counties: Ashland, Barron, Bayfield, Burnett, Douglas, Eau Claire, Florence, Forest, Iron, Jackson, Juneau, Langlade, Lincoln, Marathon, Marinette, Oconto, Oneida, Polk, Price, Rusk, Sawyer, Taylor, Vilas, Washburn, and Wood. The SFI Certification Number is NSF-SFIS-1Y943.

**C. NSF Audit Team:**

Lead Auditor: Mike Ferrucci    Auditors: Dave Wager, JoAnn Hanowski

**D. Audit Dates: August 10-13, 2010**

**E. Reference Documentation:**

SFI 2005-2009 Standard® - primary focus

2010-2014 SFI Standard® - review of progress towards meeting 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 to the overall program of management of Wisconsin's County Forest Program:**

- Retirement of Wisconsin DNR Forest Certification Coordinator. While this is a "higher priority" vacancy, no yet approved, may take awhile; transition plan: Teague Prichard –state lands; Jeff Barkley – County; Kathy Nelson – private lands certification duties
- Proposal to eliminate seedling production from one State nursery (Hayward will not distribute seedlings after 2012); moving from 3 nurseries to 2 \*Note: *In response to public input WDNR has agreed to sow seed for an additional year at Hayward Nursery to further evaluate nursery situation.*

- New BMPs to be followed in 2011; have added filter-strip recommendations for streams and vernal pools; can be stipulated in a TS contract.
- Reduced from 4 Bureaus to 3; certification moved to Bureau of Forest Business Services
- Polk county new County Forest Administrator now will be permanent full time.
- 2 liaison vacancies: Bayfield and Rusk;
- Forestry Division formerly averaged a 3% vacancy rate; now up to 12% vacancy; 8 furlough days per person annually for 2010 and 2011
- County forest time standards (always was considered a minimum) now WDNR considers it a maximum; has been a slight reduction in support for the county forestry program.
- During BMP revision process the classification of a stream was changed from a determination of its navigability to more objective criteria (stream width)
- Governorship in Wisconsin will be changing in 2011 which could impact WI. DNR Leadership (appointed DNR positions at risk)

#### 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: Impacts to roads, skid trails, and soils on one harvest site in Iron County and one in Marinette County are not consistent with SFI requirements.
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, Two 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: SFI Reporting Form

**Appendix I**



**Surveillance Notification Letter  
and Audit Schedule**



July 15, 2010; Final Revision August 2, 2010

Jeff Barkley, County Forest Program Specialist  
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 County Forest System

Dear Mr. Barkley:

As previously arranged, we are scheduled to conduct the Surveillance Audit for the Wisconsin County Forest System on August 10 to 13 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 your remaining open Non-conformances as well as focus on issues involved in the two Major Non-conformances previously closed.

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

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,

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

Dave Wager  
Director -Forest Management Certification SCS  
6107 Skyview Drive,  
Missoula, Montana 59803  
[dwager@scscertified.com](mailto:dwager@scscertified.com)  
Phone: 406-251-7049 Cell: 510-708-0397

PS: This audit will be observed by an auditor from ANAB, our accreditation body. Please make hotel arrangements for two rooms in the same places that I will be staying.

## 2010 Wisconsin County Forest Audit Schedule

### **Tuesday August 10**

Audit team travels to Wisconsin

Audit Team: Mike Ferrucci (SFI Lead)

Dave Wager (FSC Lead)

JoAnn Hanowski (SFI and FSC Team)

Audit team meeting & Opening Meeting – Tuesday August 10, 7:00 PM - 8:30 PM Central time.

Opening meeting format will be a conference call – Wager & Barkley in Chippewa Falls; Ferrucci, Hanowski, Warren & Gritt in Green Bay; Severt - Merrill

### **Wednesday August 11**

Oconto County ( 43,581 acres, SFI & FSC) – JoAnne Hanowski

8 – 5 PM Meet at Oconto County Courthouse (Oconto Cty. Forestry office)

Chippewa County (33,107 acres, FSC-only) –Dave Wager

8 – 5 PM Meet at Chippewa County Courthouse (Chippewa Cty. Land Cons. & Forest Mgt. office)

Marinette County (230,862 acres, SFI-only) – Mike Ferrucci

8 – 5 PM Meet at Wausaukee Ranger Station

### **Thursday August 12**

Florence County (36,709 acres, SFI & FSC) – JoAnne Hanowski

8 – 1 PM Meet at Florence Natural Resource Center

Forest County (10,888 acres, SFI & FSC) – JoAnne Hanowski

1-5 PM Meet at Forest County Courthouse (Forest County Forestry office)

Ashland County (40,008 acres, SFI & FSC) – Dave Wager

8 – 5 PM Meet at Ashland County Forestry Office – Butternut

Oneida County (82,278 acres, SFI-only) – Mike Ferrucci

8 – 5 PM Meet at Oneida County Courthouse (Oneida County Forestry office)

### **Friday August 13**

Iron County (174,267 acres, SFI & FSC) – Dave Wager, Mike Ferrucci and JoAnne Hanowski

8 – 1 PM Meet at Iron County Forestry Office – Hurley

\*Audit Team may split to cover more ground

2 – 3:30 PM: Exit Meeting and Presentation of results – Iron County Forestry & Parks office

### **Logistics – DNR Forestry CO**

- Jeff Barkley will travel with Dave Wager and will have a state vehicle
- Jim Warren will travel with JoAnne Hanowski and will have a state vehicle

- John Gritt will travel with Mike Ferrucci and will be accompanied by Kate Lenz and/or Mike Folgert in Marinette and Brian Spencer and/or Phil Theiler in Oneida. They will have a State car but will travel with Regional staff (in a woods-worthy vehicle) during actual field tour.

***Hotel Logistics***

- Hanowski (& Jim Warren) – Overnights in Green Bay (Tues.), Florence (Weds.), Woodruff Area (Thurs.)
- Wager (& Jeff Barkley) – Overnights in Chippewa Falls (Tues.), Park Falls (Weds.), Woodruff Area (Thurs.)
- Ferrucci (& John Gritt) – Overnights in Green Bay (Tues.), Rhinelander (Weds.), Woodruff Area (Thurs.)
- Accreditation auditor – Overnights in same locations as Ferrucci and John Gritt

**From:** Barkley, Jeffrey D - DNR [mailto:Jeffrey.Barkley@Wisconsin.gov]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 21, 2010 10:04 AM  
**To:** Chris Hoffman; Piikkila, Thomas J - DNR; 'Robert Skalitzky'; McCourt, Todd C - DNR; Dahlby, Mike; Skorczewski, James B - DNR; John Scott - Marinette; Schwantes, Joseph A - DNR; Boren, Stuart A - DNR; Patrick Smith; dzforestco@ez-net.com; Williams, Craig B - DNR; Joe Vairus; Zinsmaster, Charles E - DNR; John Bilogan; Paul Fiene - Oneida; Oradei, Emanuel - DNR  
**Cc:** Jane Severt; Prichard, Teague - DNR; Mike Ferrucci - NSF-ISR; Dave Wager; Gritt, John J - DNR; Mather, Robert J - DNR  
**Subject:** WI. County Forest Audit - Preliminary timber sales - ACTION REQUIRED  
**Importance:** High

Administrators / Liaisons:

Attached is the itinerary & preliminary timber sale list for the August 11-13, 2010 county forest certification audit. The spreadsheet contains individual worksheets for each of your Forests highlighting the preliminary selections in green highlight (excepting Iron). A master list of all the Sales and all the Stands in those sales is also included. On your individual worksheets you will need to go through each of the highlighted sales and complete the highlighted columns on the right side of the worksheet. You will also need to select an additional 3 timber sales from the list using the following criteria:

*From the auditors: "I'd like the local foresters to suggest another two or three. Preliminary selections are marked in green. I would like a variety of sale types, with a focus on completed Aspen clearcuts and on partial harvests that are both active or completed. I also need to see some sales that are on steep ground or near wetlands, streams, lakes, etc."*

Highlight the additional 3 sales in yellow.

Please coordinate between the County and DNR staff so that only one response is sent per County.

When completed **send it directly to: Mike Ferrucci [mferrucci@iforest.com](mailto:mferrucci@iforest.com) and Dave Wager [Dwager@scscertified.com](mailto:Dwager@scscertified.com) with a cc to me please. **Send no later than July 27th.** Once the auditors receive your ground-truthed list they will make the final sale selections for your county and return it back to you directly.**

When you receive the FINAL list back from the auditors please make a packet for each sale including:

- 2460-1 Timber Sale Cutting Notice & Report (including narrative)
- Map of the Sale
- Contract
- Any other pertinent correspondence on the sale

\*The packet doesn't need to be fancy, just staple them together. I would recommend having at least 6 copies available for each field stop. Also remember to plot the sale locations on an overall map of your Forest for use when the auditors arrive.

**Secondly**, in the return e-mail to the auditors also would appreciate suggestions on other sites that might be of value on your Forest (e.g. recreation sites, planting, cultural, etc.) or that are particularly important to your Forest. While timber sales provide the framework for the audit, they are not the only stops of value. If you have sites of this type you'd like to show, make sure they are accessible and reasonable to get to, given their location and the time allotted.

As always, call with questions.

 *Jeff Barkley*

County Forest Specialist, Bureau of Forest Management, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources

(☎) **phone:** (608) 264-9217 (☎) **fax:** (608) 266-8576 (✉) **e-mail:**

[jeffrey.barkley@wisconsin.gov](mailto:jeffrey.barkley@wisconsin.gov)

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".

## 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.

#### **Dave Wager, FSC Lead Auditor**

Mr. Wager is Director of Forest Management Certification for SCS. During his 10 years as Director, Mr. Wager has administered the program and led Forest Management and Chain-of-Custody evaluations throughout the world. Mr. Wager has led assessments of 40 forest management operations worldwide including Minnesota DNR, Pennsylvania State Forests, Massachusetts State Forests, Potlatch Corporation's Idaho Forestlands and Oregon Poplar Tree Farm, Wisconsin County Forests, Collins Pine Company, Department of Defense-Fort Lewis Installation, and operations in Brazil, Canada, Costa Rica, Japan, and Malaysia.

In his role as Program Director, Mr. Wager oversees all first-time certification evaluations, annual audits, and contract renewal certifications on approximately 75 active certificate holders covering 30 million acres. In other natural resources work, Mr. Wager played a key role in the development of Starbucks CAFE Practices- a program to ensure procurement of sustainably grown and processed coffee. Mr. Wager has expertise in business and forest ecology (B.S. business, Skidmore College; M.S. Forest Resources, Utah State University) and utilizes both in his position with SCS. While studying forest ecology at Utah State University, Mr. Wager was awarded a NASA Graduate Student Research Fellowship to develop dendrochronological techniques to assess Douglas-fir growth in Utah's Central Wasatch Mountains.

#### **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 Wisconsin County Forest Program 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.

The 25 participating Wisconsin County Forests have been certified to the Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Standard since December 10, 2004 (SFI certificate #NSF-SFIS-1Y943). In 2009 the scope of the Wisconsin SFI Program was expanded, and the program was recertified. This report describes the first annual follow-up Surveillance Audit.

Wisconsin County Forest Program includes 2.3 million acres of forestland managed by 29 counties in the central and northern portions of Wisconsin. The scope of the SFIS Certification encompasses sustainable forestry activities of participating counties within the Wisconsin County Forest System and land management operations in selected Wisconsin County Forests including 25 counties encompassing 2,189,121 acres of publicly owned forests, including the following counties:

Ashland, Barron, Bayfield, Burnett, Douglas, Eau Claire , Florence , Forest , Iron, Jackson , Juneau , Langlade, Lincoln , Marathon , Marinette, Oconto, Oneida, Polk, Price, Rusk, Sawyer, Taylor, Vilas, Washburn, Wood

Responsibility for management of these forests rests with elected county boards, with management activities implemented by county-employed foresters supported by DNR personnel. The forests are managed to provide revenue, habitat, recreational opportunities, and to protect biodiversity values and special sites. The lands abound with a variety of game and non-game wildlife species, and attract a variety of recreationists from hunters to trail users to nature enthusiasts. The most common tree species in order are aspen, sugar maple, red maple, red oak, red pine, basswood, and white birch. Harvest levels over the past decade have averaged over 12 million board feet and 660,000 cords per year.

The Wisconsin County Forest's SFI Program is managed by Jeffrey Barkley, County Forests Specialist. A County Forest Certification Committee comprised of representatives of the counties, the Wisconsin County Forest Association, and DNR staff help implement the SFI program, reviewing progress and making suggestions for improvements or changes as needed.

#### **SFIS Audit Process**

The audit was performed by NSF-ISR on August 10-13, 2010 by an audit team headed by Mike Ferrucci, Lead Auditor. The other members of the audit team included Dave Wager, FSC Lead Auditor and Forest Ecologist and JoAnn Hanowski, 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. Follow-up or Surveillance Audits are required by the 2005-2009 Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard ®.

The 2010 audit was conducted in conjunction with an FSC audit covering many of the same counties, the same organizational approach, and by the same audit team. The two processes (SFI and FSC) shared audit

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 Wisconsin DNR.

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. Forest practices that were the focus of field inspections included those that have been conducted since January 1, 2008. Selected SFI requirements to promote sustainable forestry practices, to practice sustainable forestry while protecting soil and water resources, and to incorporate continual improvement systems were reexamined during the audit. 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 requirements of the 2005-2009 Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard were used in the audit; no indicators were modified. As with the initial certification the scope included timberland only, as the Wisconsin County Forest Program's SFI programs do not include procurement operations. Several of the SFI Performance Measures were outside of the scope of the county programs and were excluded from the scope of the SFI Certification Audit as follows:

- Indicator 2.1.3 Plantings of exotic tree species
- Objective 8 – Procurement Requirements

The NSF-ISR SFI Certification Audit was governed by an audit plan designed to enable the audit team to determine conformance with the applicable SFI requirements. The plan included provisions for the assembly and review of audit evidence consisting of documents, interviews, and on-site inspections of ongoing or completed forest practices.

