



2000 Powell St., Suite 600
Emeryville, CA 94608, USA
www.scscertified.com
Brendan Grady
bgrady@scscertified.com

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

State of Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources

SCS-FM/COC-00070N

101 S. Webster Street
Mark Heyde
www.dnr.wi.gov

CERTIFIED	EXPIRATION
01/13/2009	01/13/2014

DATE OF FIELD AUDIT
08/13/2012
DATE OF LAST UPDATE
12/11/2012

Organization of the Report

This report of the results of our evaluation is divided into two sections. Section A provides the public summary and background information that is required by the Forest Stewardship Council. This section is made available to the general public and is intended to provide an overview of the evaluation process, the management programs and policies applied to the forest, and the results of the evaluation. Section A will be posted on the FSC Certificate Database (<http://info.fsc.org/>) no less than 30 days after issue of the certificate. Section B contains more detailed results and information for the use of by the FME.

FOREWORD

Cycle in annual surveillance audits			
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 st annual audit	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 nd annual audit	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 rd annual audit	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4 th annual audit
Name of Forest Management Enterprise (FME) and abbreviation used in this report:			
State of Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (DNR)			

All certificates issued by SCS under the aegis of the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) require annual audits to ascertain ongoing compliance with the requirements and standards of certification. A public summary of the initial evaluation is available on the SCS website www.scs-certified.com.

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

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

Contents

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY 4

 1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION 4

 1.3 Standards Employed 5

 2.0 ANNUAL AUDIT DATES AND ACTIVITIES 5

 3.0 CHANGES IN MANAGEMENT PRACTICES 13

 4.0 RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION 13

 6.0 CERTIFICATION DECISION 26

 8.0 ANNUAL DATA UPDATE 31

 8.2 Annual Summary of Pesticide and Other Chemical Use 32

Appendix 1 – List of FMUs Selected For Evaluation..... 55

Appendix 2 – Evaluation of Management Systems 55

Appendix 3 – List of Stakeholders Consulted..... 55

Appendix 5 – Pesticide Derogations 59

Appendix 6 – Detailed Observations..... 59

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY

1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1 Annual Audit Team

Auditor Name:	David Capen	Auditor role:	Lead Auditor
<p>Qualifications: Dr. David E. Capen is a Professor Emeritus in the Rubenstein School of Environment and Natural Resources at the University of Vermont. He has a B.S.F. degree in Forestry from the University of Tennessee, an M.S. degree in Wildlife Management from the University of Maine, and a Ph.D. in Wildlife Science from Utah State University. He was an active member of the faculty at the University of Vermont from 1976 to 2010, maintaining a part-time research appointment since retiring from teaching in 2002. David is a Certified Wildlife Biologist and was a Certified Forester from 2002-2008. He has been a member of The Wildlife Society for more than 40 years; the Society of American Foresters for more than 20 years; a charter member of Society for Conservation Biology; and a member of several professional ornithological organizations. He has conducted numerous FSC audits in Massachusetts, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, and Indiana.</p>			
Auditor Name:	Mike Ferrucci	Auditor role:	Team Auditor
<p>Qualifications: Mike Ferrucci is the SFI Program Manager for NSF – International Strategic Registrations and is responsible for all aspects of the firm’s SFI Certification programs. He is qualified as a RAB-QSA Lead Auditor (ISO 14001 Environmental Management Systems), as an SFI Lead Auditor for Forest Management, Procurement, and Chain of Custody, as an FSC Lead Auditor Forest Management and Chain of Custody, as a Tree Farm Group Certification Lead Auditor, and as a GHG Lead Auditor. Mike has led Sustainable Forest Initiative (SFI) certification and precertification reviews throughout the United States. He has also led or participated in joint SFI and Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) certification projects in nearly one dozen states and a joint scoping or precertification gap-analysis project on tribal lands throughout the United States. He also co-led the pioneering pilot dual evaluation of the Lakeview Stewardship Unit on the Fremont-Winema National Forest.</p> <p>Mike Ferrucci has 30 years of forest management experience. His expertise is in sustainable forest management planning; in certification of forests as sustainably managed; in the application of easements for large-scale working forests, and in the ecology, silviculture, and management of mixed species forests, with an emphasis on regeneration and management of native hardwood species. Mike has conducted or participated in assessments of forest management operations throughout the United States, with field experience in 4 countries and 30 states. Mike has been a member of the Society of American Foresters for over 30 years. Mike is also a Lecturer at the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, where he has taught graduate courses and workshops in forest management, operations, professional forest ethics, private forestry, and financial analysis.</p>			
Auditor Name:	JoAnn Hanowski	Auditor role:	Team Auditor
<p>Qualifications: JoAnn M. Hanowski was a senior research fellow at the University of Minnesota-Duluth’s Natural Resources Research Institute. She has considerable expertise evaluating the effects of forest management on wildlife habitat, and is currently working on research projects involving the response of birds to various forest management practices in stream and seasonal pond buffers and the development of indicators of forest and water health and sustainability in Minnesota and across the Great Lakes. She was a member of the forest bird technical team for the original GEIS and participated on the wildlife technical team that wrote forest management guidelines for Minnesota. She is a participant in a 14-year project for monitoring avian populations on the Chequamegon National Forest. She is currently a member of the riparian science technical committee that is investigating the effectiveness of</p>			

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 2007 JoAnn contributed regional ecological expertise to the annual surveillance audits of the MN DNR's FSC and SFI certificates.

1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation

A. Number of days spent on-site assessing the applicant:	3.5
B. Number of auditors participating in on-site evaluation:	3
C. Additional days spent on preparation, stakeholder consultation, and post-site follow-up:	2
D. Total number of person days used in evaluation:	12.5

1.3 Standards Employed

1.3.1. Applicable FSC-Accredited Standards

Title	Version	Date of Finalization
FSC-US Forest Management Standard	1.0	July 2010
All standards employed are available on the websites of FSC International (www.fsc.org), the FSC-US (www.fscus.org) or the SCS Forest Conservation Program homepage (www.scs-certified.com/forestry). Standards are also available, upon request, from Scientific Certification Systems (www.scs-certified.com).		

2.0 ANNUAL AUDIT DATES AND ACTIVITIES

2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities

Date: August 13, 2012	
FMU/Location/ sites visited	Activities/ notes
Northern Highlands American Legion State Forest (NHAL), Boulder Jct. WI	Opening meeting: Introductions, audit protocols, review of field itinerary, briefings from DNR staff, questions and answers relating to audit standards.
Tract 17-06, Lake Laura Old-growth Research Site	This was one of several experimental harvests conducted in late successional stands with the objective of accelerating the stand structure to mimic old-growth. This site is in northern hardwoods and involved several treatments: 35-foot, 60-foot, and 80-foot gaps with varying amounts of debris and scarification. Snags and DWD were created during the 2008 "harvest." Deer exclosures were built; impacts on soil structure by earthworms are evident and are being documented.
Tract 35-09, Lost Canoe Lake Sale	Late successional stands of oak, white pine, maple, aspen, and white birch. Silvicultural objective is to maintain and enhance the types and leave the components of old-growth forest intact. Old trees were retained; abundant woody debris left on site; 400-foot no-cut zone around a "wild lake."

Tract 7-09, Bear Springs	This was a large sale (321 acres) that had a prescription for 303 acres of regeneration harvest (e.g., aspen, birch) and a smaller regeneration harvest in swamp conifer. Adequate green tree retention was left including snags, oak, and super canopy red and white pine. The operator did a good job of putting slash on hilly skid trails to prevent rutting.
Tract 30-10, Punch Lake	A 240-acre block was harvested in 8 different stands. Five different management strategies were used depending on habitat type and "lake zone." Good green tree retention was observed including oak, red and white pine and some paper birch. The RMZ along Punch Lake was red-lined and had a lighter overstory removal than the adjacent upland.
Tract 8-12, Manitowish River	This 44-acre harvest site included an even-aged harvest of aspen (40 acres) and a 4-acre RMZ along the Manitowish River (a Scenic River) that will be managed for older stand characteristics. This area had adequate regeneration of a variety of tree species. Wildlife and the regional ecologist helped with the planning and marking (green trees) on this site.
Tract 32-11, Nichols Lake	This sale included 170 acres in several stands and had both pine thinning and aspen/oak/hardwood regeneration harvest prescriptions. A linear area along the road was painted but not yet harvested. The goal is to remove aspen, oak and hardwood and leave the conifer species. These road buffers were not treated in the last rotation of stands in this area.
Date: August 14, 2012	
FMU/Location/ sites visited	Activities/ notes
Thunder Lake Wildlife Area	This 3070-acre property is actively managed for open wetland habitat by burning, cutting or shearing woody vegetation (about 1000 acres), and active forest management for various age classes of tamarack and black spruce (about 1000 acres). The remaining 1000 acres are managed as the Rice Lake State Natural Area. The most recent burn was conducted in 2010 as a joint effort between wildlife and forestry. The SNA is managed for wild rice primarily by controlling water depth in the lake and by managing beaver populations. The master plan for the property is from 1980 and it is currently not in the queue for master plan updates.
Spur Lake SNA	This SNA was originally designated to provide a representative of an undeveloped wild rice lake. However, mild winters over the past several years have favored the development of water lilies, and they have taken over as the main vegetation type on this shallow lake. The last harvest of rice was in 2002, and the Mole Lake Tribe may be interested in performing some rice restoration work on the lake.
Spur Lake SNA timber harvest	This harvest within the SNA boundary on 46 acres of "old forest" was conducted to promote a multi-age old forest condition. Gaps for harvesting were identified with yellow paint, and the logger was instructed to harvest all trees greater than 1" diameter within the gap. Merchantable aspen, white birch and balsam fir were