During the audit NSF-ISR reviewed a sample of the written documentation assembled to provide objective evidence of SFIS Conformance. NSF-ISR also selected field sites for inspection based upon the risk of environmental impact, likelihood of occurrence, special features, and other criteria outlined in the NSF-ISR SFI-SOP. NSF-ISR 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 of the audit 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 County Forest Program's SFI Program was found to be in substantial conformance with the SFIS Standard. There was one SFI Minor Non-conformance:

#### **Minor Non-conformance SFI-2010-01:**

Road drainage work and wood yarding practices observed on the active harvest at Tract# 55-08 on the Marinette County Forest were not implemented so as to protect and maintain forest and soil productivity (Indicators 2.3.4 and 2.3.7). Iron County Tract # 28-09 located in Section 5, T43N, R3E (Town of Mercer) along Moose Lake Road did not have harvest system layout that minimized impacts to wet soils or to small wetland pockets (Indicators 2.3.2 and 2.3.4).

Performance Measure 2.3: Program Participants shall implement management practices to protect and maintain forest and soil productivity.

Indicator 2.3.2: Process to identify soils vulnerable to compaction and use of appropriate methods to avoid excessive soil disturbance.

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

Indicator 2.3.7: Minimized road construction to meet management objectives efficiently.

The program will develop a corrective action plan for the identified issue, provide it to the NSF Lead Auditor for review, and implement the plan as specified. NSF will review the implementation during the next surveillance audit.

The NSF-ISR Audit team also reviewed previously closed minor non-conformances and issues raised during past audits. In most cases, the team found that the Wisconsin County Forest Program continues to consistently implement appropriate corrective actions. The issues have included: consistent use of contract provisions that specify BMP compliance, implementing stand level habitat retention elements, road and trail maintenance, training for harvesting contractors, tribal consultation, the internal review process, pesticide use, policies to define and prevent excessive rutting and to protect soil productivity, efforts to identify and protect or exceptional resource areas, advances in Northern Hardwood Silviculture, development and implementation of biomass harvesting guidelines, and BMPs for Invasive species. The program should be commended for its continuing attention to these issues and significant progress in improving practices in many of these areas.

#### **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.

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.”

The program will develop a corrective action plan for the identified issue, provide it to the NSF Lead Auditor for review, and implement the plan by December 31, 2010. NSF will review the implementation during the next surveillance audit.

#### **Opportunities for Improvement**

Some areas for continuing emphasis were also identified. In the SFI system these are termed “opportunities for improvement” (OFI). Such findings do not indicate a current deficiency with respect to the standard, but served to alert Wisconsin County Forest Program to areas that could be strengthened or which could merit future attention. The 2010 OFIs include:

There is an opportunity to assess the system for tracking regeneration in stands managed under selection silviculture (group selection/individual tree selection). (SFI Indicator 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 & natural regeneration.”)

There is an opportunity to improve the system of ensuring that SFI requirements are fully implemented by all involved counties to ensure more comprehensive review of certification requirements. (SFI Indicator 13.1.1 “System to review commitments, programs, and procedures to evaluate effectiveness.”)

#### **Exceptional Practices**

Wisconsin County Forest Program was found to exceed the 2005-2009 Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard® as follows:

Management efforts and results in terms of forest health are exceptional.

(SFI Performance Measure 2.4 “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.”)

The program exceeds the standard for minimizing clearcut size.

(SFI Indicator 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.")

The Wisconsin County Forests provide an exemplary array of recreation opportunities; forest management is implemented to enhance these. Further the counties have done an exceptional job of balancing road use with environmental protections so as to provide public road access while having a sustainable road system.

(SFI Indicator 12.2.3 "Recreation opportunities for the public, where consistent with forest management objectives.")

The county forests provide a model for citizen participation through the county forest committees.

(SFI Performance Measure 12.1.3 "Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall participate in the development of public land planning and management processes.")

The next Surveillance Audit is scheduled for August 10 to 12, 2011.

### **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** – The county forest management plans and supporting documentation and the associated inventory data accumulated during RECON and summarized in the WisFIRS inventory and reporting system were the key evidence of conformance.

**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 associated records were used to confirm practices. Each county has programs for reforestation, for protection against insects and 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.

**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 found in various manual codes and guidance documents, 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.

**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.

**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, magazine articles highlighting some of the protected sites, and written protection plans were all assessed during the evaluation.

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

**Summary of Evidence** – Field observations of completed operations, harvest inspection forms, contract clauses, 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 the key evidence used to assess support for research, supported by field visits to several research sites.

**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 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** – Interviews with foresters were used to assess the requirements.

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

To support and implement sustainable forest management on public lands.

**Summary of Evidence** – Interviews and review of correspondence 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.

## **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 More Information Contact:**

Jeffrey Barkley, County Forests Specialist  
Wisconsin DNR – Forestry Division  
101 S Webster Street - FR/4, Madison WI 53703  
[jeffrey.barkley@wisconsin.gov](mailto:jeffrey.barkley@wisconsin.gov) 608-264-9217

or

Mike Ferrucci, SFI Program Manager  
NSF-International Strategic Registrations  
789 N. Dixboro Rd, Ann Arbor, MI 48105  
203-887-9248 (Corporate Office Phone 1-888-NSF-9000) <http://www.nsf-isr.org>

**Appendix III**



**Audit Matrix**

**Wisconsin County Forest Program – evaluation against SFI 2005-2009 Standard**

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 during the August 2010 audit
- Findings are indicated by a date or date code: Audit Date: June 2007; Date Code: 7; May 2008 Code 8; September 2009 Code 9; August 2010 Code 10

**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	
<b>1.1</b>	<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>		7, 8, 9, 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).		7, 8, 9, 10				
1.1.2	Documentation of annual harvest trends in relation to the sustainable forest management plan.		7, 8, 9, 10				
1.1.3	A forest inventory system and a method to calculate growth.		7, 8, 9, 10				
1.1.4	Periodic updates of inventory and recalculation of planned harvests.		7, 8, 9, 10				
1.1.5	Documentation of forest practices (e.g., planting, fertilization, and thinning) consistent with assumptions in harvest plans.		7, 8, 9				

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

Performance Measure/ Indicator		Audit -or	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				OFI
			C	EXR	Maj	Min	
2.1	<i>Program Participants shall reforest after final harvest, unless delayed for site-specific environmental or forest health considerations, through artificial regeneration within two years or two planting seasons, or by planned natural regeneration methods within five years.</i>		7, 8, 9, 10				
2.1.1	Designation of all management units for either natural or artificial regeneration.		7, 8, 9, 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			8			9
2.1.3	Minimized plantings of exotic tree species and research documentation that exotic tree species, planted operationally, pose minimal risk.		7, 8, 9, 10				
2.1.4	Protection of desirable or planned advanced natural regeneration during harvest.		7, 8, 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.		7, 8, 9, 10				
2.2	<i>Program Participants shall minimize chemical use required to achieve management objectives while protecting employees, neighbors, the public and the forest environment.</i>		9, 10				
2.2.1	Minimized chemical use required to achieve management objectives.		7, 8, 9, 10				
2.2.2	Use of least toxic and narrowest spectrum pesticide narrowest spectrum and least toxic pesticides necessary to achieve management objective.		7, 9, 10				
2.2.3	Use of pesticides registered for the intended use and applied in accordance with the label requirements.		8, 9, 10				
2.2.4	Use of Integrated Pest Management where feasible.		7, 8, 9, 10				
2.2.5	Supervision of forest chemical applications by state-trained or certified applicators.		7, 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 ...		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>	
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						
<b>2.3</b>	<b><i>Program Participants shall implement management practices to protect and maintain forest and soil productivity.</i></b>		7, 8			10	
2.3.1	Use of soils maps where available.		7, 8, 9, 10				
2.3.2	Process to identify soils vulnerable to compaction and use of appropriate methods to avoid excessive soil disturbance.		7, 8, 9			10	
2.3.3	Use of erosion control measures to minimize the loss of soil and site productivity.		7, 8, 9, 10				7, 8
2.3.4	Post-harvest conditions conducive to maintaining site productivity (e.g., limited rutting, retained down woody debris, minimized skid trails).		7, 8			9, 10	7, 8
2.3.5	Retention of vigorous trees during partial harvesting, consistent with silvicultural norms for the area.		7, 8, 9, 10				
2.3.6	Criteria that address harvesting and site preparation to protect soil productivity.		7, 8, 9, 10				
2.3.7	Minimized road construction to meet management objectives efficiently.		7, 8, 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>		7, 8	9, 10			
2.4.1	Program to protect forests from damaging agents.		7, 8	9, 10			
2.4.2	Management to promote healthy and productive forest conditions to minimize susceptibility to damaging agents.		7	8, 9, 10			
2.4.3	Participation in, and support of, fire and pest prevention and control programs.		7, 8, 10	9			
<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>		7, 9, 10				
2.5.1	Program for appropriate research, testing, evaluation and deployment of genetically improved planting stock including trees derived through biotechnology.		7, 9, 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>		7, 9, 10				
3.1.1	Program to implement state or provincial equivalent BMPs during all phases of management activities.		7, 8, 9, 10				8
3.1.2	Contract provisions that specify BMP compliance.		7, 10		9		
3.1.3	Plans that address wet weather events (e.g., inventory systems, wet weather tracts, defining acceptable operational conditions, etc.).		7, 9, 10				
3.1.4	Monitoring of overall BMP implementation.		7, 8, 9, 10				9
<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>		7, 9, 10				
3.2.1	Program addressing management and protection of streams, lakes and other water bodies and riparian zones.		7, 9, 10				
3.2.2	Mapping of streams, lakes and other water bodies and riparian zones, and where appropriate, identification on the ground.		7, 9, 10				
3.2.3	Implementation of plans to manage or protect streams, lakes and other water bodies.		7, 8, 9, 10				
3.2.4	Identification and protection of nonforested wetlands, including bogs, fens, vernal pools and marshes of significant size.		7, 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>		7, 8, 10				8 (2)
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.		7, 8, 10				9 (2)
4.1.2	Program to protect threatened and endangered species.		7, 8, 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		8, 9, 10	7			
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).		7, 10		9	8	7
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.		7, 9, 10	8			
4.1.6	Support of and participation in plans or programs for the conservation of old-growth forests in the region of ownership.		7, 8, 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.		7, 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>		8, 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.		8, 9, 10				

Performance Measure/ Indicator		Audit -or-	--- Indicate Only One ---				OFI
			C	EXR	Maj	Min	
4.2.2	A methodology to incorporate research results and field applications of biodiversity and ecosystem research into forest management decisions.		8, 9, 10				

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

Performance Measure/ Indicator		Audit -or-	--- Indicate Only One ---				OFI
			C	EXR	Maj	Min	
5.1	<i>Program Participants shall manage the impact of harvesting on visual quality.</i>		9, 10				
5.1.1	Program to address visual quality management.		7, 8, 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.		7, 8, 9, 10				
5.2	<i>Program Participants shall manage the size, shape, and placement of clearcut harvests.</i>		7, 9, 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.		7, 8	9, 10			
5.2.2	Documentation through internal records of clearcut size and the process for calculating average size.		9, 10				
5.3	<i>Program Participants shall adopt a green-up requirement or alternative methods that provide for visual quality.</i>		9				
5.3.1	Program implementing the green-up requirement or alternative methods.		9				
5.3.2	Harvest area tracking system to demonstrate compliance with the green-up requirement or alternative methods.		9				
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.		7, 9				

**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		Audit -or	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				OFI
			C	EXR	Maj	Min	
6.1.	<i>Program Participants shall identify special sites and manage them in a manner appropriate for their unique features.</i>		7, 8, 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.		7, 8, 9, 10				
6.1.2	Appropriate mapping, cataloging, and management of identified special sites.		7, 8, 9, 10				

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

Performance Measure/ Indicator		Audit -or	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				OFI
			C	EXR	Maj	Min	
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>		7, 8, 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).		7, 8, 9, 10				

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

**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>	
9.1	<i>Program Participants shall individually, through cooperative efforts, or through associations provide in-kind support or funding, in addition to that generated through taxes, for forest research to improve the health, productivity, and management of forest resources.</i>		7, 9, 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.		7, 8, 9, 10				
9.2	<i>Program Participants shall individually, through cooperative efforts, or through associations develop or use state, provincial, or regional analyses in support of their sustainable forestry programs.</i>		9				
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.		9				

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

Performance Measure/ Indicator		<u>Audit</u> <u>-or</u>	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				<u>OFI</u>
			<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
<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>		7, 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.		7, 8, 9, 10				
10.1.2	Assignment and understanding of roles and responsibilities for achieving SFI Standard objectives.		7, 9, 10				
10.1.3	Staff education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities.		7, 8, 9	10			9
10.1.4	Contractor education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities.		7, 8, 9, 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>		7, 9, 10				
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.		7, 9, 10				

**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>		9				
11.1.1	Access to relevant laws and regulations in appropriate locations.		7, 9				
11.1.2	System to achieve compliance with applicable federal, provincial, state, or local laws and regulations.		9				
11.1.3	Demonstration of commitment to legal compliance through available regulatory action information.		7, 9				
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.		7, 9				
<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>		9, 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.		9, 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
			C	EXR	Maj	Min	
<b>12.1</b>	<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>		10				
12.1.1	Support for efforts of SFI Implementation Committees.		7, 9, 10				
12.1.2	Support for the development and distribution of educational materials, including information packets for use with forest landowners.		9, 10				
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.		9, 10				
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).		9, 10				
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				
<b>12.2</b>	<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>		7, 9, 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).		7, 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.		7, 8, 9, 10				
12.2.3	Recreation opportunities for the public, where consistent with forest management objectives.			7, 8, 9, 10			

Performance Measure/ Indicator		Audit -or-	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				OFI
			C	EXR	Maj	Min	
12.3	<b>Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall participate in the development of public land planning and management processes.</b>			7, 9, 10			
12.3.1	Involvement in public land planning and management activities with appropriate governmental entities and the public.			7, 8, 9, 10			
12.3.2	Appropriate contact with local stakeholders over forest management issues through state, provincial, federal, or independent collaboration.			7, 9, 10			
12.4	<b>Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall confer with affected indigenous peoples.</b>		7, 9				
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.		7, 8, 9, 10				
12.5	<b>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.</b>		9				
12.5.1	Support for SFI Implementation Committee efforts (toll-free numbers and other efforts) to address concerns about apparent nonconforming practices.		7, 9				
12.5.2	Process to receive and respond to public inquiries.		7, 9				
12.6	<b>Program Participants shall report annually to the SFI Program on their compliance with the SFI Standard.</b>		7, 9, 10				
12.6.1*	Prompt response to the SFI annual progress report. (*Note: This indicator will be reviewed in all audits.)		7, 8, 9, 10				
12.6.2	Recordkeeping for all the categories of information needed for SFI annual progress reports.		7, 9, 10				
12.6.3	Maintenance of copies of past reports to document progress and improvements to demonstrate conformance to the SFI Standard		7, 9, 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 -or</u>	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				<u>OFI</u>
			<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
13.1*	<i>Program Participants shall establish a management review system to examine findings and progress in implementing the SFI Standard, to make appropriate improvements in programs, and to inform their employees of changes. (*This Performance Measure will be reviewed in all audits.)</i>		7, 8, 9, 10				
13.1.1	System to review commitments, programs, and procedures to evaluate effectiveness.		7, 8, 9, 10				9, 10
13.1.2	System for collecting, reviewing, and reporting information to management regarding progress in achieving SFI Standard objectives and performance measures.		7, 8, 9, 10				
13.1.3	Annual review of progress by management and determination of changes and improvements necessary to continually improve SFI conformance.		7, 8, 9, 10				

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

Requirement	Auditor	Notes
1.1	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	<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. 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A review of the plans for the 6 SFI counties visited this audit confirmed that all of the required SFI elements were included.</li> <li>• Plans are updated annually to add: (1) Approved amendments; (2) Annual Accomplishment report; and (3) Current annual work plan and budget.</li> </ul>
1.1.2	C	<p>"Documentation of annual harvest trends in relation to the sustainable forest management plan."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All counties enrolled in the county forest program (all part of the SFI certification and 4 more) are required to track harvests, maintain and inventory, calculate allowable harvest levels (annually) and provide this information to Wisconsin DNR. Wisconsin DNR provides the tools and systems for doing this work. Both harvest trends and annually re-calculated harvest targets are available for any county upon request.</li> <li>• Marinette County establishes harvests (establishes) 3,800 to 4,000 acres per year, well within allowable calculated annually about 6,000 acres per year.</li> <li>• Marinette County "Long Term Harvest Goal" calculated January 2010 is 6,746 acres per year (15-year average) but some acres will be deferred (not actually ready).</li> <li>• Marinette County "Harvest Establishment History" from 1996 to 2010 reviewed.</li> <li>• Marinette County 49% aspen; 10% NH, 6% each Red Pine, Swamp Hardwood</li> <li>• Oneida County harvest establishment history provided for years from 2000 to 2010.</li> <li>• Oneida County establishes harvests (establishes) about 1750 acres per year, well within allowable calculated annually about 1,900 acres per year.</li> <li>• Oconto County establishes 500-600 acres of harvest/year which is within their allowable 800 acres.</li> <li>• Florence County allows on average about 750 acres of harvest/year and the average harvest has been under 600 acres/year. About 50% of their forests are aspen and 50% northern hardwoods.</li> <li>• Forest County, one of the smallest Counties (&lt;11,000 acres) establishes between 300 and 700 acres of harvest/year (within plan goal).</li> </ul>
1.1.3	C	<p>"A forest inventory system and a method to calculate growth."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Foresters inventory a portion of each county forest annually using the RECON system. FIA data provide broad growth determinations (see previous indicator).</li> <li>• Allowable cut determinations based on area control are included in management plans, providing a good analysis, description of methods, and strategic approaches to deal with age class imbalances. Annual tactical planning refines these harvest level determinations.</li> </ul>
1.1.4	C	<p>"Periodic updates of inventory and recalculation of planned harvests."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marinette County has had a summer intern doing inventory updates for past 2 summers continuing this summer; only 25% of recon is more than 20 years old but by the end of this summer this will be reduced by about half, most of this older recon is</li> </ul>

		<p>young stands.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Marinette County 2010 and 2008 “Annual Harvest Goals” by forest type were compared; adjustments were confirmed; these are caused by inventory updates, mostly involving extending next treatment date into future, often due to better actual site quality than previously shown in system, allowing for longer Aspen rotations.</li> <li>Oneida County plan is to clean up oldest recon this year which amounts to approx. 8000 acres. About 1/2 to 3/4 is swamps, kegs, grass, streams, lakes, etc. The other portion is complete compartment updates that are due.</li> </ul> <table> <tr> <td>1950 to 1970</td> <td>388 acres</td> <td>.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1970 to 1985</td> <td>4956 acres</td> <td>6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1985 to 1990</td> <td>2465 acres</td> <td>3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1990 to 1995</td> <td>4661 acres</td> <td>6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1995 to 2000</td> <td>10,202 acres</td> <td>13%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000 to 2005</td> <td>35,481 acres</td> <td>45%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005 to 2010</td> <td>21297 acres</td> <td>27%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>79450 acres</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Iron County has more than doubled the acres with stand exam (inventory) less than 10 years old, from less than 25% to just over 50%. Trends for the major types (aspen/birch, hardwoods, pine types, and spruce-fir) are all positive, particularly over the past 4 years. Oneida County recon is also in good shape.</li> </ul>	1950 to 1970	388 acres	.5%	1970 to 1985	4956 acres	6%	1985 to 1990	2465 acres	3%	1990 to 1995	4661 acres	6%	1995 to 2000	10,202 acres	13%	2000 to 2005	35,481 acres	45%	2005 to 2010	21297 acres	27%	Total	79450 acres	100%
1950 to 1970	388 acres	.5%																								
1970 to 1985	4956 acres	6%																								
1985 to 1990	2465 acres	3%																								
1990 to 1995	4661 acres	6%																								
1995 to 2000	10,202 acres	13%																								
2000 to 2005	35,481 acres	45%																								
2005 to 2010	21297 acres	27%																								
Total	79450 acres	100%																								
1.1.5	NR	“Documentation of forest practices (e.g., planting, fertilization, and thinning) consistent with assumptions in harvest plans.”																								
2.1	C	<i>“Program Participants shall reforest after final harvest, unless delayed for site-specific environmental or forest health considerations, through artificial regeneration within two years or two planting seasons, or by planned natural regeneration methods within five years.”</i>																								
2.1.1	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 under-stocked areas and achieve desired species composition and stocking rates for both artificial and natural regeneration.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Marinette County: Most planting is Jack Pine; due to droughty sites and periodic drought this species can be challenging; methods include clearcut, site preparation by spot scalping using Bracke scarifier, then plant generally by hand; also cc, site preparation using anchor chain then direct seed.</li> <li>Confirmed Marinette County “Harvest Establishment Monitoring” printout from WISFIRS showing 3,696 established acres and 131 deferred acres. This item was reviewed in the partnership meeting held on September 8, 2009 at the Wausaukee Ranger Station. Minutes: <b>“Regeneration Monitoring-</b> For artificially regenerated sites the foresters turn in maps of areas that need to be replanted or seeded to the Assistant County Forest Administrator, who coordinates site prep and planting work. The county/DNR staff conduct and record 1, 3, and 5 year survival rates. Sites with excessive mortality may receive supplemental planting 1-2 more times. For natural regeneration foresters have typically kept an eye on their own closed out sales. We discussed and agreed that using WisFIRS to prompt foresters to check stands where regeneration may be questionable would help to insure regeneration success. Foresters will start coding stands for “Habitat Maintenance – 8 – Survival Check” under planned treatments.”</li> </ul> <p>Florence County partnership meeting minutes state: <b>“Regeneration Monitoring-</b> For artificially regenerated sites the foresters turn in maps of areas that need to be replanted or seeded to the Assistant County Forest Administrator, who coordinates</p>																								

		<p>site prep and planting work. The FCF/DNR staff conduct and record one, three, and five year survival rates. We discussed and agreed that using WisFIRS to prompt foresters to check stands where regeneration may be questionable would help to insure regeneration success. The Assistant Administrator is now coding stands for "Habitat Maintenance – 8 – Survival Check" under planned treatments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Observations showed regeneration is not a problem in most portions of all sites visited. Deer numbers are at or below target, and are generally at 10-year lows.</li> <li>• Foresters in Florence, Forest and Oconto Counties conduct timely regeneration monitoring and reforest sites when necessary.</li> </ul>
2.1.3	C	<p>"Minimized plantings of exotic tree species and research documentation that exotic tree species, planted operationally, pose minimal risk."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marinette County - No exotic species are planted.</li> <li>• Oneida County - No exotic species are planted; very little planting is done.</li> <li>• Iron County - No exotic species are planted; very little planting is done.</li> <li>• Forest, Florence, Oconto- No exotic species planted.</li> </ul>
2.1.4	C	<p>"Protection of desirable or planned advanced natural regeneration during harvest."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hardwood management, which relies on natural regeneration, was a focus of the 2010 audits. Harvest areas reviewed did not have high levels of damage to advance regeneration.</li> </ul>
2.1.5	C	<p>"Artificial reforestation programs that consider potential ecological impacts of a different species or species mix from that which was harvested."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of management plans and interviews confirmed that careful assessment is done prior to planting any site, particularly when a species change is recommended.</li> <li>• Forest type conversions through planting are conducted on a limited acreage each year. When done they are based on a review of soil and habitat types (to confirm appropriate soils and likely success) and long-term management plans. The goal is generally to increase the amount of a forest type that is lacking in a region when compared to natural or pre-settlement conditions. Habitat or other ecological benefits generally drive such decisions.</li> <li>• One example discussed in Oneida County involves planting Jack Pine on a dry, sandy site where off-site and low vigor, low stocking aspen had been present.</li> </ul>
2.2	C	<p><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></p>
2.2.1	C	<p>"Minimized chemical use required to achieve management objectives."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marinette County: Mechanical site preparation is widely employed; Chemical use is generally a last resort employed only after other possible methods have been tried or are known to be ineffective.</li> <li>• Oneida County generally uses natural regeneration, inherently requiring little herbicide. There has been no recent forest use of herbicides; open landscape management is done using fire.</li> <li>• Forest, Florence and Oconto Counties rely primarily on natural regeneration and where necessary some mechanical site preparation is used.</li> </ul>
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>• Confirmed for sites audited this year.</li> </ul>
2.2.3	C	<p>"Use of pesticides registered for the intended use and applied in accordance with the label requirements."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirmed for sites audited this year.</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, as documented in the plans:  <i>"Integrated pest management for the purpose of this Plan, is defined as follows: The maintenance of destructive agents, including insects, at tolerable levels, by the planned use of a variety of preventive, suppressive, or regulatory tactics and strategies that are ecologically and economically efficient and socially acceptable."</i></li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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> <li>• Forest management efforts focus on maintaining healthy stand conditions so as to minimize the need for chemical treatments; stands visited were generally healthy.</li> </ul>
2.2.5	C	<p>“Supervision of forest chemical applications by state-trained or certified applicators.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is required by law and by policy in all counties. The training is widely available. Most applications, except small treatment areas, are done by contractors who are very experienced.</li> <li>• Confirmed the Pesticide applicator certificates for supervisors of the Shrine Road Openings for habitat enhancement for Northern Blue Butterfly (Site 10) Marinette County.</li> </ul>
2.2.6	C	<p>“Use of best management practices appropriate to the situation; for example ...”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marinette County: Interviewed John Scott, who described practices comprising most of the examples in this indicator; Interview applicator Sparky Stimart, Skyline Helicopters 715-493-7294</li> </ul>
2.3	Minor	<p><b><i>“Program Participants shall implement management practices to protect and maintain forest and soil productivity.”</i></b></p> <p><u>Minor Non-conformance: Road drainage work and wood yarding practices observed on the active harvest at Tract# 55-08 on the Marinette County Forest were not implemented so as to protect and maintain forest and soil productivity (see Indicators 2.3.4 and 2.3.7 below). Iron County Tract # 28-09 Section 5, T43N, R3E Town of Mercer, along Moose Lake Road did not have harvest system layout that minimized impacts to wet soils or to small wetland pockets (see Indicators 2.3.2 and 2.3.4 below).</u></p>
2.3.1	C	<p>“Use of soils maps where available.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Soil maps are contained in the GIS and are used in planning timber sales and other treatments.</li> </ul>
2.3.2	Minor	<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> <li>• Iron County: Site 1 did not have harvest system layout that minimized impacts to wet soils or to small wetland pockets. Several small wetlands were crossed even though alternate routes were available to completely avoid or to minimize impacts to wetlands soils. The impacts included rutting (near steep section of main skid trail) and placing modest amounts of slash into the wetlands.</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>• BMPs including design of harvest, time of year, use of logging slash, etc. are being effectively employed; little erosion was observed on skid roads or trails.</li> <li>• Confirmed BMP checklists being used on the Jackson County Forest (Contract #2154, Tract 11-08; Contract #2130, Tract 20-07)</li> </ul>
2.3.4	Minor	<p>“Post-harvest conditions conducive to maintaining site productivity (e.g., limited rutting, retained down woody debris, minimized skid trails).”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marinette County: Site 8 (Tract# 55-08 active Northern hardwood selection harvest) had significant soil disturbance from ineffective attempt (using excavator) to drain the truck access road. This site also had many ruts on skid trails but not to the “excessive level” specified in the sale contract. One observed forwarder load was very large and the machine was compacting the soil and creating numerous ruts. This portion of the job had long yarding distances requiring repeated trips so the operator was offsetting the roads 30 to 50 feet but still having a significant impact, with soil compaction and disturbance near most trees in the portion of the sale inspected. There was not sufficient woody debris used to protect skid trails observed. Alternative skid road</li> </ul>