	harvested, but many old aspen trees were green painted and retained. The operator was also instructed to avoid damage to coarse woody debris on the site. Good looking site.
Little Rice Wildlife Area	The overall goal of this property is for wildlife management. The property is a major wild rice resource that was created by a dam on the Wolf River. It is also prime habitat for several non-game species (trumpeter swan, bald eagle, and osprey) and an important migratory bird stop. About 280 acres of forest have been harvested since 1974 on a property that has a 1982 master plan which is not in the queue for update.
Pancake Point Timber Sale	Block 6 was a typical northern hardwood management prescription. Some green trees were painted for retention and the goal was to create 40-50 foot tree gaps with the harvest. The site was harvested in the winter of 2011. Block 5 was an aspen regeneration harvest and the prescription required that several large white pines be retained on the site. One of these pines has an active bald eagle nest (after the harvest). Larger than required riparian buffers were left along the lake and wetland areas. Block 4 was also an aspen regeneration harvest. There were a few clumps of large aspen left on the site which looked good.
Pine-Popples Wild Rivers, Savage Lake Timber Sale	This was a northern hardwood type where a recent timber sale had been marked with the objective of long-term development and maintenance of old forest attributes. Although not a formal research project, monitoring is detailed, including deer exclosures. A second site on the same property (formerly owned by Goodman Timber), has been marked with similar objectives.
Spread Eagle Barrens State Natural Area	This was an unusual field visit in that forest stands are being removed as part of a project to convert the area to pine barrens and bracken grasslands, rare community types. Results to date have been excellent. Controlled burning has been used to maintain areas already in barrens conditions. Numerous birds are found here because of the habitat created; berry picking is popular among the public. Some ATV damage was observed, but enforcement has largely prevented such damage. Management plan was approved in 1995.
Menominee River State Park and Recreational Area, Tract 03-11	This was a 70-acre stand of mature white and red pine, and oak, that had been marked for a light selection harvest intended to promote characteristics of an old-growth stand. The advertised harvest did not sell, however, because of low volume. Another attempt is planned, to include a nearby plantation-like stand of red pine. Form 2460 noted a recommendation to wash all harvesting equipment to prevent further intrusions of spotted knapweed. Treatment of conifer stumps with sporax is required.
Turtle Flambeau Scenic Waters Area	
Site 1, Prairie Management Demonstration Area	Long-term burn program, reviewed 3 units burned in 2012, met objectives, Little Bluestem doing well, treating for spotted

	Knapweed (Milestone) Christine Niehaus License 019797 thru 5-31-2014; wild rice planted several years ago doing well, observed Trumpeter Swan nesting pair with 7 young; Mecca Trail system for XC skiing, hiking, biking.
Site 2 Sale 180, Tract 1210	Tornado 2010 Salvage, Interviewed Ken Meyer, Springstead Logging, finishing today, trained and understands BMPs, rutting standard, attention to safety, getting ready to move out. Retention included scattered trees (species designated) smaller pockets, and bigger areas on edges left uncut. Timber Sale Inspection Form 2460-27 pages of detailed notes. Contract amendment approval paperwork; forester sold one block and then set up and got approval for additional blocks of salvage harvesting work.
Stop 3 Sale 180, Tract 1210	Same sale, separate block; very good utilization and retention.
Site 4 Tract 111, Sale 190	Salvage in portions, also marked hardwood area.
Hay Creek-Hoffman Lake Wildlife Area	
Site 1	Observed several hunter walking trails (there are 18 of these, all gated); trails are mowed on 3-year rotation; formerly had shorter rotation for mowing these trails and roadsides.
Stop 2, ad hoc	Northern hardwood cut 5 years ago, discussed deer populations which are slightly below goal; advanced regeneration looks good, with minimal deer damage.
Stop 3, ad hoc	Aspen clearcut with retention cut 2007, ample regeneration, aspen management for game is key focus for entire property.
Site 4, Tract 112	Set up, not cut, 2 treatments: Hardwood selection 9 acres in a young, even-aged stand; discussed BA reduction, crop-tree management (challenging in stand that has so many poor-quality trees); 32 acres of aspen clearcut, with careful attention to cut block layout for wetlands, goal to enter some aspen early (this harvest) to break up large blocks of aspen.
Site 5, Hoffman Lake Road	State maintained forest road, gravel surface, crown, ditches in places, cross drains, very good condition.
Site 6, Flowage Dam	Created the lake/ flowage; provides habitat.
Willow Flowage Scenic Waters Area	
Site 1, 930	Sale set up in 2007 but cut in 2011. Viewed from woods roads and ATV trail. Typical sale for this property (general forest management emphasizes visual; goal is to promote "natural-looking" harvest practices) with much retention and excellent attention to aesthetics. Forester includes seasonal restrictions for any NHI "hits" as required (for example for rare turtles).
Site 2, 941	72 acres, aspen clearcut with significant retention (criticized by industry). Aspen was defoliated 3 successive years by tent caterpillars.
Site 3, Dam/Flowage/Boat Landing/Nature Center	Viewed from vehicles.

Site 4, 940	Nearly complete harvest mostly aspen clearcut, small areas of red pine thinning and some jack pine clearcut areas. Staggered block management is employed to break up a very large aspen stand, alternating blocks cut 6 years apart. Forester is closely monitoring aspen health. Discussed soil habitat classification (PARVA).
Date: August 15, 2012	
FMU/Location/ sites visited	Activities/ notes
Peshtigo River State Forest and Governor Thompson State Park	The State Forest is operating from a 2007 Master plan and includes 9000 acres. The majority of the forest habitat in the Park is pin oak, aspen and pine plantation. FERC requires that a 200-ft buffer is left uncut along the Peshtigo River. The Park has a 2004 Master Plan and provides a variety of recreational opportunities including camping, hiking and water sports. A major goal in the Park is to control populations and spread of invasive species.
Western Oak Sale	This 40-acre aspen regeneration harvest lies within the Park boundary (one stand of five that will be harvested). The sale has been marked, but not harvested. Some green trees were marked as well as a red line around a swamp hardwood stand and along a trout stream.
Western Oak Sale	This stand was damaged by a tornado in 2007 and a portion was salvaged harvested in 2008. The harvest prescription was to harvest all trees except white oak, red and white pine, spruce and green marked trees. There was some good advanced regeneration present in the area harvested in 2008.
Mayor Sale 3810-10	This 141-acre sale included an intermediate thinning in a red pine plantation and a 44-acre regeneration harvest in a declining scrub oak stand (1/3 of the oak was dead). The regeneration harvest was established prior to the green tree retention guidelines and no snags were left on the site. This area is near the Peshtigo River and conservation of wood turtles is a concern here. Staff consulted with an ecologist prior to harvest to determine best management for the turtle. The red pine thinning included a treatment for annosum that was done by a consulting forester. The long term goal in this stand is to promote pine habitat.
Bisjak Lane	This 159-acre sale area was marked but not harvested. We walked into the area (19 acres) where a shelterwood harvest of red oak was set up. The goal is to retain a 60% crown closure and to regenerate the red oak. This species has been hard to regenerate due to competition with red maple and deer browse.
Wausaukee Timber Demo Forest	This 40-acre site was acquired from the Federal Government in 1908 and was mostly a pole-size stand of mixed pine originating from the 1871 Peshtigo Fire. It was used as demonstration forest in 1945 and several improvement cuts were conducted through 1962. A timber sale has been set up on this property but not yet harvested. Two overstory removal patches of about 5 acres were established, the red pine plantation will be thinned and the remaining areas will receive a thin from below treatment. The goal is to maintain a