		<p>patterns were not considered (herringbone pattern for example). <u>Minor Non-conformance: see 2.3 above.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Iron County: Site 1, in the completed section of the harvest, had rutting on main skid trail in one location and in wetlands adjacent to that location, and logging slash in and adjacent to other minor wetlands. Impacts to some of these wetlands were beyond necessary levels, as alternate routes were available.</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>• Field observations confirmed the retention of vigorous trees and the appropriate application of silviculture guidelines for removal of least vigorous and poorest quality trees and retention of the trees best adapted to the site.</li> <li>• Foresters consistently emphasized the retention of the most vigorous trees when marking stands; results of partial harvests were very good.</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>• Wisconsin State BMPs for Water Quality (avoid excessive rutting) and Wisconsin DNR and/or individual county policies (defining excessive rutting) provide these criteria.</li> <li>• Confirmed that “excessive rutting” definitions are in all recent timber sale contracts.</li> <li>• Concern that the program’s approach to this indicator may not be sufficient to protect and maintain forest and soil productivity in limited cases. Marinette County Tract# 55-08 had many long, parallel skid trails with extensive, shallow and non-continuous ruts (observed close to the loading area; unknown how far away from loading area to the west these extended) that were not severe enough to be labeled “excessive”. These trails are quite closely spaced, adding to the impact to soil productivity and tree roots. The resultant ruts have affected the rooting zone of many residual trees.</li> </ul>
2.3.7	Minor	<p>“Minimized road construction to meet management objectives efficiently.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marinette County: Site 8 (Tract# 55-08 active Northern hardwood selection harvest) had significant soil disturbance from excavator attempt (ineffectively) to drain road; many ineffective roadside holes and trenches were observed, resulting in significant soil disturbance and root damage, but because the ground did not slope away from the road in most places the work had little or no chance of improving drainage; the visual impact can be restored but the impacts to soils and to tree roots will remain; timber sale inspection reports indicated the Forester’s disapproval of the road modification and dictated repair work. <u>Minor Non-conformance: see 2.3 above.</u></li> </ul>
2.4	EXR	<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>  <b><u>Management efforts and results in terms of forest health are exceptional.</u></b></p>
2.4.1	EXR	<p>“Program to protect forests from damaging agents.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Each counties’ forest management plan has a section on protection: “600 Protection: Objective: To protect and manage the resources of the forest from preventable losses resulting from fire, insects, diseases and other destructive elements including those caused by people. Protective methods shall include proper silvicultural methods.”</li> <li>• Wisconsin DNR employs pest control specialists and makes their services readily available to the counties.</li> <li>• County foresters interviewed were aware of forest pests, including new or emerging threats, and understand pest control and/or sanitation/salvage options.</li> </ul>
2.4.2	EXR	<p>“Management to promote healthy and productive forest conditions to minimize susceptibility to damaging agents.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All foresters interviewed knew the primary pests of the forest types under their management and the silvicultural methods needed to maintain vigorous stands as well as needed treatments when pests appear.</li> <li>• Rotations are set short enough to prevent many pest problems (for example Jack Pine rotations of 50 years or Aspen rotations between 40 and 50 years).</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Marinette County awareness of emerging diseases included Annosum Root Rot (requiring stump treatments for cut conifers) and Beech scale (monitoring for now)</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>Marinette County Forestry program uses Btk spray for gypsy moth control in campgrounds; also will spray a strip along boundary adjacent to any private landowner who is spraying.</li> <li>DNR participates in regional and national fire cooperation compacts; county staff can participate as time allows.</li> </ul>
2.5	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 Wisconsin DNR’s representative on the broad climate change effort “Wisconsin Initiative on Climate Change Impacts (WICCI).</li> <li>The plan is consistent with science and up-to-date protocols.</li> </ul> </li> <li>There are many partner organizations, all providing valuable science-based support or collaboration.</li> </ul>
3.1	C	<p><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></p>
3.1.1	C	<p>“Program to implement state or provincial equivalent BMPs during all phases of management activities.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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> <li>As suggested in the 2009 report, roads and ATV/OHV trails were assessed during the 2010 audit to determine whether maintenance meets BMP requirements for having adequate road surface material, road profiles being crowned or sloped, and ditched as needed.</li> <li>Forest access roads are well maintained, with regular grading. Erosion along these roads appears to be within acceptable limits due to proper road design and maintenance. The two months prior to the audit visits were the wettest on record, yet roads traveled during the 2010 audit were generally in very good condition.</li> <li>State funding for county forest roads is not adequate; counties are subsidizing their road programs with revenue from timber sales.</li> <li>Observed some erosion on actively used ATV trails (Oneida County) but design and maintenance are serving to minimize the impacts. One critical factor is the ability of foresters to manage road use, with the authority to block unstable roads the most critical factor. If this authority is lost, or if recreational road use is significantly expanded without the concurrent increase in road maintenance budgets the certification audits would increase in length and cost in order to assure that the roads are being sustainably managed.</li> </ul>
3.1.2	C	<p>“Contract provisions that specify BMP compliance.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confirmed for all counties visited during 2010 SA and 2009 SA.</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> <li>Iron County: Site 1 was operated during wet conditions during the summer of 2010, which was unusually wet. There were many measures taken to prevent site impacts, particularly the use of brush/logging slash to protect the ground from compaction and rutting. Despite these measures wetlands and soils on many portions of the tract were impacted, with some rutting and compaction, and with much logging slash placed in or near wetlands to prevent further impact. The current wet weather policy may not be adequate for such weather.</li> </ul>
3.1.4	C	<p>“Monitoring of overall BMP implementation.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Iron, Marinette, Florence, Forest, Oconto and Oneida County sale inspection reports include BMPs.</li> </ul>
3.2	C	<p><b>“Program Participant shall have or develop, implement, and document, riparian protection measures based on soil type, terrain, vegetation and other applicable factors.”</b></p>
3.2.1	C	<p>“Program addressing management and protection of streams, lakes and other water bodies and riparian zones.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confirmed that this program continues to operate effectively by reviews of completed and partially completed timber harvests and road and trail improvement efforts.</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 within the timber sale contracts.</li> <li>Sale and/or harvest unit boundaries are designed to avoid or buffer wetlands, stream, lakes, and other water bodies. Riparian buffers associated with harvests are shown on maps and marked on the ground.</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>Streams, lakes and other water bodies and riparian zones are mapped, and are marked on the ground (red paint on trees) near harvests 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>Confirmed by field observations that wetlands and riparian zones are protected.</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”, or by not marking any trees for harvest.</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>Iron County Site #1 had marginal levels of protection for several small nonforested wetlands; although efforts were made to protect the wetlands from machine damage (use of logging slash) there was rutting, interrupted subsurface flow, and loading of slash in or near 3 small wetlands on this site. These were not of significant size.</li> <li>One very small seasonal wetland on Oneida County Site #5 that was harvested when the ground was frozen and covered with snow had a skid trail through it and some logging slash in it. The wetland would not have been obvious in the winter, and given the long-term drought that preceded the current rainy summer would not have been wet or obvious even if the sale was set up with no snow cover.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All other wetlands of significant size observed this audit (a focus were adequately protected.</li> <li>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>
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>Seasonal wetlands and vernal ponds observed in Forest, Florence and Oconto Counties employed buffers to protect the water resource.</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	<p><b><i>“Program participants shall have programs to promote biological diversity at stand- and landscape- scales.”</i></b></p>
4.1.1	C	<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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Marinette County is involved in the Pike River Watershed Improvement project; an assessment of all culverts for fish passage issues has been completed, next there will be a prioritization, followed by replacement of selected culverts.</li> <li>Counties visited this year participate with the State in the implementation of the Wildlife Action Plan, identification of SNA’s and HCVF habitats and forests. County employees have received training on the applicability of the WAP to their properties.</li> </ul>
4.1.2	C	<p>“Program to protect threatened and endangered species.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Marinette County foresters use the “Field Guide to Stick Nests” and follow up as needed with the Wisconsin DNR wildlife biologist</li> <li>Marinette County Funded 2008 Master’s Thesis Janet C. King UWSP on Red-shouldered Hawk nest locations; have these in their GIS; other sensitive species include Northern Blue butterfly and its important habitat plant the Dwarf Bilberry, Grey Wolves (6 packs), Kirtland’s Warbler (occasional sightings, and wood turtles.</li> <li>Iron County is participating and contributing to the cost of collaring and locating American Martens for a habitat utilization study for this species.</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>Confirmed checks of NHI database as part of sale planning in Marinette County, Oneida County, Iron County, Florence, Forest, and Oconto Counties.</li> <li>Iron County has identified and is protecting HCVF forest with passive management.</li> <li>The zoology NHI backlog has been reduced substantially over the past two years. Currently (end of 2009) there are 104 records/reports that are ready to be mapped and an additional 140 records that are ready not ready to map. 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.</li> </ul>
4.1.4	C	<p>“Development and implementation of criteria, as guided by regionally appropriate science, for retention of stand-level wildlife habitat elements (e.g., snags, mast trees, down woody debris, den trees, nest trees).”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>County personnel employ State wide silvicultural guidelines for retaining structural diversity in even-aged management systems. County personnel attended State wide training to gain understanding and application of the new green tree retention</li> </ul>

		<p>standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some Counties (Oconto) visited had incorporated previous guidelines to retain stand-level wildlife structure in their management.</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>Marinette County uses a compartment system (400+); compartments are grouped into 39 wildlife habitat units used to plan the distribution of various timber types/cover types.</li> <li>County plans utilize DNR data that has assessed regional forest cover and age/size classes to plan and manage activities at the County Forest level.</li> <li>Conservation Opportunity Areas identified in the State Wildlife Action Plan are recognized and used by the Counties to coordinate and plan management on a landscape scale.</li> <li>The WCFP has long had an objective of promoting biodiversity at stand and landscape levels (the over-riding PM).</li> </ul>
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>Iron County has identified a high conservation value forest area of about 1700 acres in the Penokee’s that has old-growth qualities and that will be passively managed.</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>Counties have a system to implement and utilize State guidelines to limit the introduction and spread of both aquatic and terrestrial invasive species in forest stands, along waterways and trails.</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>Counties prescribe and use 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>
4.2	C	<p><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></p>
4.2.1	C	<p>“Collection of information on critically imperiled and imperiled species and communities and other biodiversity-related data through forest inventory processes, mapping, or participation in external programs, such as NatureServe, state or provincial heritage programs, or other credible systems. Such participation may include providing nonproprietary scientific information, time, and assistance by staff, or in-kind or direct financial support.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A variety of programs are available to assist with the management of imperiled species and communities on the county forests including NHI data, the Wisconsin Wildlife Action Plan and the Conservation Opportunity Areas. Counties have access to NHI and are encouraged to participate by reporting locations of ETS to the State.</li> <li>Wisconsin DNR wildlife managers, BER staff and species experts are available to county forest managers to provide important management support.</li> <li>Counties participate and financially support research projects on critically imperiled species and communities.</li> <li>Counties coordinate with State personnel to provide locations and identification of both forests and habitats of exceptional conservation value. SNA’s are identified in County plans and are incorporated into the State system. However, Oconto County has not finalized their SNA designation as identified in their Master Plan.</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>Research results and expertise on red-shouldered hawk nesting was provided by</li> </ul>

		<p>ornithologist Gene Jacobs to the Wood County Forest during project implementation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Kotar Habitat Classification System was being utilized by managers on most county forests.</li> <li>• Research results have driven monitoring and management programs for the Karner Blue Butterfly.</li> <li>• Research results from American Marten habitat assessment are driving forest management planning and site specific habitat prescriptions. Iron County is incorporating regional, science-based habitat management plans for the American Marten in new timber sales within the documented Marten range in the forest.</li> </ul>
5.1	C	<b><i>“Program Participants shall manage the impact of harvesting on visual quality.”</i></b>
5.1.1	C	<p>“Program to address visual quality management.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All of the management plans include Section 520 “Aesthetic Management Zones”.</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>• Harvests in visible areas, particularly near recreation facilities (campgrounds, trails) were carefully designed to minimize visual impacts. Harvests in those locations have good utilization, visual buffers, and care is taken to minimize impacts on alternative activities.</li> <li>• Most contracts include multiple requirements for slash scattering and/or disposal; some of these provisions are for fire –related reasons, but most also help manage aesthetic impacts.</li> </ul>
5.2	C	<b><i>“Program Participants shall manage the size, shape, and placement of clearcut harvests.”</i></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 18.1 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>• 18.1 acres in 2009</li> </ul>
5.3	NR	<p><b><i>“Program Participants shall adopt a green-up requirement or alternative methods that provide for visual quality.”</i></b></p> <p>Note: Hardwood management was the focus in 2010. Few clearcuts were reviewed.</p>
5.3.1	NR	<p>“Program implementing the green-up requirement or alternative methods.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
5.3.2	NR	<p>“Harvest area tracking system to demonstrate compliance with the green-up requirement or alternative methods.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
5.3.3	NR	<p>“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.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
6.1.	C	<b><i>“Program Participants shall identify special sites and manage them in a manner appropriate for their unique features.”</i></b>
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>• Oneida County: Paul Fiene has located over 40 historic sites, archeological remains of logging camps. These are marked off from active management and located on maps. Archeologists have been consulted. Also have protected ¼ mile of remnant</li> </ul>

		<p>narrow-gauge railway.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oneida County has also protected the site of a former Native American village.</li> <li>• Oconto County has identified and is protecting one cultural resource site.</li> <li>• Forest County has a good working relationship with the Potawatomi Tribe to identify and protect their cultural resources that occur on County Land.</li> </ul>
6.1.2	C	<p>“Appropriate mapping, cataloging, and management of identified special sites.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marinette County: visited one special site (St. Hubert’s Shrine) and discussed the management practices for two others (Athelstane Barrens and Dunbar State Natural Area); also discussed relict Beech forest.</li> </ul>
7.1	C	<p><b>“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.”</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>• Marinette County changed their contracts and computer system to allow variable top diameter harvesting (4” tip, 2” tip, no tip restriction) to accommodate biomass harvesting where allowed by the guidelines (soils based).</li> <li>• Foresters (either county or Wisconsin DNR or both) monitor utilization on all harvests. Confirmed with loggers interviewed.</li> </ul>
9.1	C	<p><b>“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.”</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>• Gap study Oneida County.</li> <li>• Red-shouldered hawk project Marinette County.</li> <li>• 2009 research support totaled \$1,169,000 in these areas: A. Forest Health &amp; Productivity, B. Water Quality, C. Wildlife and Fish, D. Landscape/Ecosystem Management and Biodiversity</li> <li>• American Marten research in Iron County.</li> </ul>
9.2	NR	<p><b>“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.”</b></p>
9.2.1	NR	<p>“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.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
10.1	C	<p><b>“Program Participants shall require appropriate training of personnel and contractors so that they are competent to fulfill their responsibilities under the SFI Standard.”</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>• All personnel encountered during the 2010 SA were aware of the commitment to the SFI standard.</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>•</li> </ul>
10.1.3	EXR	<p>“Staff education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities.”</p> <p><u>The Wisconsin County Forest Program, supported by Wisconsin DNR, has demonstrated exceptional results in staff training.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The program has devoted considerable resources to training over the past year or</li> </ul>

		<p>longer, with special efforts in BMPs for biomass and invasive species and in wildlife and biodiversity issues. This training has had clear benefits; foresters are more knowledgeable in many areas in the vast and ever-expanding knowledge base needed to continually improve land management and resource stewardship.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marinette County demonstrated significant support for staff training.</li> </ul>
10.1.4	C	<p>“Contractor education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirmed logger training requirements are in all timber sale contracts.</li> <li>• Logger training certificates or training status are checked/confirmed for each logging contractor on county forest harvest sites. Foresters communicate with FISTA to check on the status of contractors by name. Wood County keeps a separate file of SFI training certificates, organized by “current” and “outdated”.</li> <li>• Contractors who conduct pesticide application must be Wisconsin Certified Pesticide Applicators</li> </ul>
10.2	C	<p><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></p>
10.2.1	C	<p>“Participation in or support of SFI Implementation Committees to establish criteria and identify delivery mechanisms for wood producers’ training courses...”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jeff Barkley attends Wisconsin SFI Implementation Committee meetings.</li> <li>• Financial support for SIC includes funding for Master Logger scholarships, payment in kind for FISTA training (primarily Carmen Wagner’s time in conducting BMP training).</li> </ul>
11.1	NR	<p><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></p>
11.1.1	NR	<p>“Access to relevant laws and regulations in appropriate locations.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
11.1.2	NR	<p>“System to achieve compliance with applicable federal, provincial, state, or local laws and regulations.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
11.1.3	NR	<p>“Demonstration of commitment to legal compliance through available regulatory action information.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
11.1.4	NR	<p>“Adherence to all applicable federal, state, &amp; provincial regulations and international protocols for research &amp; deployment of trees derived from improved planting stock &amp; biotechnology.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
11.2	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>• Each county has such policies in place; confirmed by review of bulletin boards and employee handbooks in Marinette County and Oneida County.</li> </ul>
12.1	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</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial support for SIC includes direct funding for Tree Farm (up to \$5000/yr).</li> </ul>
12.1.2	C	<p>“Support for the development and distribution of educational materials, including information packets for use with forest landowners.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WCFA provides such support.</li> <li>Article in newspaper “The Echo” Summer 2010 by Paul Fiene about forest history, preservation of historic logging camp sites, and management of county forests.</li> </ul>
12.1.3	C	<p>“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.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WCFA provides such support.</li> </ul>
12.1.4	C	<p>“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).”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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>“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.”</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</li> </ul>
12.2.2	C	<p>“Periodic educational opportunities promoting sustainable forestry, such as ...”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Marinette County: John Scott teaches a 3-hour seminar annual at UW Marinette, also speaks to Rotary Club and Masonic Lodge; Pete Villas gives forestry talks to high school classes; Andy and Marcus (foresters) annually do forestry presentations at Camp Bird, the counties’ summer youth camp.</li> <li>Oneida County: Liaison Forester is involved in public out reach/education, including working with Boy Scouts/ Cub Scouts on forestry merit badges mostly tree ID and utilization information and a short description of what a forester does; work with 3 Eagle Scout projects in the past 6 years with a RHN City Park tree nursery park replanting project; speaking about “what a forester does” in the 4th, 5th grade; and the school forest program here in Rhinelander for the past 10 years and that includes monthly meetings, timber sale est. &amp; admin, recreational development projects, annual tree planting projects with 20-30 HS students; and most years one HS Environmental Ed class in the fall for a field forestry talk.</li> <li>The Wisconsin County Forestry Association’s Executive Director Jane Severt is involved in many educational activities and with many organizations that support forestry. From a nominating form for the “Friend of Forestry” award: “Jane serves on a number of groups including the Council on Forestry, Great Lakes Forest Alliance, Board. of Directors for the Great Lakes Timber Professionals Association, Lake States Resource Alliance, University of Wisconsin – Stevens Point Forestry Advisory Committee, BMP Advisory Committee, Congressman Kagen’s Resource Advisory Council, the Statewide Implementation Committee (SFI), and the Forest Stewardship Committee. She was the lead for the development of the Forest Management track for the Invasive BMP development. Upon Representative Fred Clark’s election to the State Legislature, she accepted the role of Chair for the overarching Forestry Invasives Leadership Team. In addition, Jane served on the Advisory Council during development of Wisconsin’s Biomass Harvesting Guidelines.</li> </ul>
12.2.3	EXR	<p>“Recreation opportunities for the public, where consistent with forest management objectives.”</p> <p><b>EXR - The Wisconsin County Forests provide an exemplary array of recreation opportunities;</b></p>

		<p>forest management is implemented so as to enhance these.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marinette County: built ford on a feeder stream to the Camp F Stream for maintenance of the hunter walking trail</li> <li>• Extensive snowmobile , hiking, cross country ski and ATV trails on all county forests audited in 2010: Marinette County Iron County Oneida County, Forest, Florence and Oconto Counties.</li> </ul>
12.3	EXR	<p><b><i>“Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall participate in the development of public land planning and management processes.”</i></b>  <u>The county forests provide a model for citizen participation, through the county forest committees.</u></p>
12.3.1	EXR	<p>“Involvement in public land planning and management activities with appropriate governmental entities and the public.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• County and State land planning and management activities are closely coordinated through the use of the DNR Liaison foresters and by incorporating state forest management, private forestry, and county forestry activities within the same administrative line-staff field organization. County forests are managed by elected county board members (through a forestry committee that is a sub-set of the full board). Confirmed through review of planning procedures and records of public meetings that extensive public opportunities for comment were employed during the recent effort to update all county plans.</li> <li>• County forests are run by the citizens; Public members can comment during any monthly county forestry committee meeting.</li> <li>• Not all of the plans are available on the internet.</li> </ul>
12.3.2	EXR	<p>“Appropriate contact with local stakeholders over forest management issues through state, provincial, federal, or independent collaboration.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Managers make significant efforts to work closely with citizens and with various organizations so as to have an effective network for communicating key issues in public lands management.</li> </ul>
12.4	C	<p><b><i>“Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall confer with affected indigenous peoples.”</i></b></p>
12.4.1	C	<p>“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.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Forest County has a good working relationship with the local tribe.</li> </ul>
12.5	NR	<p><b><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></b></p>
12.5.1	NR	<p>“Support for SFI Implementation Committee efforts (toll-free numbers and other efforts) to address concerns about apparent nonconforming practices.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
12.5.2	NR	<p>“Process to receive and respond to public inquiries.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
12.6	C	<p><b><i>“Program Participants shall report annually to the SFI Program on their compliance with the SFI Standard.”</i></b></p>
12.6.1*	C	<p>“Prompt response to the SFI annual progress report.” (*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. Also reviewed 2009 report.</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 tracks most of the information, which is entered for each timber harvest on a site-by-site basis. Financial support for research, the SIC, etc. is available from standard accounting reports.</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>• Done by Jeff Barkley</li> </ul>
13.1*	C	<p><b><i>“Program Participants shall establish a management review system to examine findings and progress in implementing the SFI Standard, to make appropriate improvements in programs, and to inform their employees of changes.”</i></b></p>
13.1.1	C, OFI	<p>“System to review commitments, programs, and procedures to evaluate effectiveness.”  <u>There is an opportunity to improve the system of ensuring that SFI requirements are fully implemented by all involved counties to ensure more comprehensive review of certification requirements.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By law and agreement DNR is responsible for reviewing the county forestry programs to ensure compliance and effectiveness. A DNR Liaison Forester is assigned to each county and must complete a minimum number of hours of oversight and direct assistance. These foresters are the front line staff for assisting county forestry departments to achieve certification. In Marinette County Wisconsin DNR provides 1.5 FTE support (Liaison Forester and others)</li> <li>• Regular communication between the County staff and local DNR Liaison &amp; Team Leader evaluate effectiveness of programs and projects, including timber sales, vegetation management, and the range of forest management activities.</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>• Management plan requirements pertaining to annual reporting are:  3100 ANNUAL ACCOMPLISHMENT REPORTS  A copy of an annual accomplishment report shall be prepared and provided to members of the County Board and to official copyholders of this Plan for inclusion into this chapter. This report shall include, at a minimum, the following:</li> <li>• Timber sale accomplishments including gross and net sale receipts and harvest goals achieved.</li> <li>• Timber stand improvement accomplishments.</li> <li>• Recreation development and maintenance accomplishments including recreation revenues and expenses.</li> <li>• Wildlife management accomplishments including revenues and expenses.</li> <li>• Fisheries management accomplishments including revenues and expenses.</li> <li>• Other accomplishments identified as “needs” in Chapter 1000.</li> <li>• DNR's internal group compliance includes internal audits every 3 yrs. and forest certification compliance and follow through is incorporated into those audits.</li> <li>• Annual work plans are submitted by each County and reviewed and approved by DNR.</li> <li>• Annual Partnership meetings are held which include certification compliance and follow through. Minutes from these annual meetings are routed through Jeff Barkley to upper level DNR Management</li> </ul>
13.1.3	C	<p>“Annual review of progress by management and determination of changes and improvements necessary to continually improve SFI conformance.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual planning/partnership meetings are held for all counties including WDNR representatives and the county forest administrator. Discussed this for Marinette County; reviewed documentation for Oneida County, Iron County, Oconto County, Florence County, and Forest County.</li> <li>• Reviewed memo and associated attachment from Wisconsin DNR County Forest Specialist to Team Ldrs., Liaisons and Area Forestry Staff that participate in County Forest Partnership Mtgs. &amp; County Forest 3 yr. audits.</li> <li>• In the memo it was stated “We must do a better job of documenting the certification discussions.” Review of these minutes showed varied level of detail.</li> <li>• The attachment, also provided to all WDNR involved staff, summarized the 2009 SFI</li> </ul>

		<p>and FSC CARs and OFIs and other categories of FSC findings. Many of the issues from the FSC portion are issues in the revised 2010-2014 standard.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Certification progress reports to the WCFA Bd. of Directors are made jointly by the County Forest Specialist &amp; WCFA Executive Director</li> <li>• General coordination and oversight are provided by County Forest Specialist Jeffrey Barkley (participated in all three days of audits) working in conjunction with the WCFA Certification committee &amp; WCFA Executive Director (Jane Severt participated in 2 days of the audit).</li> <li>• Confirmed the “Agenda - County Forest – Annual Certification Review - July 23, 2010” Meeting Objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Review County Forest Certification group participation</li> <li>○ Discussion &amp; Review of new SFI &amp; FSC standards</li> <li>○ Review of progress and future plans on outstanding Corrective Actions (CARs) and Opportunities for Improvement / Recommendations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ SFI</li> <li>▪ FSC</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ 2010 County Forest Surveillance audit</li> <li>○ FSC Logo Use &amp; License Agreements</li> <li>○ Items from the floor</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The meeting included “Attendees: Darrell Zastrow – Deputy Chief State Forester, Division of Forestry, Bob Mather – Director, Bureau of Forest Management, Jim Warren – Chief, Public Lands and Conservation Services Section in Bureau of Forest Management, Jane Severt – Executive Director – Wisconsin County Forests Association, Jeff Barkley – DNR County Forest Specialist, John Gritt, Teague Prichard”. The meeting topics and Jeff Barkley’s preparation notes comprise a robust review of the program.</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. Additional requirements have been underlined; most have additional comments attached (seek technical support if you don’t know how to set your version of MSWord so that the comments are visible).

**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 were retained in the matrix below. 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	Performance measures (such as this one) which have underlying “changed” indicators have been retained for clarity.								

	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	Management plans include all required items a through h above. Item h (a review of non-timber issues) has some new examples of possible non-timber issues. The county forest plans have extensive reviews of recreation and wildlife/biodiversity conservation and less detailed information on economic / market issues. The planning for non-timber issues is very robust, varying between counties only to address the different opportunities (more detail on recreation issues where these are important, etc). The requirement is clearly met.								
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						
Notes	County forest plans and 15-year harvest schedules (re-run each year) document planned future activities.								

**Comment [MF1]:** New non-timber issues listed must be included as relevant.

**Comment [MF2]:** New: document future activities; past was already required.

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

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<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	Program Participants shall implement <u>forest management practices to protect and maintain forest and soil productivity.</u>								
<i>Notes</i>	Performance measures 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>
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>	The Wisconsin County Forest Program uses the “Silviculture and Aesthetics Handbook” to guide silviculture. This is a peer-reviewed science-based document. The program has been audited against this handbook since the original 2004 certification. Thus this indicator change is not significant. See 2005-2009 SFI Matrix.								