	multi-aged white/red pine stand.
North Branch Beaver Creek Fishery Area	1980 Master Plan
Beaver Creek 33 rd Road Sale	This sale was established to regenerate mature stands of red maple and aspen. The forester worked with fisheries to protect this watershed for fisheries resources. Precautions included leaving a 200-foot no harvest, no equipment buffer along Beaver Creek and 100-foot on the tributaries. The harvest will follow green tree retention guidelines and a target of 30 BA post-harvest.
Parking Lot Sale	This sale includes 5 stands with a variety of silvicultural prescriptions. We visited the stand that will receive a regeneration harvest (scrub oak, aspen, and jack pine). The sale was marked but not harvested. There was an archeological relic on this site that will be protected by harvesting on frozen ground only. Many green trees were painted on this site.
Pike Wild River	Numerous parcels along the North and South Branch of the Pike River. Management focuses on riparian habitat and wild river recreational activities. Restoration of riparian habitat is a key activity.
Tract 03-10	Small, patch cuts, with 150-foot no-cut zone along river and 150-400-foot zone for careful, aesthetics management. Sandy areas managed for wood turtle nesting.
Tract 6-10	This was a mixed species stand marked for selective harvest; deer browsing was evident and Penn sedge was common. Boundary with private owner was clearly marked. Advanced regeneration was well established
Reclamation site	This was a 40-acre purchase from a private owner. A cabin, shed and old car were removed from the site, and native vegetation has been restored.
Newly purchased site targeted for reclamation	A house, shed, and guest house will be removed from the site (as much as possible sold at auction); paved driveway will be removed; and trees will be planted. This is a major effort to restore native vegetation and habitat to a section of the Pike River riparian zone.
Amberg Wildlife Area	This was a visit to a 1200-acre wildlife area (1982 Master Plan), originally purchased as a deer yard. The area is 57% white cedar and still functions as winter deer cover; no harvesting has been done to maintain the cedar. Aspen and red pine are other major types on the area. Openings have been maintained by burning. Insects were released in 2007 for control of spotted knapweed, and are still effective.
Lake Noquebay Wildlife Area	This was a 1300-acre wildlife management area, with extensive sedge meadows, managed as an SNA. Visited one forested site where a mixed stand of aspen, red maple, and mixed hardwoods has been marked for harvest. The objective is to maintain the stand composition with increased age-class diversity.
Green Bay Shores Wildlife Area	This visit was to the Peshtigo Harbor Unit. The entire management area is part of a Global Conservation Opportunity Area on the shores

	of Lake Michigan. Master planning is in progress. The field visit featured a stop in an old-growth forest, part of an SNA; a field of bluestem grass, burned in spring 2012; and a forest stand marked for harvest where a plan is in place to cut and herbicide shiny buckthorn in the understory. Two more sites were visited briefly, both forest stands marked for harvest, with the objective of creating early successional habitat for wildlife, while retaining patches of older trees.
Menard Island Resource Area	Original, core holding was Menard Island, with significant expansions 15 years ago part of “the great addition” led by Gov. Thompson. Management goals Wisconsin River conservation, recreation, and game hunting for early successional species. No Master Plan; instead Feasibility Study and Environmental Analysis of Menard Island Resource Area Expansion (probably not meeting FSC requirements); Tier 2 Master Planning expected in 3-4 or more years. Forester and property manager (wildlife) and fisheries meet to review all harvest plans, and consider issues at larger spatial scales: Aspen age-class imbalance, role of this property (river corridor) in landscape, heavy harvesting of surrounding industrial lands.
Site 1, Tract MI 11-10Rollies Road Sale	62 acre harvest, mostly aspen regeneration with coppice retention; stands here are on poor aspen sites, but goal is to regenerate aspen with modest increase in other species as part of the regional effort toward young forest management (10-15-acre cut blocks at 10-year intervals). Various forest health issues cause stands to start breaking up at age 35 to 40. Retention of some marked aspen, all white pine and most red pine (thinning); some clumped retention; loggers will strive to avoid damage to scattered understory spruce and fir.
Peters Marsh Wildlife Area	Wildlife property with goals for game habitat and fishing (stream and spring-fed ponds). Marsh has dried up, is burned to control brush; grassland managed for warm-season grasses. Aspen managed for small patch sizes. Hunting for grouse, woodcock, deer, and turkeys. Management plan 30-years old. Managers have consulted regional ecologist, and are aware of COAs. The last Lincoln-Langlade County Integrated Property Managers Meeting was February of 2011 otherwise same informal planning as described elsewhere (emails or conversations).
Site 1	Jack Pine planting on former farmland.
Site 2, Job 10-11	Completed coppice with reserves for aspen regeneration, with two small pockets of selection harvests in hardwood. Good retention including thinned “reserve” patch stands within matrix of aspen. The result was deemed to be good habitat for golden-winged warbler. The main skid road was rutted for an extensive length, but within guidelines. There was some very minor surface erosion, but road is re-vegetating.
Upper Wolf River Fishery Area	Master Plan November 1979, update Tier 2 set for about 2015. This unit’s purpose is to protect the main stem and tributaries, including

	<p>spring ponds, of the Wolf River. Fisheries' focus is on shore land protection for cold-water management, achieved mostly via a 300-foot buffer (closer when non-native plantations are being harvested in a conversion program). Management practices on upland areas are based on agreement between wildlife and forestry, and are game-oriented, consistent with a working forest approach. Strategies: Aspen – keep in aspen, and for marginal aspen mixtures attempt to increase aspens component; N. Hardwood – selection system, some big-tree management; Cedar – most located in wetlands or scenic areas, so hands-off, though foresters have some concern about the long-term fate of cedar. Management issues: many parcels have no access for management; land control challenges, but active efforts to locate and mark boundaries; recreation management, including proximity to the Wolf River State Trail which does allow ATV use (wildlife does not); age of plan.</p>
Site 1, 3410	Aspen and mixed species clearcut with standards, 14 acres, not yet harvested. Location near Hunting River, tributary to the Wolf River.
Site 2, Sale 3410-6-12, Tract 6-12	Sold, uncut conifer plantations. 9 acres red pine crown thinning; will continue to thin leaving some very large pine but allowing stand to convert to hardwoods and white pine. Forester used Kotar habitat classification to confirm this long-term plan. 7 acres white spruce and 5 acres Norway spruce also to be thinned (row and free, respectively). Timber sale contract contained all required elements.
Site 3, Sale 7-12	55 acre selection in mixed northern hardwood with removal of all aspen. Stand is dense, even-aged, with limited opportunities for gaps. Made gaps near oak trees and expanded openings where past salvage had opened stand. Discussed regeneration, will track following harvest. Deer target is 20/square mile, and managers report some impact on regeneration. Sale boundaries are 300 feet from the Wolf River.
Site 4, Wolf River Trail	State-owned, managed by Langlade County, with more development to be done; currently great for snowmobiles. Wolf River Trestle represents a significant investment in infrastructure.
Woods Flowage Fishery Area	
Site 1	Dredge operation to restore trout habitat by removing silt from the bottom of a cold-water, spring-fed pond. Second season of operation; significant investment by Trout Unlimited. Ron Plank, LTE Fisheries, Assistant Dredge Operator Jeff Reissmann, DNR Fisheries, Equipment Operator Boat tour of pond, dredging site, interviewed operators to understand operation; confirmed safety training.
Date: August 16, 2012	
FMU/Location/ sites visited	Activities/ notes
Northeast District Office, Wisconsin DNR, Green Bay, WI	Closing meeting: Auditors thanked DNR personnel for their outstanding efforts during the audit process; closing of CARs from 2011; discussion of conformance with FSC standard; presentation of

	draft CARs and OBS from 2012 audit.
--	-------------------------------------

3.0 CHANGES IN MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

There were no substantive changes in DNR’s forest management practices.

4.0 RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION

4.1 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations

Note: There was no finding 2011.1.

Finding Number: 2011.2	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC US FM STD; 4.4.a.
<p>Non-Conformity: A summary of the social impact assessment activities, as defined in Indicator 4.4.a., have not been made available.</p> <p>Background: The summary portion is a new requirement in the FSC standard. The summary requirement in 4.4.a does not require the completion of a new comprehensive social impact assessment. Rather the intent is to briefly summarize existing social impact assessment activities and programs assuming that these address all the bulleted items of 4.4.a.</p>	
<p>Corrective Action Request: DNR shall produce a summary to demonstrate that management understands the likely social impacts of management activities, and incorporates this understanding into management planning and operations. Social impacts include effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Archeological sites and sites of cultural, historical and community significance (on and off the FMU); • Public resources, including air, water and food (hunting, fishing, collecting); • Aesthetics; • Community goals for forest and natural resource use and protection such as employment, subsistence, recreation and health; • Community economic opportunities; • Other people who may be affected by management operations. 	
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	The Wisconsin Environmental Policy Act (WEPA). WEPA requires the Department to evaluate the environmental consequences of its actions, whether regulatory, management or administrative. The evaluation must include consideration of short-term and long-term environmental effects including secondary effects; particularly to geographically scarce resources such as historic or cultural resources, scenic and recreational resources, prime farmlands, threatened or endangered species or ecologically sensitive areas. The evaluation must also

	<p>identify cumulative effects of repeated or related actions. In addition, consideration must be given to the degree of risk or uncertainty associated with predicting environmental effects, including those relating to public health or safety. The degree in which the action may establish a precedent for future actions or foreclose future options must also be considered, including impacts to and consistency with plans or policies of local, state or federal government.</p> <p><u>Economic Impact Analysis.</u> Wisconsin Act 21 established requirements for state agencies in regard to promulgation of administrative rules. Specifically, the Act requires agencies, including the Department of Natural Resources, to prepare an economic analysis of a proposed rule before initiating the rulemaking process. The analysis must contain information on the economic effect of the proposed rule on specific businesses, business sectors, public utility ratepayers, local governmental units and the state’s economy as a whole.</p> <p><u>Master Planning.</u> All NR 44 master plans go through public review and input during development. Two public meetings (at minimum) are held during the planning process. The public is offered the opportunity to review and comment on the property’s vision and goals, land management and protection strategies, recreation management and use objectives, and general management policies and provisions. The public is offered an additional opportunity to provide comments during Natural Resource Board consideration of the plan. In the event the Department considers a change to an existing master plan (amendment or variance) the public is provided, via notification in a news release, the opportunity to comment on the proposed change.</p> <p><u>Land Acquisition.</u> Every land acquisition proposed by the Department requires Natural Resource Board approval. Justification for acquisition, including broad management direction for the parcel, is contained within a “green sheet” provided to the Board. The Board provides the opportunity for public comment prior to rendering a decision.</p> <p><u>Historic and Archeological Resources .</u> WDNR Manual Code 1810.1 provides the mechanism for implementing an agreement with the State Historical Society regarding protection of archeological sites, historic structure (structures over 50 years old) and identified burial sites, as well as ensuring compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. The manual code stipulates procedures for identifying and avoiding impacts to historical and archeological resources in regard to a proposed activity, permit, or issuance of funds.</p> <p><u>Aesthetics.</u> The Forestry Division’s Silvicultural and Forest Aesthetics Handbook includes a Forest Aesthetics chapter. The intent is to incorporate aesthetic management considerations into forest management activities with minimal impact on forest productivity. The chapter includes sections addressing aesthetic management, stand considerations, species considerations, design considerations, enhancement, and sale planning and administration.</p> <p><u>Integrated Property Management Meetings.</u> Property managers hold annual Integrated Property Management meetings to debrief on the previous year’s</p>
--	---

	<p>activities and provide a forum for cross-program consideration of activities planned for the upcoming year. The public is given the opportunity, via public meetings or review of online work plans, to comment on planned management activities.</p> <p><u>Tribal Relations.</u> The Department of Natural Resources meets with tribal representatives on an annual basis. The meetings are intended to share information concerning natural resources matters of mutual interest, including land management activities. The Department also meets with tribal representatives on an ad hoc basis, particularly in regard to high profile resources issues (i.e. wolf management).</p>
SCS review	The summary of social impact assessments conducted by Wisconsin DNR is well done and adequately addresses the standard.
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2011.3	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC US FM STD; 6.1.b
<p>Non-Conformity: Audit team finds that DNR has not completed the following certification requirements: Prior to commencing site-disturbing activities, the forest owner or manager assesses and documents impacts of planned management activities on forest community types and development, size class and/or successional stages, and associated <i>natural disturbance regimes</i>. This finding only applies to State lands that conducting site disturbing activities and are not operating under a revised master plan.</p>	
<p>Corrective Action Request: DNR must ensure that prior to undertaking site disturbing activities that managers assess and document impacts of planned management activities on forest community types and development, size class and/or successional stages, and associated <i>natural disturbance regimes</i>.</p>	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	<p><u>Timber Sale Narrative.</u> The timber sale narrative includes a wide range of considerations and impact assessments. A number of checks and reference materials are included.</p> <p><u>Interim Forest Management Plans (IFMP).</u> A process has been developed to facilitate timber management for those properties with outdated (pre-NR44) plans or no master plan. Interim Forest Management Plans (IFMP) will utilize collaboration across programs to determine management objectives and property prescriptions in an effort to bridge the gap in the master planning process; however, they will not pre-empt the master planning process. Rather, IFMPs are intended to enable timber management, where appropriate, utilizing a</p>

	<p>sustainable, ecologically grounded approach until master plan revision or development.</p> <p>There are three components to the IFMP: property assessment, management objectives, and property prescriptions. The property assessment provides information on the property including the following items: landscape and regional context, land use and past management, forest types, size classes and successional stages, rare species, State Natural Area designations, High Value Conservation Forests and other limited resources/natural community types, Biotic Inventory status, cultural and archeological sites, invasive species, recreational use and soils. Management objectives outline the primary forest management objectives. Property prescriptions require the identification of specific and pertinent prescriptions by area or forest type, including passive management areas, extended rotation, and other information that will help achieve the objectives. A template has been created to standardize IFMPs.</p> <p>The parks program has developed IFMP guidance specific to their program and consistent with the intent of this initiative. The attached guidance was developed for parks managers to refer to when developing IFMPs for their properties.</p> <p><u>“H” Code in WisFIRS.</u> To strengthen the linkage between IFMP development and WisFIRS, a new prefix has been created. The “H” code is defined as “Management objective not yet determined.” This prefix is to be used for stands with no master plan, an outdated master plan, or where there is failure to agree on objectives during the IFMP process. Stands with current master plans, those currently undergoing master planning, pre-NR44 plans with clear objectives should not receive an “H” code prefix.</p> <p>Stands with the “H” code prefix will not undergo active management until objectives are agreed upon. Once the objectives are determined – through the development of an IFMP or during the master planning process – the “H” code will be removed and updated in WisFIRS with the appropriate management treatment. Even if an “H” code is applied, the existing treatments should be retained and stands will remain in the harvest schedule, but excluded from planning goals. A review of the “H” code listed stands within WisFIRS will facilitate the prioritization of properties that need to set management objectives.</p>
SCS review	<p>The Timber Sale Narrative, while important, is not a comprehensive assessment of impacts. Although DNR has established an acceptable process for developing Interim Forest Management Plans, site-disturbing activities are still occurring prior to development of the interim plans.</p>
Status of CAR:	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Closed</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)</p>

Finding Number: 2011.4			
Select one:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):			

Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC US FM STD; 6.1.c
Non-Conformity: Using the findings of the impact assessment (Indicator 6.1.b), management approaches and field prescriptions are developed and implemented that: 1) avoid or minimize negative short-term and long-term impacts; and, 2) maintain and/or enhance the long-term ecological viability of the forest.	
Corrective Action Request: DNR should ensure that management approaches avoid or minimize long-term impacts that regeneration harvests can have on age and size class distribution across the landscape.	
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	DNR responded with a short note that noted regional planning for American woodcock, aspen, and sharp-tailed grouse. The relevance of this note to the observation was not clear.
SCS review	Future audits will continue to focus on management planning as it impacts age and size class distributions across the landscape.
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2011.5	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC US FM STD; 6.3.h
<p>Non-Conformity: Audit team finds DNR has not consistently assessed the risk of, prioritized, and, as warranted, developed and implemented a strategy to prevent or control invasive species, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. a method to determine the extent of invasive species and the degree of threat to native species and ecosystems; 2. implementation of management practices that minimize the risk of invasive establishment, growth, and spread; (Addressed Invasive BMP's) 3. eradication or control of established invasive populations when feasible: and, 4. monitoring control measures and management practices to assess their effectiveness in preventing or controlling invasive species. <p>Evidence: Actions being taken to address invasive spp problems at Blue Mound, Yellowstone, and Cross Plains were found to be insufficient to meet the requirements for 6.3.h. Although DNR is making considerable efforts to control invasive plants on Wildlife Areas - most of the properties visited in 2011</p>	

were unable to demonstrate systematic efforts to determine the extent (e.g., inventory of invasives) and have planned strategy for prioritizing and treating invasives.