**Comment [MF3]:** Formerly stated as “silvicultural norms”. The change clarifies that proper silviculture is required, rather than merely doing no worse than the average in the area.

	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>
2.3.7	<u>Road construction and skidding layout to minimize impacts to soil productivity and water quality.</u>	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	Except as noted in the 2005-2009 SFI Matrix the program is in conformance. No changes in the program are needed, as minimize impacts to soil and water are long-standing priorities.								

**Comment [MF4]:** Completely revised from “Minimized road construction to meet management objectives efficiently.” Change of emphasis from economic to ecological, and expansion to include “skidding layout”. This later issue was previously considered by most auditors under BMPs; now it is clearer where the issue should be addressed.

	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>
2.4	Program Participants shall manage so as to protect forests from <u>damaging agents, such as environmentally or economically undesirable wildfire, pests, diseases and invasive exotic plants and animals</u> , to maintain and improve long-term forest health, productivity and economic viability.	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	The county forestry program has addressed invasive exotics for several years (insects for many years); efforts to deal with invasive plants continue to increase.								

**Comment [MF5]:** This additional item in the PM was already covered to some degree under Indicator 2.4.1. Formerly these “invasive exotic plants and animals” had to be at “damaging” levels; now they seem to be considered damaging agents by definition.

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

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

	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>
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>								
<i>Notes</i>	Performance measures 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>
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						
<i>Notes</i>	<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>• Iron County Site #1 had marginal levels of protection for several small nonforested wetlands; although efforts were made to protect the wetlands from machine damage (use of logging slash) there was rutting, interrupted subsurface flow, and loading of slash in or near 3 small wetlands on this site. These were not of significant size.</li> <li>• All other wetlands of significant size observed this audit (a focus during 2010) were adequately protected.</li> <li>• 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. Because of these revisions the program will be in conformance with the revised indicator</li> </ul> <p>Conclusion: The Wisconsin County Forest Program, supported by Wisconsin DNR, is prepared to cover this modest change.</p>								

**Comment [MF6]:** Formerly “of significant size”.

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

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

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<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	Program Participants shall have programs to promote biological diversity at stand- and landscape-levels.								
Notes	Performance measures which have underlying “changed” indicators have been retained for clarity.								

**Comment [MF7]:** Elevated the statement including stand and landscape scales from several indicators to the overriding Performance Measure.

	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>
4.1.1	Program to promote the conservation of native biological diversity, including species, wildlife habitats and <u>ecological</u> community types.	JH	10						
Notes	Marinette County is involved in the Pike River Watershed Improvement project; an assessment of all culverts for fish passage issues has been completed, next there will be a prioritization, followed by replacement of selected culverts.  Counties visited this year participate with the State in the implementation of the Wildlife Action Plan, identification of SNA’s and HC VF habitats and forests. County employees have received training on the applicability of the WAP to their properties.								

**Comment [MF8]:** Changed from “natural”; limited impact as most organizations don’t make a distinction.

	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>
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						
Notes	The WCFP has long had an objective of promoting biodiversity at stand and landscape levels (the over-riding PM).  County plans utilize DNR data that has assessed regional forest cover and age/size classes to plan and manage activities at the County Forest level. Conservation Opportunity Areas identified in the State Wildlife Action Plan are recognized and used by the Counties to coordinate and plan management on a landscape scale. The WCFP has long had an objective of promoting biodiversity at stand and landscape levels (the over-riding PM).								

**Comment [MF9]:** By removing the modifying phrase “where practical and when consistent with management objectives” this requirement has been significantly changed / strengthened.

**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 WCFP does not procure wood for mills.

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

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

	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>
14.1	Program Participants shall take appropriate steps to comply with applicable federal, provincial, state and local forestry and related social and environmental laws and regulations.	MF	10						
Notes	Each county has such policies in place; confirmed by review of bulletin boards and employee handbooks in Marinette County and Oneida County.								

**Comment [MF10]:** Formerly "commitment to comply". Intent and effort are still a major part of the auditor's considerations. The goal is compliance; perfect compliance is not expected.

**Comment [MF11]:** Expanded slightly to include social laws; most organizations already include such laws in their programs. Auditors need to ask.

	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>
14.2	Program Participants shall take appropriate steps to comply with all applicable social laws at the federal, provincial, state and local levels in the country in which the Program Participant operates.								
Notes	Performance measures 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>
14.2.2	Forestry enterprises will respect the rights of workers and labor representatives in a manner that encompasses the intent of the International Labor Organization (ILO) core conventions.	MF	10						
Notes	There have not been any ILO-related complaints? If any occur the program must report to NSF, who must pass these along to SFI Inc.								

**Comment [MF12]:** New indicator; see SFI Guidance Document; SFI CB third party auditors don't need to investigate conformance to the ILO conventions unless the program participant received an outside complaint that some other part of the US labor system isn't already looking at (and the odds of that are apparently very small). The auditor doesn't need to do any sort of discovery audit to otherwise seek out violations. If there is an ILO-related complaint, the CB auditor passes it up the line to SFI for evaluation.

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

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

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<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, associations or other partners provide in-kind support or funding for forest research to improve forest health, productivity, and sustainable management of forest resources, and the environmental benefits and performance of forest products.</u></b>	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	Wisconsin SIC's 2009 progress report and interviews confirmed involvement with and support for the Wisconsin SIC. Jane Severt, Executive Director Wisconsin County Forests Association is on the Board of Directors of the Wisconsin SIC.								

**Comment [MF13]:** Most organizations meet this through support of the trade organization; going forward SIC support could be helpful for the new requirements.

	<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>
15.3	<b><u>Program Participants shall individually and/or through cooperative efforts involving SFI Implementation Committees, associations or other partners broaden the awareness of climate change impacts on forests, wildlife and biological diversity.</u></b>	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	Wisconsin DNR has several initiatives underway under the umbrella of the Wisconsin Climate Initiative (WICCI). The Executive Director of the Wisconsin County Forests Association is involved and has been briefing the organization's members at meetings.								

**Comment [MF14]:** New requirement.

	<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>
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 county foresters. This information has not been e made available to all land managers.								

**Comment [MF15]:** New requirement.

	<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>
15.3.2	<b><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></b>	MF						10	
<i>Notes</i>	Transitional Minor Non-conformance: 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 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.								

**Comment [MF16]:** New requirement.

**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.								
Notes	Performance measures 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	<u>Forestry enterprises shall have a program for the use of certified logging professionals (where available) and qualified logging professionals.</u>	MF	10						
Notes	Wisconsin DNR provides financial support to the Wisconsin Master Logger Program. Certified loggers are accepted in equal terms with SFI-trained loggers. Counties are considering ways to support this program, but may not legally be able to give a preference in bidding.								

**Comment [MF17]:** Moved so that all organizations, not just procurement, must comply. Also added “certified logging professionals”.

	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</u> 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.								
Notes	Performance measures 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> <p>a. awareness of sustainable forestry principles and the SFI program;</p> <p>b. best management practices, including streamside management and road construction, maintenance and retirement;</p> <p>c. reforestation, <u>invasive exotic plants and animals</u>, forest resource conservation, aesthetics, and <u>special sites</u>;</p> <p>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>);</p> <p>e. logging safety;</p> <p>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;</p> <p>g. transportation issues;</p> <p>h. business management;</p> <p>i. public policy and outreach; and</p> <p>j. <u>awareness of emerging technologies</u>.</p>	MF	10						
<b>Notes</b>	<p>Financial support for SIC includes funding for Master Logger scholarships, direct funding for Tree Farm (up to \$5000 annually), payment in kind for FISTA training (primarily Carmen Wagner's time in conducting BMP training).</p> <p>The County Forest Specialist participates in the Wisconsin SFI Implementation Committee. A meeting is scheduled for mid-August to include a discussion of revisions to the training requirements.</p> <p>Jane Severt, Executive Director Wisconsin County Forests Association is on the Board of Directors of the Wisconsin SIC.</p>								

**Comment [MF18]:** Significantly longer list of topics required in training 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>
16.2.2	<p>Participation in or support of SFI Implementation Committees to establish criteria for recognition of logger certification programs, where they exist, that include:</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						
Notes	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.								

**Comment [MF19]:** New, but these programs do not exist in many locales, so this will be N.A. in most cases (programs exist in ME, WI, and Michigan).

**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>	Performance measures 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>
17.1.1	Support, including financial, 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. Financial support for SIC includes funding for Master Logger scholarships, direct funding for Tree Farm (up to \$5000 annually), payment in kind for FISTA training (primarily Carmen Wagner’s time in conducting BMP training). Jane Severt, Executive Director Wisconsin County Forests Association is on the Board of Directors of the Wisconsin SIC.								

Comment [MF20]: New.

	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>
17.1.3	Support for the development of regional, state or provincial information materials that provide forest landowners with practical approaches for addressing special sites and biological diversity issues, such as invasive exotic plants and animals, specific wildlife habitat, Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value, and threatened and endangered species.	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	Jane Severt, Executive Director Wisconsin County Forests Association and/or many county forest administrators serve on the board of or are active participants in many organizations that provide such information. One example is the work done by the Wisconsin Council on Forestry to develop Invasive Species BMPs.								

Comment [MF21]: Expanded requirement with longer list of required items; focus completely on development of this information, as distribution is covered elsewhere.

	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>
17.1.5	Program Participants are knowledgeable about credible regional conservation planning and priority-setting efforts that include a broad range of stakeholders and have a program to take into account the results of these efforts in planning.	MF	10						

Comment [MF22]: Formerly “Consider the results of these efforts in planning where practical and consistent with management objectives.” Considerably strengthened.

<b>Notes</b>	<p>Two OFIs from 2009 SA were related to this indicator:  <i>There is an opportunity to incorporate the information provided in the Wisconsin Wildlife Action Plan and related tools to protect and maintain biodiversity. (Also SFI Indicator 4.1.1), and</i>  <i>There is an opportunity to improve training on the Wisconsin Wildlife Action Plan and associated information.</i></p> <p>The county forest management plans and many timber harvests have been influenced by or include elements of many different landscape-scale biodiversity protection projects:          1995 Statewide Biodiversity Report; Great lakes Assessment; US FS CN          In 1990's big assessments done for the Northern Region for state forest planning          Oneida County Forests' role: lake protection; increase red and white pine component; increase composition and structure (increase complexity within NH stands). The NH Chapter of the Silviculture Manual, if followed, will help contribute to this role.          Chequamegon Nicolet National Forest "Shared Landscape Initiative".          Ecological Landscapes of Wisconsin being used as the basis for an Ecosystems Management Handbook that will describe the Conservation Opportunities and practical management actions.</p> <p>Discussed Oneida County Forests' role: Aspen and early successional forest stages; lake protection; increase red and white pine component; starting to increase the representation of Jack Pine using available sandy sites; and increase composition and structure (increase complexity within NH stands). The NH Chapter of the Silviculture Manual, if followed, will help contribute to this final item (NH).</p>
--------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Objective 18. Public Land Management Responsibilities.**

To promote and implement sustainable forest management on public lands.

No changes in Objective 18.

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

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

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
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						
<b>Notes</b>	Now in the standard, but always required.								

Comment [MF23]: Now in the standard, but always required.

	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>
--	-----------------------	--------------	----------	------------	------------	------------	------------	-------------------------	---------------------------

19.1.1	<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 and any nonconformities</u> and corrective action plans to address them, opportunities for improvement, and exceptional practices; and</li> <li>h. the certification decision.</li> </ul>	MF	10							
Notes	NSF will include all of this information in the report.									

**Comment [MF24]:** Significant change in requirements for the SFI report; covered in the NSF SOP for the audit and 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.

	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>
20.1	Program Participants shall establish a management review system to examine findings and progress in implementing the SFI Standard, to make appropriate improvements in programs, and to inform their employees of changes.	MF	10						
Notes	Performance measures 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>
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					2010	
Notes	NSF’s Lead Auditor conducted a review of the program’s efforts against the alternate approach listed in the Requirements for the SFI 2010-2014 Program: Standards, Rules for Label Use, Procedures, and Guidance in Section 9, “Appendix 1: Audits Of Multi-Site Organizations”; <b>see below.</b>								

**Comment [MF25]:** New; expected to be challenging; check with the NSF Forestry Program Manager.

	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>
20.1.2	System for collecting, reviewing, and reporting information to management regarding progress in achieving SFI 2010-2014 Standard objectives and performance measures.	MF	10						
Notes	No change to the indicator. See 2005-2009 SFI Matrix for details.								

	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>
20.1.3	Annual review of progress by management and determination of changes and improvements necessary to continually improve conformance to the SFI 2010-2014 Standard.	MF	10						
Notes	No change to the indicator. See 2005-2009 SFI Matrix for details.								

**4.1.2 Supplement for Multi-Site Organizations using alternate approaches to sampling provided for in Section 5.1 of the Audit Procedures and Auditor Qualifications and Accreditation document, to assess minimum eligibility criteria:**

<b>4.1.2</b>	<b>Alternate Approach (to IAF MD1) Per SFI Requirements</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>
a.	A legal or contractual link shall exist between all sites.	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	Enrollment in the program is governed by Wisconsin law. There are formal procedures for entering or withdrawing lands from the county forest program as well as for the SFI Certification system.								

<b>4.1.2</b>	<b>Alternate Approach (to IAF MD1) Per SFI Requirements</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>
b.	The scope and scale of activities carried out by participating sites shall be similar.	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	The counties all operate under the same set of laws, funding mechanisms, objectives, and management plans developed using a common template. Activities are similar: timber management, habitat management, recreation, and biodiversity conservation are included.								