Background: Finding is mostly driven by observations on State Parks where in some cases we observed minimal or no efforts to identify, prioritize, and treat invasives- despite moderate levels of infestation on a property.

Corrective Action Request: DNR shall assess the risk of, prioritize, and, as warranted, develop and implement a strategy to prevent or control *invasive species* as required by Indicator 6.3.h.

FME response
(including any evidence submitted)

The department has a variety of actions in place or in process to prevent or control invasive species.

- The property manager’s handbook section on Invasive Species (Section 6.8.11) provides the most comprehensive guidance on identifying, prioritizing and treating invasives. Because the property manager’s handbook is an intranet resource for staff, a word version of the content is provided as an attachment. An updated to this portion of the handbook is in process, but has yet to be approved. One of the main additions to the draft revision is a discussion of establishing management zones on a property (Zero Tolerance Zone, Acceptable Threshold Zone, and Slow the Spread Zone).
- The Wisconsin Council on Invasive Species is in the process of developing a Statewide Strategic Plan that will inform the future prioritization and treatment of invasive species at the statewide level.
http://invasivespecies.wi.gov/section_detail.asp?linkcatid=3666&linkid=1704&locid=59 DNR Invasive Species team members are staffing that effort.
- The department has an Invasive Species Team in place that meets regularly to update NR40, identify needs for and deliver training to DNR staff and partners, and staffs the Wisconsin Council on Invasive Species statewide strategic planning effort. Part of this team’s work includes the prioritization of invasive species in the state and the updating of the list of prohibited and restricted species in NR40. <http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/Invasives/classification.html>
- The department and partners maintains a suite of Best Management Practices meant to limit the spread of invasive species in the state:
<http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/Invasives/bmp.html>
- Foresters can use WisFIRS to record a limited number of invasive species at the stand level as part of recon. In order to increase awareness and assist in prioritization efforts, WisFIRS is being upgraded to substantially increase the number of invasive plants a forester can document.
- The Rapid Ecological Assessments that are completed in advance of master plans generally list the invasive species of note or importance that were observed on the property during the field work.
- Master plans have numerous references to the importance of preventing and controlling invasive species and may reference the important invasive species identified at the time of the plan. The master plan lays the framework for the importance of managing invasive species rather than prescribing specific responses because invasive species threats can change considerably over the 15-20 year life of a master plan.
- Parks is in the final stages of developing an invasive species plan template that can be used by each park property to help prioritize invasive species

	<p>management activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Invasive species concerns and BMPs are embedded throughout Wisconsin Forest Management Guidelines and specifically Chapter 8 which can serve as a valuable resource for property managers. <p>http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/ForestManagement/documents/guidelines/chapter8.pdf</p>
SCS review	In 2012, the audit team found that state lands visited during the field audit had clear plans for management of invasive species, active programs to control invasives, and suitable schemes for monitoring success. DNR, as a whole, has excellent guidance for identification and control of invasive species.
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2011.6	
Select one:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	7.1.f
<p>Non-Conformity: 7.1.f. requires that if invasive species are present, the management plan describes invasive species conditions, applicable management objectives, and how they will be controlled (see Indicator 6.3.j). Properties visited in the 2011 audit had varying levels of conformance with this requirement. There is an opportunity to improve coverage of invasive species in management planning documents, particularly for properties that do not have an updated master plan or a stand-alone invasive species management plan.</p>	
<p>Corrective Action Request: DNR should take measures to ensure that invasives are addressed in planning documents.</p>	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	See response for 2011.5
SCS review	The 2012 audit found that this observation is mostly tied with the many out-dated property plans and the need for interim or revised plans. Invasive species are adequately addressed in newer plans.
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2011.7	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	6.6.d
<p>Non-Conformity: Audit Team Finds a non-conformity with the following FSC requirement. When chemicals are used a written prescription is prepared that describes the site-specific hazards and environmental risks, and the precautions that workers will employ to avoid or minimize those hazards and risks, and includes a map of the treatment area.</p> <p>Chemicals are applied only by workers who have received proper training in application methods and safety. They are made aware of the risks, wear proper safety equipment, and are trained to minimize environmental impacts on non-target species and sites.</p> <p>Evidence: Chemical pesticides are being used on Blue Mound State Park without a written prescription and without approval through the DNR chemical use process.</p> <p>Corrective Action Request: DNR must ensure its chemical use is done consistently with the requirements of 6.6.d.</p>	
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	<p><u>Blue Mound State Park:</u> The SW District Park Supervisor will work with the park manager to emphasize compliance with department pesticide procedures.</p> <p><u>Federal Permits :</u> The USEPA under the Clean Water Act requires a permit for application of a pesticide in a water of the state or could enter a water of the state. Each program has obtained that permit, or is in the process of doing so.</p> <p><u>Internal Training/Outreach:</u> The Department has formed a Pesticide Use Team and has met 3 times to begin revising manual codes, develop a training plan and countless other tasks. Along with this, staff has posted announcements in internal program newsletters emphasizing the importance of proper use of pesticides as well as the requirements for application, approval and reporting. Example: Friday July 13, 2012: This information was included in <i>Park Shorts</i>, an internal weekly newsletter that goes out to all DNR Park staff.</p> <p><u>Pesticide Use in WSPS</u> <i>As the growing season progresses, we need to continue thinking about how we use pesticides as part of our daily work. The pesticide use page on the Department intranet site (intranet.dnr.state.wi.us/int/land/forestry/staff_tools/pesticides/) does a good job of pulling together information about minimizing pesticide use, worker protection, training and certification requirements, pesticide use approval and record-keeping, DNR pesticide policies, and other related topics. It's important to periodically review the Department pesticide use policies to make sure that we're using pesticides as safely and effectively as we can as well as being in compliance. Also, remember to keep those certifications and licenses maintained and up-to-date.</i></p>
SCS review	DNR has made a significant effort and considerable progress toward addressing

	this request for corrective action. Future audit teams will continue to assess the implementation of new procedures to assure the proper use of chemicals on stand lands.
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2011.8	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	8.2.d.2
Non-Conformity: Indicator 8.2.d.2. requires that certificate holders have a monitoring program in place to assess the condition and environmental impacts of the forest-road system. While DNR has a program in place for many of the roads particularly when associated with timber harvests- there is an opportunity to improve upon the monitoring of closed or infrequently used roads on other state lands.	
Corrective Action Request: DNR should ensure that there is a monitoring program in place to assess the condition and environmental impacts of the forest-road system- particularly on other state lands.	
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	<p>In FY12, the Department completed an assessment of roads and parking lots to provide better and safe access to Department lands. Five million dollars in "Conservation Infrastructure" funds were authorized, much of which went to improving roads owned and maintained by the department. State Forests continue to update and maintain the forest road inventory for access and maintenance purposes.</p> <p>The wildlife program has a new initiative called the LMS (land Management System) which includes the framework of formalizing road and infrastructure assessments.</p>
SCS review	DNR's response to this observation was excellent.
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

4.2 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations

Finding Number: 2012.1	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	

Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator(s):	FSC US 1.1.b
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): DNR has not compiled a listing of the applicable federal, state, county, municipal, and tribal laws to facilitate determination of conformance with FSC US 1.1.a and to ensure that employees and contractors are duly informed about applicable laws and regulations.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): DNR must ensure that employees and contractors, commensurate with their responsibilities, are duly informed about applicable laws and regulations.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	Upon reviewing draft CARs and OBS, the Certification Coordinator submitted a response to SCS, "...the audit team missed Appendix D of our recently revised and published Forest Management Guidelines. The Forest Management Guidelines is a publication that we use with contractors, landowners, foresters, etc."
SCS review	Appendix D of the Forest Management Guidelines is the appropriate reference for laws and authorities that address this indicator. Although such evidence was requested before and during the audit, it is appropriate to close this CAR before the draft audit report is delivered.
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2012.2	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Major CAR</u> <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Minor CAR</u> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Observation</u>	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> <u>Pre-condition to certification</u> <input type="checkbox"/> <u>3 months from Issuance of Final Report</u> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation)</u> <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Other deadline (specify):</u>
FSC Indicator(s):	FSC US 4.2.b
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): Although contracts with logging contractors contain language requiring contractors to abide by OSHA regulations concerning job-site safety, DNR foresters responded to questions from auditors by indicating that they do not enforce compliance with these regulations upon observing unsafe practices, e.g., working without personal protective equipment. There were limited opportunities to observe contractors at work on this audit, and no instances of unsafe behavior, but there appears to be double standard—DNR employees do comply with requirements to wear protective gear, but they look the other way when contractors do not.	

Corrective Action Request (or Observation): DNR, their employees, and contractors should address their policies and procedures for demonstrating a safe work environment.	
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2012.3	
Select one: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator(s):	FSC US 6.1.B
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): For lands not covered by either a NR44-compliant master plan or a landscape-focused plan, site disturbing activities are being carried out without completing an Interim Forest Management Plan. A Minor CAR was issued in 2011 (CAR 2011.3) for the same non-conformity, thus the CAR is elevated to a Major.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): DNR must identify cases of non-conformance with FSC 6.1.b, since CAR 2011.3 was issued, and report these to Scientific Certification Systems. DNR must then ensure that managers assess and document impacts of planned management activities on elements 1-5 listed in Criterion 6.1.a prior to undertaking additional site disturbing activities (except where contracts for such activities have already been signed).	
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> WI DNR has analysed it's timber sale records and determined that there are 47 instances where timber sales were established on properties without Interim Forest Management Plans (IFMPs) on or after March 16, 2012 (the date of issuance of a the Minor CAR). Properties and their associated timber sales were deleted from the master list because in one case a property Master Plan was complete and waiting NRB approval; and in 23 cases timber sales were already sold, under contract and in many cases were complete. This leaves 25 properties requiring IFMPs for work already established. Two properties were added for tracking because local managers wanted to group other properties for IFMP development purposes. WI DNR also understands and has directed staff that an IFMP or a NR44 compliant master plan must be in place prior to selling any future timber sale. The only rare exception will be consideration for situations where life or property is threatened, e.g. storm damage in a high fire

danger landscape. The attached Excel files detail the properties and sales involved.

2. Cause analysis: The response to the 2011 minor CAR for the same noncompliance involved an IFMP development directive to staff from the Lands Division Administrator in May 2012. Although the directive was comprehensive and complete, it was apparent that it did not clearly identify who was receiving the assignment to complete IFMPs or in what situations IFMPs were required. The IFMP development guidance was packed into a very large email that contributed to staff having a difficult time accessing the needed information. In some cases the directive was received by staffs that were entering a busy summer field season and the urgency for immediate action by Lands Division staff was not communicated. Forestry Division staff also play a key role in the development of IFMPs; the May guidance did not clearly identify the forester's role in IFMP development.
3. Corrective Action Plan:
 - A. The Department will follow through on the development of IFMPs that address the assessment of forest cover types, age or size classes, and habitats at relevant spatial scales including multidisciplinary planning and management planning, particularly for timber sales; SFI indicator 4.1.5.
 - B. Identify properties and timber sales where immediate IFMP development must occur to proceed with established timber sales (see Major CAR IFMPs required spread sheet attached).
 - C. Reissue guidance to Lands Division staff that clearly states the assignment to develop IFMP's by November 7, 2012 to enable a coordinated public outreach/comment period of two weeks, November 8 - November 21.
 - D. Issue clear guidance to foresters that clarify the foresters' role in the IFMP development process.
 - E. Develop an IFMP web page to house information and data links for IFMP development; note: developed prior to reissued guidance memo.
 - F. Completed IFMPs will be available for review by the CB by December 10, 2012; see <http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/lands/IFMP.html> for completed IFMP's. Note: 26 IFMP's were completed for 36 properties.
4. Both the IFMP directive issued by Kurt Thiede, Lands Division administrator and a clarification of the forester's role issued by Darrell Zastrow, Deputy Forestry Division Administrator clearly state that all future timber sales will need either a completed IFMP or a NR44 compliant master plan prior to a sale being sold. Ideally as we catch up with a backlog of this planning workload, IFMPs or Master Plans will be in place prior to sale establishment. Annual integrated property meetings will continue to be required by March 1 of each calendar year; managers will look for the opportunity to coordinate new IFMP development to support the work plans identified during the integrated property meeting process.

Referenced documents are included in the transmittal email.

SCS review	SCS verified that the IFMPs identified to be created immediately were available on the WDNR webpage. The IFMPs include an assessment of impacts of planned management activities on elements 1-5 listed in Indicator 6.1.a. Site-level plans and SOPs may address certain elements in more detail. For example, while soil resources are described in IFMPs consistent with 6.1.a, in some IFMPs impacts to soils are only mentioned where sensitive hydrological features are known to exist at the unit level. In these cases, the assessment of any impacts to soils may be addressed in site-level plans.
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2012.4	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator(s):	FSC US 8.3.a
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): In one instance, DNR foresters were not aware of the proper protocols for tracking FSC-certified products from the stump to mill. Normally, trip tickets are used for such tracking because DNR usually sells wood on a weight or volume basis, determined at the mill. But, in the instance of a lump-sum sale without trip tickets (as planned), there would be no safeguard to prevent mixing of certified products from DNR lands with uncertified products from elsewhere.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): DNR must ensure that foresters understand the process of maintaining chain of custody of certified products.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

5.0 STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS

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

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

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

5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted

No stakeholder groups were consulted.	
---------------------------------------	--

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

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

No stakeholder comments were received or solicited during the surveillance audit.

6.0 CERTIFICATION DECISION

The certificate holder has demonstrated continued overall conformance to the applicable Forest Stewardship standards. The SCS annual audit team recommends that the certificate be sustained, subject to subsequent annual audits and the FME’s response to any open CARs.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments:	

7.0 CHANGES IN CERTIFICATION SCOPE

- There were no changes in the scope of the certification in the previous year.

Name and Contact Information

Organization name	State of Wisconsin, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Contact person	Mark Heyde

Address	01 S. Webster Street P.O. Box 7921 Madison, WI 53707	Telephone	608-267-0565
		Fax	608-266-8576
		e-mail	Mark.Heyde@Wisconsin.gov
		Website	www.dnr.gov

Scope of Certificate

Certificate Type	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Single FMU		<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple FMU	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Group			
SLIMF (if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/> Small SLIMF certificate		<input type="checkbox"/> Low intensity SLIMF certificate	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Group SLIMF certificate			
# Group Members (if applicable)				
Number of FMU's in scope of certificate	1			
Geographic location of non-SLIMF FMU(s)	Latitude & Longitude:			
Forest zone	<input type="checkbox"/> Boreal		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Temperate	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Subtropical		<input type="checkbox"/> Tropical	
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is:			Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac	
privately managed	0			
state managed	1,613,937			
community managed				
Number of FMUs in scope that are:				
less than 100 ha in area	0	100 - 1000 ha in area	0	
1000 - 10 000 ha in area	0	more than 10 000 ha in area	1	
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is included in FMUs that:			Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac	
are less than 100 ha in area	0			
are between 100 ha and 1000 ha in area	0			
meet the eligibility criteria as <i>low intensity</i> SLIMF FMUs	NA			
Division of FMUs into manageable units:				
The 663 properties are divided into compartments and further divided into stands.				

Production Forests

Timber Forest Products	Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac
Total area of production forest (i.e. forest from which timber may be harvested)	789,687
Area of production forest classified as 'plantation'	0
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by replanting or by a combination of replanting and coppicing of the planted stems	87,969
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by natural	701,718

regeneration, or by a combination of natural regeneration and coppicing of the naturally regenerated stems	
Silvicultural system(s)	Area under type of management
Even-aged management	
Clearcut (clearcut size range)	261,978
Shelterwood	191,558
Other:	30,795
Uneven-aged management	
Individual tree selection	106,584
Group selection	124,788
Other:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (e.g. nursery, recreation area, windbreak, bamboo, silvo-pastoral system, agro-forestry system, etc.)	298 (Nursery)
The sustainable rate of harvest (usually Annual Allowable Harvest or AAH where available) of commercial timber (m3 of round wood)	Acres (area control) 5,148 ASPEN 1,538 BOTTOMLAND HDW. 348 WHITE BIRCH 202 WHITE CEDAR 587 C. HARDWOODS 123 BALSAM FIR 286 FIR SPRUCE 282 HEMLOCK 41 MISC. CONIFEROUS 27 MISC. DECIDUOUS 467 RED MAPLE 3,680 N. HARDWOODS 4,851 OAK 742 SCRUB OAK 676 JACK PINE 2,798 RED PINE 1,841 WHITE PINE 256 BLACK SPRUCE 136 SWAMP CONIFER 861 SWAMP HDW 103 WHITE SPRUCE 259 TAMARACK 25,252 TOTAL
Non-timber Forest Products (NTFPs)	
Area of forest protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for the production of NTFPs or services	
Other areas managed for NTFPs or services	
Approximate annual commercial production of non-timber forest	Christmas trees: 250/year