<b>4.1.2</b>	<b>Alternate Approach (to IAF MD1) Per SFI Requirements</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>
c.	The management system framework shall be consistent across all sites (allowing for site level procedures to reflect variable local factors).	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	The counties all operate under the same set of laws, funding mechanisms, objectives, and management plans developed using a common template.								

4.1.2	Alternate Approach (to IAF MD1) Per SFI Requirements	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFl</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
d.	<p>A Central Function shall be established that shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. provide a commitment on behalf of the whole multi-site organization to establish and maintain practices and procedures in accordance with the requirements of the relevant standard;</li> <li>ii. provide all the sites with information and guidance needed for effective implementation and maintenance of practices and procedures in accordance with the relevant standard;</li> <li>iii. maintain the organizational or contractual connection with all sites covered by the multisite organization including the right of the Central Function to exclude any site from participation in the certification in case of serious non-conformities with the relevant standard;</li> <li>iv. keep a register of all the sites of the multi-site organization, including (for <i>SFI 2010-2014 Standard</i>) the forest area associated with each participating site;</li> <li>v. maintain an internal audit or monitoring program sufficient to provide annual performance data on overall organizational conformance with the relevant standard;2</li> <li>vi. maintain an internal audit or monitoring program sufficient to provide periodic performance data on overall organizational conformance with the relevant standard;</li> <li>vii. operate a review of the conformity of sites based on results of internal audit and/or monitoring data sufficient to assess Organizational performance as a whole rather than at the individual site level;</li> <li>viii. establish corrective and preventive measures if required and evaluate the effectiveness of corrective actions taken; and</li> <li>ix. establish procedures for inclusion of new sites within the multi-site organization including an internal assessment of conformity with the standard, implementation of corrective and preventive measures and a requirement to inform the relevant certification body of changes in participation prior to including the sites within the scope of the certification.</li> </ul>	MF	10						

<i>Notes</i>	<p>The central function is managed by the Wisconsin DNR County Forest Specialist Jeff Barkley under the direction of the Wisconsin State Forester and his designees, with significant support and involvement by Jane Severt, Executive Director Wisconsin County Forests Association (WCFA) and that organization's Board of Directors and associated committees. The DNR provides the legal, financial, and technical support; WCFA provides support for responding to challenges, for understanding new certification requirements and for training.</p> <p>Auditors confirmed items i. through ix. Item vii is supported by extensive monitoring using a variety of forms and regular field inspections by a County Liaison Forester assigned to each county. "Internal audits" against certification requirements are conducted as part of the 3-year overall audits, but these have been focused on past non-conformances or Opportunities for Improvement that had been identified during third-party audits. Annual Partnership Meetings also include a review of certification, also focused on third-party findings. Both sets of reviews do include many other certification-related issues, but are not structured to include the full range of certification requirements.</p> <p><u>There is an opportunity to improve the 3-Year audits and the annual Partnership Meetings to review the full range of issues addressed under SFI Certification.</u></p>
--------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

4.1.2	Alternate Approach (to IAF MD1) Per SFI Requirements	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>
e.	<p>Functions and responsibilities of individual sites shall be established for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. implementing and maintaining the requirements of the relevant standard;</li> <li>ii. responding effectively to all requests from the Central Function or <i>certification body</i> for relevant data, documentation or other information whether in connection with formal audits or reviews or otherwise;</li> <li>iii. providing full co-operation and assistance in respect of the satisfactory completion of internal audits, reviews, monitoring, relevant routine enquiries or corrective actions; and</li> <li>iv. implementing relevant corrective and preventive actions established by the central office..</li> </ul>	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	<p>The overall partnership between the Wisconsin DNR and the participating county forestry programs has effectively met these requirements. The County Forest Administrators have the primary responsibility, with the WDNR in a supporting role. All data requested by the NSF Lead Auditor was provided, including activities lists requested for planning and follow-up information requests. Evidence of each counties' response to recent findings, including Non-conformances and Opportunity for Improvement, was present in the notes from the partnership meetings and/or revealed by on-site auditing.</p>								

**Participants, entire audit:**

Mike Ferrucci, NSF Lead Auditor

JoAnn Hanowski, NSF Team Auditor

Dave Wager, Technical Specialist (and FSC Lead Auditor)

Jim Warren, WDNR Forest Management Bureau Chief

John Grit, Forester

John Stratton, Witness Auditor (Marinette County, Forest County, Florence County)

Jim Finley, Witness Auditor (Marinette County, Forest County, Florence County)

**Itinerary Summary**

Wednesday August 11

Oconto County ( 43,581 acres, SFI & FSC) – JoAnne Hanowski

Chippewa County (33,107 acres, FSC-only) –Dave Wager

Marinette County (230,862 acres, SFI-only) – Mike Ferrucci

Thursday August 12

Florence County ( 36,709 acres, SFI & FSC) – JoAnne Hanowski

Forest County (10,888 acres, SFI & FSC) – JoAnne Hanowski

Ashland County (40,008 acres, SFI & FSC) – Dave Wager

Oneida County (82,278 acres, SFI-only) – Mike Ferrucci

Friday August 13

Iron County (174,267 acres, SFI & FSC) – Dave Wager, Mike Ferrucci and JoAnne Hanowski

## Field Sites and Participants:

Wednesday August 11

### Oconto County FSC-SFI audit Wed, Aug 11th, 2010

#### Opening meeting attendance

JoAnn Hanowski	FSC-SFI audit team
Ron Gropp	WI DNR Team Leader
Jim Warren	WI DNR Chief Public Lands and Conservation Services
Todd McCort	WI DNR Liason Forester Oconto County
Katherine Lenz	WI DNR Area Forestry Specialist
Dave Borisch	Oconto County Asst Adm
Bob Skaltzky	Oconto County Forest Adm
John Huff	WDNR-Wildlife

Stop 1: 125-07 One harvest unit with three harvest stands- red pine thinning, aspen clearcut, swamp hardwood clearcut. Examined stream crossing to aspen stand. Used culvert for crossing which was removed and approach reseeded. 50 ft no-cut buffer along stream. Good retention of white pine and oak in aspen clearcut.

Stop 2: 148-08 One harvest unit with two harvest stands-red pine thinning and jack pine regeneration. Third entry into red pine, thinned to 120. Small jack pine stand (<2 acres) cut to 6 ba. Little regen in jack pine, will reassess and likely hand plant jack pine.

Stop 3: 165-09 Red pine stand thinning at age 65 cut to 120ba. Getting good oak regen and goal is for oak. Have guidelines for tree marking in red pine stands for thinning.

Stop 4: 171-09 Scrub oak age 77 reduced to 50 ba harvested in 2001. 2007 regen survey indicates lots of oak regen. Talked about red-shouldered hawk, using key for identifying stick nests and developing mgmt plans for ets species.

Stop 5: 129-07 2009 winter harvest in hemlock stand. Vernal pond had 30-40 ft uncut buffer. Little hemlock regen after first growing season. Deer, penn sedge (indicator of exotic earthworm presence) could be inhibiting hemlock regen. Northern hardwood thinning also sold with this sale. Second entry releasing oak with ¼ to ½ acre gaps. Goal is to convert to climax forest in an uneven-aged state.

Stop 6: 144-08 Hardwood thinning conducted on stand with a group marking experiment. Written guidelines provided for tree marking to the individuals that participated in the marking. Quite a bit of individual variation in residual ba (target was 90). Another vernal pond buffer.

Stop 7: Active sale 17-08 Aspen regen harvest that was active. 39 of about 80 acres will be harvested with this entry and the remaining acres will be harvested in the next 5 years. BA will be reduced to about 9%. Had conversation with certified logger on site.

Stop 8: 147-08 Red maple, aspen clearcut of about 19 acres with prescribed aspen enhancement. Cut ot about 5ba with good regen of both maple and aspen. Good white pine residual and ash island left due to wet soilsl.

### **Marinette County (230,862 acres, SFI-only) – Mike Ferrucci**

#### Marinette County Participants

John Scott, Marinette County Forest and Parks Administrator

Pete Villas, Assistant Forest Administrator

Wayne Vogt, Marinette County Forester

Marcus Isaacson, Marinette County Forester

Andy Lange, Marinette County Forester

Phil Fritz, Marinette County Scaler

John Landenberger, Marinette County Forestry Intern

Dave Halfmann, DNR Wildlife Biologist

Mike Folgert, Area Forestry Supervisor, Wisconsin DNR

Cole Couvillion, Forestry Team Leader, Wisconsin DNR

Joe Schwantes, Marinette County Liaison Forester, Wisconsin DNR

Jane Severt, Executive Director Wisconsin County Forests Association

1. Tract# 22-08 Aspen and Red Maple Regeneration Harvest 46 acres; Completed late fall 2009; very good green tree retention
2. Near Site 1 Road use gravel pit – plan to restore
3. Tract# 70-07 Dunbar Township Northern hardwood 157 acres; completed marked selection harvest; gaps somewhat small but were cleaned; some rutting occurred near Aspen clearcut (note actual 4 acres, planned for only 1 acre, confirmed WisFIRS database update was done)
4. Tract# 70-04 Northern hardwood 108 acres; completed marked selection harvest; gaps somewhat larger and cleaned; drove loop road then checked portion of lot where some rutting occurred, now ok
5. Camp 12 (T37N, R19E) Oak Regeneration Site Preparation 10 acres; Fully-stocked oak sawtimber/poletimber; silvicultural trial to mechanically treat (Fecon mower no snow cover) dense sapling Ironwood; will monitor this site (and companion site that was winter mowed) and follow up with herbicide treatment if needed; numerous tiny oak seedlings present
6. County Forest Road 518 Steam Crossing with culvert slightly perched that is slated for replacement; a watershed assessment has been done for the Pike River Watershed
7. Tract# 54-06 Aspen Clearcut 12 acres with significant conifer retention of 10 to 30' tall spruce retained
8. St. Hubert's Shrine (patron saint of hunters) special site; confirmed recreation management with no-harvest buffer

9. Tract# 55-08 Northern hardwood selection harvest active; interviewed Donny Lemaster, Skidder Operator/ contract logger; significant problems with road work done by buyer's procurement forester using excavator to attempt (ineffectively) to drain road; also many ruts on skid trails but not to the "excessive level"; skidder load was huge; long yarding distance, limited efforts to use brush to protect skid trails; Minor CAR
10. Shrine Road Openings for habitat enhancement for Northern Blue Butterfly which relies on the Dwarf Billbery plant; first step was a "Conservation Assessment" done by a specialist; nest treated by hand cutting brush/small trees, carrying to access road, and treating the stumps with a herbicide reviewed spray records confirmed that applicator is Licensed and that chemicals used (Garlon 4 aka Trypiclor) is registered for the application; doing follow-up monitoring of butterfly populations during early July flights
11. Hobachee Road Jack Pine Site Preparation for spring 2011 planting; post harvest brush raking/piling; will sell for biomass? Or burn? Follow-up herbicide
12. Murphy Flats along State Highway 8; various pine harvests with implementation of visual management; some pine sites were treated with Garlon 4 and Tordon 101 this year confirmed need spray records

Thursday August 12

**Florence County 8/12/10**

Opening meeting:

JoAnn Hanowski	FSC-SFI team auditor
Phil Theiler	WI-DNR Area Forest Supervisor
Jeremy Holtz	WDNR Wildlife Biologist
Jim Foley	ANAB Tech Expert
John Stratton	ANAB Auditor
Jake Walaisak	Florence County
Stu Beven	WDNR Liason Forester/team leader
Pat Smith	Florence County Forest Administrator
Andy Nault	Florence County
Jane Severt	WCFA
Jim Warren	WI DNR

1. Uplands 723-09f: Northern hardwood with 125ba marked for target of 80ba. Talked about gap size-observe that smaller gaps are more successful in getting good regen throughout gap. Larger gaps tend to dry out and produce more raspberry. Suggested that climate change may have an impact. Used green paint for wildlife trees.
2. Dead Pecker: Aspen clearcut with white pine retention. Did some spruce/balsam salvage due to budworm damage. Left a 100ft buffer along stream and lowland swamp adjacent to buffer will be harvested in winter.
3. Blood Trail: Aspen clearcut with white pine and oak residuals. Removed some at risk white pine-site has pine tendencies. Inspected a wetland on the site-good bmp implementation with buffer, no operation or slash within wetland.

4. That Scrub Oak Sale: Clearcut w.oak residual. Trees on site were dying due to insect and disease-many of the retention trees were also in decline. Getting red maple regen which is not desirable. Plan is to plant red and jack pine on the site after site prep. Not many options for the site.

**Forest County (10,888 acres, SFI & FSC) – JoAnne Hanowski**

Opening Meeting:

JoAnn Hanowski	FSC-SFI team auditor
Phil Theiler	WI-DNR Area Forest Supervisor
Jeremy Holtz	WDNR Wildlife Biologist
Jim Foley	ANAB Tech Expert
John Stratton	ANAB Auditor
Stu Beven	WDNR Liason Forester/team leader
Jane Severt	WCFA
Jim Warren	WI DNR
Dan Peters	Natural Resources Tech
David Ziolkowski	County Forest Administrator

1. Uphill Sale: Northern Hardwood 110ba marked for harvest to 80-90ba. Active site with hand felling and skidding. Interviewed two loggers/no spill kit. Marked site with hardwood marking guidelines and left 350 gaps of about 1/10th acre each. Re-entry in 15 years to achieve northern hardwood maintenance objective. Cross country ski trail on site.
2. Lost Arrow: Northern hardwood with some aspen-about 20 acres. Marked and did not cut around two cultural resources on the site (old logging sites). Good bmp implementation along intermittent stream-35ft buffer and no equipment within 15 ft-looked good.
3. Bur Oak: Aspen regen harvest from 07/08. Retention was done by prescription with good results- oak and white pine residuals. Snags lacking although prescription indicated that all dead standing trees should be left on site. Winter harvest due to intermittent high water levels on the site.