products included in the scope of the certificate, by product type	Boughs: 5 tons/year Firewood: 3000 tons/year
Explanation of the assumptions and reference to the data source upon which AAH and NTFP harvest rates estimates are based:	
Species in scope of joint FM/COC certificate: <i>Scientific/ Latin Name (Common/ Trade Name)</i>	
Aspen/Popple:	<i>Populus tremuloides</i> <i>Populus grandidentata</i>
Balsam poplar	<i>Populus balsamifera</i>
White birch	<i>Betula papyrifera</i>
Eastern Cottonwood	<i>Populus deltoides</i>
Swamp white oak	<i>Quercus bicolor</i>
Siver maple	<i>Acer saccharinum</i>
American elm	<i>Ulmus americana</i>
River birch	<i>Betula nigra</i>
Green ash	<i>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</i>
White oak	<i>Quercus alba</i>
Bur oak	<i>Quercus macrocarpa</i>
Black oak	<i>Quercus velutina</i>
Northern pin oak	<i>Quercus ellipsoidalis</i>
Black walnut	<i>Juglans nigra</i>
Butternut	<i>Juglans cinerea</i>
Shagbark hickory	<i>Carya ovata</i>
Bitternut hickory	<i>Carya cordiformis</i>
Black cherry	<i>Prunus serotina</i>
Red maple	<i>Acer rubrum</i>
Hackberry	<i>Celtis occidentalis</i>
Scotch pine	<i>Pinus sylvestris</i>
European larch	<i>Larix decidua</i>
Norway spruce	<i>Picea abies</i>
Eastern redcedar	<i>Juniperus virginiana</i>
Blue spruce	<i>Picea pungens</i>
Norway maple	<i>Acer platanoides</i>
Boxelder	<i>Acer negundo</i>
Black locust	<i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i>
Honey locust	<i>Gleditsia triacanthos</i>
Eastern Hophornbeam, Ironwood	<i>Ostrya virginiana</i>
Musclewood, Bluebeech	<i>Carpinus caroliniana</i>
Sugar maple	<i>Acer saccharum</i>
Yellow birch	<i>Betula alleghaniensis</i>
White ash	<i>Fraxinus americana</i>
American beech	<i>Fagus grandifolia</i>

American basswood	<i>Tilia americana</i>
Northern red oak	<i>Quercus rubra</i>
Northern white cedar	<i>Thuja occidentalis</i>
Balsam fir	<i>Abies balsamea</i>
Eastern hemlock	<i>Tsuga canadensis</i>
Red Pine	<i>Pinus resinosa</i>
Jack Pine	<i>Pinus banksiana</i>
Eastern white pine	<i>Pinus strobus</i>
Black spruce	<i>Picea mariana</i>
Tamarack	<i>Larix laricina</i>
Black ash	<i>Fraxinus nigra</i>
White spruce	<i>Picea glauca</i>

FSC Product Classification

Timber products		
Product Level 1	Product Level 2	Species
W1 Rough Wood	W1.1 Roundwood (logs)	
W1 rough Wood	W1.2 Fuel Wood	
W3 Wood in chips of particles	W3.1 Wood chips	
Non-Timber Forest Products		
Product Level 1	Product Level 2	Product Level 3 and Species
N6 Plants and plant parts	N6.1 Flowers	N6.3.1 Christmas trees

Conservation Areas

Total Area of forest and non-forest land protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for conservation objectives		ha or ac		
High Conservation Value Forest/ Areas				
High Conservation Values present and respective areas:		Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac		
	Code	HCV Type	Description & Location	Area
<input type="checkbox"/>	HCV1	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g. endemism, endangered species, refugia).		
<input type="checkbox"/>	HCV2	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant large landscape level forests, contained within, or containing the management unit, where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural		

		patterns of distribution and abundance.		
<input type="checkbox"/>	HCV3	Forests or areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems.		
<input type="checkbox"/>	HCV4	Forests or areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g. watershed protection, erosion control).		
<input type="checkbox"/>	HCV5	Forests or areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g. subsistence, health).		
<input type="checkbox"/>	HCV6	Forests or areas critical to local communities' traditional cultural identity (areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in cooperation with such local communities).		
Total Area of forest classified as 'High Conservation Value Forest/ Area'				

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

<input type="checkbox"/> N/A – All forestland owned or managed by the applicant is included in the scope.		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Applicant owns and/or manages other FMUs not under evaluation.		
<input type="checkbox"/> Applicant wishes to excise portions of the FMU(s) under evaluation from the scope of certification.		
Explanation for exclusion of FMUs and/or excision:	No change from previous surveillance audits.	
Control measures to prevent mixing of certified and non-certified product (C8.3):		
Description of FMUs excluded from or forested area excised from the scope of certification:		
Name of FMU or Stand	Location (city, state, country)	Size (<input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac)

8.0 ANNUAL DATA UPDATE

8.1 Social Information

Number of forest workers (including contractors) working in forest within scope of certificate (differentiated by gender):		
300 male workers	89 female workers	
Number of accidents in forest work since last audit	Serious: 44	Fatal: 0
Relevant data not submitted by DNR		

8.2 Annual Summary of Pesticide and Other Chemical Use

 FME does not use pesticides.

Site	Submittal	Chemical(s) and Amount(s) Used	Area Treated (acres)
	Date		
Allenton W.A.	20-Dec-11	Escort - 10.0 ounces-dry, Translate - 7.5 ounces-wet	10
Anthony Branch Fishery Area	23-Nov-11	Buccaneer Plus - 1.0 gallons, Low Vol 4- 2,4D - 32.0 ounces-wet	1
Armstrong Unit KMSF	17-May-11	Round Up Power Max - 4.5 ounces-wet	0.1
Badfish Wildlife Area	16-Dec-11	Halex - 15.0 gallons, Roundup pro max - 15.0 gallons	40
Badfish Wildlife Area	14-Dec-11	Milestone - 2.0 quarts, Element 3A - 18.0 quarts, Escourt XP - 30.0 ounces-dry	70
Bakken's Pond	22-Dec-11	2, 4-D Amine 4 - 0.3 ounces-wet, Milestone VM - 12.0 ounces-wet	5
Bald Bluff SNA	9-Jun-11	Transline - 3.0 ounces-wet	1
Bark Bay Slough SNA	19-Dec-11	AquaNeat - 42.0 ounces-wet	0.35
Battle Bluff SNA	12-Dec-11	2-4-D AMINE - 8.0 ounces-wet	1
Battle Bluff SNA	12-Dec-11	Garlon 4 - 435.0 ounces-wet	4.5
Bean Brook Fish and Wildlife Area	21-Jun-11	Plateau - 0.25 ounces-wet	0.5
Beaver Brook Wildlife Area	29-Jul-11	Rodeo - 2.0 ounces-wet	1
Beaver Brook Wildlife Area	15-Dec-11	Cornerstone Plus - 10.0 ounces-wet	15
Beaver Brook Wildlife Area	11-Jan-12	Element 4 - 13.0 ounces-wet	14
Beaver Brook Wildlife Area	26-Jan-11	Garlon 4 - 2.0 ounces-wet	0.5
Beaver Brook Wildlife Area	15-Dec-11	Garlon 4 Ultra - 12.0 ounces-wet	10
Beaver Brook Wildlife Area	15-Dec-11	Rodeo - 1.0 ounces-wet	1
Beaver Brook Wildlife Area	2-Aug-11	Rodeo - 3.0 ounces-wet	3
Besadny Fish and Wildlife Area	17-Feb-11	Element 4 - 100.0 ounces-wet, water - 100.0 gallons	100
Besadny Fish and Wildlife Area	17-Feb-11	Element 4 - 75.0 ounces-wet	5
Besadny Fish and Wildlife Area	17-Feb-11	Milestone - 20.0 ounces-wet, water - 25.0 gallons	4

Besadny Fish and Wildlife Area	17-Feb-11	Milestone - 21.0 ounces-wet, water - 20.0 gallons	3
Besadny Fish and Wildlife Area	17-Feb-11	Milestone - 8.0 ounces-wet, water - 330.0 ounces-wet	5
Besadny Fish and Wildlife Area	17-Feb-11	Razor Pro - 32.0 ounces-wet	5
Besadny Fish and Wildlife Area	17-Feb-11	Razor Pro - 45.0 ounces-wet, water - 15.0 gallons	10
Beulah Station	22-Dec-11	Tryclopyr - 29.0 ounces-wet, glyphosate - 13.0 ounces-wet	5
Big Foot Beach	27-Dec-11	glyphosate - 360.0 ounces-wet	19
Big Muskego	27-Dec-11	aminopyralid - 1.0 ounces-wet, glyphosate - 1.0 ounces-wet	0.5
Big Muskego Lake wildlife area	17-Nov-11	glyphomax - 18.0 ounces-wet	2
Big Roche Cri fishery Area	13-Dec-11	Credit 41 - extra (roundup equiv) - 3.0 gallons	10.5
Bird Creek	8-Jun-11	Glyfos X-tra - 2.0 ounces-wet, Crossbow - 2.0 ounces-wet	0.5
Birding Trail- Peshtigo Harbor Wildlife Area	20-Oct-11	Habitat - 3.5 ounces-wet, Methylated Seed Oil - 3.0 ounces-wet	0.1
Black River State Forest	29-Nov-11	Element 3A - 3.0 gallons	14
Black River State Forest	6-Dec-11	Element 4 - 15.8 gallons	105
Black River State Forest	5-Dec-11	Element 4 - 32.0 gallons	117
Black River State Forest	6-Dec-11	Element 4 - 52.0 gallons	42.6
Black River State Forest	6-Dec-11	Element 4 - 6.6 gallons	89
Black River State Forest	6-Dec-11	Element 4 - 8.0 gallons	42.5
Black River State Forest	30-Nov-11	Escort - 3.0 ounces-dry, Element 3A - 1.0 gallons	15.25
Black River State Forest	15-Jun-11	Fusilade DX - 21.0 ounces-wet, Activate Plus - 14.0 ounces-wet	5.3
Black River State Forest	29-Nov-11	Oust - 0.5 ounces-dry, Element 3A - 40.0 ounces-wet	1
Black River State Forest	29-Nov-11	Plateau - 45.0 ounces-wet	0.6
Black River State Forest	29-Nov-11	Razor Pro - 1.25 gallons	1.4
Black River State Forest	21-Sep-11	Triclopyr 4 - 51.0 ounces-wet	0.00024
Blackhawk Lake Wildlife Area	22-Dec-11	Escort - 0.234 pounds, Milestone - 2.0 pounds	5
Bloch NA Fields	15-Feb-11	Element 3A - 3.0 quarts, Liberate with Leci-tech - 1.0 ounces-wet	5

Blue Mound State Park	8-Dec-11	Garlon 4 Ultra - 3.0 gallons, Round Up 2, 4, D - 10.0 gallons	3.5
Blue River Bluffs	22-Dec-11	Element 4 - 13.0 ounces-wet	1
Blue River Sand Barrens	22-Dec-11	Element 4 - 28.0 ounces-wet	5
Bluff Creek	22-Dec-11	Element 4 - 274.0 ounces-wet, Garlon 3A - 8.0 ounces-wet	16
Bluff Creek	27-Dec-11	Tryclopypyr - 19.2 ounces-wet	1
Brooklyn Wildlife Area	15-Dec-11	Element 4 - 7.5 gallons	80
Bruins	14-Dec-11	Element 4 - 2.0 gallons	40
Brunet Island State Park	29-Sep-11	Round Up - 16.0 ounces-wet	1
Buckhorn State Park	24-Nov-11	Round Up - 4.0 milliliters	0.002
Buena Vista Wildlife Area	1-Dec-11	Element 4 - 320.0 gallons	160
Buena Vista Wildlife Area	1-Dec-11	Milestone - 525.0 ounces-wet	160
Bulwalda	14-Dec-11	Element 4 - 1.0 gallons, Milestone - 25.0 ounces-wet	180
Cadiz Springs Recreation Area	8-Dec-11	2,4-dichlorophenoxyacetic acid - 2.0 quarts	0.5
Cadiz Springs Recreation Area	8-Dec-11	terramethrin - 6.0 ounces-wet, permethrin - 6.0 ounces-wet	1
Cassville Bluffs	22-Dec-11	Element 4 - 48.0 ounces-wet	1.5
Cassville Bluffs SNA	3-Feb-11	Element 4 - 3.5 gallons	10
Chaffee Creek Fisheries Area	23-Aug-11	Milestone - 2.5 ounces-wet	5
Cherokee Marsh	3-Feb-11	Garlon 3A - 1.0 gallons	7
Cherokee Marsh	22-Dec-11	Habitat - 45.5 ounces-wet	3
Cherokee Marsh Fishery Area	23-Nov-11	RazorPro - 0.28 gallons, Low Vol 4-2,4D - 9.0 ounces-wet	0.2
Chiwaukee Prairie State Natural Area	16-Dec-11	2,4-D Amine - 422.4 ounces-wet	2.5
Chiwaukee Prairie State Natural Area	16-Dec-11	Aquamaster - 1.6 ounces-wet	0.05
Chiwaukee Prairie State Natural Area	16-Dec-11	Aquamaster - 39.4 ounces-wet	0.1
Chiwaukee Prairie State Natural Area	16-Dec-11	Garlon 3A - 101.0 ounces-wet	1
Chiwaukee Prairie State Natural Area	16-Dec-11	Garlon 3A - 158.0 ounces-wet	8
Chiwaukee Prairie State Natural Area	16-Dec-11	Garlon 3A - 18.0 ounces-wet	0.3
Chiwaukee Prairie State Natural Area	16-Dec-11	Garlon 3A - 244.0 ounces-wet	12

Chiwaukee Prairie State Natural Area	16-Dec-11	Garlon 3A - 93.0 ounces-wet	1.25
Chiwaukee Prairie State Natural Area	16-Dec-11	Garlon 3A - 96.0 ounces-wet	15
Chiwaukee Prairie State Natural Area	16-Dec-11	Milestone - 0.7 ounces-wet, Krenite - 0.04 ounces-wet	0.2
Chiwaukee Prairie State Natural Area	16-Dec-11	Nufarm Polaris - 430.0 ounces-wet	15
Chiwaukee Prairie State Natural Area	16-Dec-11	Rodeo - 12.0 ounces-wet	0.75
Chiwaukee Prairie State Natural Area	16-Dec-11	Rodeo - 20.0 ounces-wet	0.6
Chiwaukee Prairie State Natural Area	16-Dec-11	Rodeo - 3.25 ounces-wet	1.5
Chiwaukee Prairie State Natural Area	16-Dec-11	Rodeo - 32.0 ounces-wet	0.35
Chiwaukee Prairie State Natural Area	16-Dec-11	Rodeo - 38.0 ounces-wet	2
Chiwaukee Prairie State Natural Area	16-Dec-11	Rodeo - 50.0 ounces-wet	1.4
Chiwaukee Prairie State Natural Area	15-Dec-11	Rodeo - 6.0 ounces-wet	0.25
Chiwaukee Prairie State Natural Area	15-Dec-11	Rodeo - 6.0 ounces-wet	0.3
Chiwaukee Prairie State Natural Area	15-Dec-11	Rodeo - 8.0 ounces-wet	0.15
Clam Lake Wildlife Area	15-Dec-11	Garlon 4 Ultra - 18.0 ounces-wet	15
Clam River Fish and Wildlife Area	21-Jun-11	Milestone - 2.5 ounces-wet	20
Clam River Fish and Wildlife Area	15-Jul-11	Milestone - 20.0 ounces-wet	3
Clam River Fish and Wildlife Area	21-Jun-11	Plateau - 0.25 ounces-wet	0.5
Clarks	14-Dec-11	Element 4 - 286.0 ounces-wet, Milestone - 26.5 ounces-wet	15
Clear Lake Boat Access	23-Nov-11	Milestone - 4.0 ounces-wet	1
Collins Marsh Wildlife Area	17-Feb-11	Element 4 - 52.0 ounces-wet, water - 204.0 ounces-wet	10
Collins Marsh Wildlife Area	17-Feb-11	Element 4 - 77.0 ounces-wet	1

Collins Marsh Wildlife Area	17-Feb-11	Habitat - 14.0 ounces-wet, water - 40.0 gallons	10
Collins Marsh Wildlife Area	17-Feb-11	Habitat - 42.0 ounces-wet, water - 45.0 gallons	20
Collins Marsh Wildlife Area	17-Feb-11	Razor Pro - 10.0 ounces-wet, water - 50.0 ounces-wet	2
Collins Marsh Wildlife Area	17-Feb-11	Razor Pro - 24.0 ounces-wet, water - 250.0 ounces-wet	10
Coon Creek Cliffs SNA	12-Dec-11	2-4-D AMINE - 12.0 ounces-wet	20
Coulee Experimental State Forest	7-Jun-11	Roundup - 1.5 gallons	8
Coulee