**Oneida County (82,278 acres, SFI-only) – Mike Ferrucci**

Oneida County Participants

John Bilogain, Oneida County Forest Director  
 Paul Fiene, Oneida County Forest Director  
 Eric Rady, Oneida County Forester / Recreation Coordinator  
 Ron Eckstein, Wildlife Biologist, Wisconsin DNR  
 Eric Kroening, Wildlife Biologist, Wisconsin DNR  
 Carmen Wagner, Hydrologist, Wisconsin DNR  
 Tim Friedrich, Wisconsin DNR  
 Manny Oradei, Oneida County Liaison Forester, Wisconsin DNR

Brian Spencer, Area Forestry Staff Specialist, Wisconsin DNR

1. Shingle Mill Road: excellent condition, proper grading, road surface.
2. Enterprise ATV Trail: 3-season trail maintained by ATV club; Oneida County conducts formal inspections three times each year; good condition in most places, some sections will need grading soon.
3. Tract #21-08 Northern hardwood with significant red oak component, 139 acres marked not cut; improvement thinning as initial entry marked 2005; also designated all Birch, Ironwood, and Fir for removal; seasonal no-harvest restrictions (common on Oneida County Forests) March 15 to August 15.
4. Tract #5-06 Northern hardwood with significant red oak component, 139 acres marked not cut; improvement thinning marked 2005 and cut 2007; reviewed residual stand, roads, skid trail, protections for included Keg (no harvest buffer) and tiny seasonal wetland confirming good practices.
5. Tract #21-09 Northern hardwood selection harvest 80% complete (stopped work due to no marked for Basswood, 74 acres; designated all Birch, Ironwood and marked Basswood heavily due to health issues from Pear Thrips infestation; canopy gaps smaller/fewer than prescribed (30-40 foot diameter, 3 per acres. A small 30-foot diameter seasonal wetland met BMPs, had been driven through when frozen/snow covered, limited amount of small branches are in it; after many years of drought this may be the first time it has had water in it.
6. Tract #9-10 Northern hardwood selection harvest marked 2009 not yet cut; pre-marked locations for gaps on 2-chain grid, gaps are marked near each location but the 4 reviewed were all somewhat small; confirmed use of updated/revised timber sale narrative form 2460-001A with more issues covered; also discussed likely response of the 1-2 inch diameter maple saplings in the understory, as the stocking is 127 and the stand was last cut in 1986, making them perhaps less vigorous than they would have been 10 years ago (group was split)
7. Enterprise Campground: recently build 11 sites rustic but very nicely done; access to the Enterprise ATV trail.
8. Deer Exlosures as part of the canopy gap study; gaps were 60-feet between crowns; in 5th growing season, regeneration protected from deer browse is significantly taller and more densely stocked than outside.
9. Tract # 16-09 Active harvest 75% complete; Aspen clearcut leaving significant large oak component; also small area of aspen cut from younger birch and red maple; logger interview – trained and fully understands required actions to protect site and implement prescription; biomass included, but provision for retaining one-in-ten tops 4-inches and smaller is not being implemented (perhaps 1 in 25), with allowance for limbing of 100" boltwood, site is probably meeting the goal of 5 tons per acre of wood debris.
10. Tract # 7-09 Finger Lake Red Oak Sale: completed thinning, confirmed BMPs, buffer adjacent to Finger Lake, no residual stand damage.

### **Ashland County 8/12/10- Dave Wager**

Opening meeting:

Jeff Barkley, DNR County Forest Specialist

Darrel Zastrow, DNR Deputy Administrator

Peter Anderson, DNR Forestry Tech

Joe Grapa, Ashland County

Chris Hoffman, Ashland County Administrator

Matt Shultz, Ashland County

Tom Piikkila, DNR County Forest Liaison  
Jay Gallagher, Area Forestry Supervisor- WDNR  
Mark Diesen, Burnett County Ass. Administrator  
Bruce Bacon, WDNR Wildlife Biologist  
Al Tatzel, DNR Area Forestry Staff

1. Tract 1-09: Trout Road- Northern Hardwood/Hemlock stand. 49-acre even aged NH stand to convert to uneven aged. Winter only harvest. Successful examples of regenerating hemlock (difficult species to regenerate in Wisc). Road bermed. Good job excluding wetland/vernal pool areas from sale- one small wetland area that had one pass along edge. Balsam bough collection point, and discussion about socio-economic importance.
2. Red Pine Thinning "Tom's Pines": Excellent marking to improve pine plantation. No significant residual damage observed. Interview with logger, who demonstrated sufficient training and knowledge. He expressed some concerns about opportunities for small operations (though no concerns were directed at Ashland County).
3. Tract 6-07 "Rubber Boot": 126-acre NH stand. Harvested 2007 with objective to convert to uneven or (all-aged) stand. Emphasis on low vigor, high risk, and poor quality. Gaps consistently put in. Good attention to green tree retention. Small area of rutting identified on sale, which was noted in inspection log. With no other problems noted on-site.
4. Tract 7-10: 57-acre NH even-aged conversion to uneven-age stand. Retained 4 hemlock inclusions, Good discussion of SGCN for Northern Mesic Forest Community. 17-acre red pine thinning. Excellent red pine site. Management will hold onto pine as long as feasible and slowly convert to NH type.
5. Tract 1-08: 51-acre aspen clearcut with green tree retention through designated conifer and RMZ. Harvested in 2008 before green tree retention guidelines were effective, but due to the RMZ likely met intent of retention guidelines. Good regeneration.
6. Tract 3-08: 28-acre aspen clearcut. Good regeneration. RMZ retention along Chippewa River.
7. Tract 11-07: 77-acre hardwood thinning; 34-acre aspen clear cut; Silver creek RMZ along sale. High quality site. Improvement cut in NH stand.
8. Tract 8-09: 164-acre aspen regeneration with retention of conifer, pockets of hardwood and wetland conifers. Under future GTR guidelines will be a need for leaving aspen patches similar to pre-harvest stand. Extensive hunter walking trails throughout sale. Hugely popular destination area for grouse hunters from all over the U.S.
9. Tract 14-09: 10 acre- Red Pine/Spruce thinning to remove budworm trees. 40-acre uncut aspen stand view from road.

#### Friday August 13

#### **Iron County (174,267 acres, SFI & FSC) – Dave Wager, Mike Ferrucci and JoAnne Hanowski**

Jeff Barkley, Wisconsin DNR County Forest Specialist  
Joe Vairus, Iron County Forest Administrator  
Neal Martinko, Iron County Forester  
C.E. Zinsmaster, Iron County Forester  
Gary Glonek, Iron County Forester  
Jane Severt, Executive Director, Wisconsin County Forest Association  
Joe Schmidt, Forester Mercer, Wisconsin DNR

Angelo Aimone, Iron County Forestry Scaler  
James Gallagher, Area Forestry Supervisor  
Tyler M., Iron County Forester  
Jim Warren, DNR Chief Public Lands and Conservation  
Henry Schienebeck, Great Lakes Timber Professionals  
Heather Bergland, DNR Forester  
Colleen Matula, DNR Forest Ecologist  
Bruce Bacon, DNR Wildlife Biologist  
Carmen Wagner, DNR Forest Hydrologist  
Al Tatzel, DNR Forestry Specialist

#### Ferrucci Sites

1. Tract # 28-09 Section 5, T43N, R3E Town of Mercer, along Moose Lake Road: Partially completed, wettest portion not attempted; prepared October 2009; Aspen stand 52 acres clearcut, White spruce plantation 34 acres thinned. Harvested during April-August 2010, during the June-August period the area has had unusually high rain levels; contract clause 9 "Suspension of Logging Operations" gives Iron County the right to temporarily suspend logging operations due to site damage during extreme wet periods. Several small wetlands were crossed even though alternate routes were available to completely avoid or to minimize impacts to wetlands soils on some of them. The impacts included rutting (near steep section of main skid trail) and placing modest amounts of slash into the wetlands. Also noted rutting on steep portion of the main skid trail in one location and in wetlands adjacent to that location, with no water bars, including unnecessary rutting caused by the forwarder traveling into the wetland unnecessarily (the processor did not enter this area; there is access to the trees that were removed directly from an upland main skid road).
2. Tract # 27-09 Section 6, T43N, R3E Town of Mercer, along Moose Lake Road: Active harvest, interviewed loggers including Scott DeRosso, Harvester Operator, and Don Steven, Forwarder Operator (both trained under the Michigan SFE program). Aspen stand and, White spruce plantation clearcut, total 98 acres, many pocket wetlands and forest openings break the area into smaller sections. Leaving unmerchantable trees and hardwood trees over 20 inches. Concern that this prescription will not meet the green tree retention provisions, forester modified instructions to loggers to leave some of the large Aspen also.
3. Tract # 18-04 Otter Slide Sale, S. Island Lake Road portion: Completed harvest in 2009 set up 2004, Northern hardwood primary type, red maple secondary. Reviewed regeneration in gaps; found significant number of seedlings mostly less than 3 feet tall, mostly sugar maple, with small yellow birch, a few cherry, others.

#### Wager Sites

1. Tract # 18-07: 62-acre NH thinning. Harvest focused on removal of poor quality, high risk trees, and regeneration in gaps. Good CWD, No BMP issues- cut winter 2009; good diversity and quality of trees retained; gaps of varying sizes consistently marked, cut, and mapped. Effective use of NH Management Evaluation Sheet.
2. Tract #18-09: 339-acre mostly NH with some swamp and bottomland hardwood. Objective enhance hardwood component by removing aspen, balsam, birch, and poor quality/high risk hardwoods. Effective implementation of silvicultural prescription. Timber Sale Notice specified winter or very dry conditions for logging. However, the sale was actively being cut during a very wet period in August. Excessive rutting was observed through a long section of one ravine. Subsequently logging contractor had moved himself to drier part of the sale where no rutting was observed.

3. Potato River Falls Park/Campsite: Iron County maintained campground along scenic Potato River. Good example of recreation opportunities provided by County Forests.

#### Hanowski Sites

1. Marten Sale: Marked hardwood with input from biologist for consideration of marten management. Current stand is mixed hemlock, maple, yellow birch about 110 ba. Plan is to harvest to 85ba. Marked buffer around vernal pond and green painted wildlife leave trees. Goal is to increase site quality and tree species diversity.
2. Tract 24-09: Marked northern hardwood and cedar stands. Wildlife biologist consulted due to martens in area-martens like conifer, larger coarse woody debris. Have marked some ¼ acre gaps. Some cedar regen on site.
3. Weber Lake Park: A new rv park, picnic area and boat launch on weber lake. Honor system fees- nice area.
4. Uller X-C trail and North Country Trail within HCVF. The HCVF is about 1700 acres and the trail goes through the HCVF that is passively managed. Nice hardwoods. County maintains the ski trails.

**Appendix IV**



**SFI Reporting Form**

## Form for Reporting a SFI 2005-2009, SFI 2010-2014 or CSA Z809 Certificate

Certification bodies are asked to complete this form with input from the organization having achieved certification to SFI 2005-2009, SFI 2010-2014 or CSA Z809. The form should be reviewed and revised as appropriate during surveillance audits. **Certification bodies are asked to send a copy of the certificate and the completed form to Rachel Dierolf ([rachel.dierolf@sfi-program.org](mailto:rachel.dierolf@sfi-program.org)).** Reporting SFI and CSA information in the form is a requirement of PEFC International and will be included on the PEFC International searchable database. Once SFI certificates and the following form are received, companies are provided with access and guidelines for logo use and all SFI certificates are listed on the SFI website.

Rachel Dierolf is responsible for tracking and reporting forest management and chain of custody statistics on behalf of PEFC US and PEFC Canada to PEFC International.

### COMPANY CONTACT INFORMATION

<b>Company Contact Name</b>			
<b>Address</b>	<b>Street, No.</b>		
	<b>City, State/Province</b>		<b>Zip/Postal Code</b>
	<b>Country</b>		
<b>Telephone</b>		<b>Fax</b>	
<b>E-mail</b>		<b>Web</b>	

### CERTIFICATE INFORMATION

<b>Forest Certification achieved (mark one)</b>	SFI 2005-2009 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	SFI 2010-2014	SFI 2010-2014 Section 2 only
	CSA Z809	
<b>Certificate Number</b>	NSF-SFIS-1Y943	
<b>Certification Date</b>	01-21-10	(mm/dd/yy)
<b>Certificate Expiry Date</b>	01-20-15	(mm/dd/yy)
<b>Text in Scope Line of Certificate</b>	The sustainable forestry activities and land management operations of participating counties within the Wisconsin County Forest System, encompassing approximately 2,189,121 acres of forestland in the following 25 counties: Ashland, Barron, Bayfield, Burnett, Douglas, Eau Claire, Florence, Forest, Iron, Jackson, Juneau, Langlade, Lincoln, Marathon, Marinette, Oconto, Oneida, Polk, Price, Rusk, Sawyer, Taylor, Vilas, Washburn, and Wood.	
<b>Certification Body Name</b>	NSF-ISR	
<b>Number of Sites and Locations Certified</b>	County Forest Program and 25 participating counties	
<b>Canada Only: Notification Fee Collected by Certification Body</b>	___Yes	___No
<b>Canada Only: Notification Fee paid to PEFC Canada</b>	___Yes	___No

### CERTIFIED FOREST INFORMATION

<b>Forest area (to which certification applies)</b>	2,189,121 <u>acres</u> /hectares (circle one)	
<b>SFI Certification</b>	State/Province Wisconsin   2,189,121 <u>acres</u> /hectares	
Listing by State/Province if certificate covers forestland located in more than one state or province for accounting purposes. <b>Circle that which applies</b>	State/Province	_____ acres/hectares
	State/Province	_____ acres/hectares
	State/Province	_____ acres/hectares
<b>Land ownership</b>	100 % public land	
<b>Is this same area certified to another forest management standard?</b>	<b>Yes/No (circle one)</b>	
	If Yes, to which standard: CSA SFI X FSC	

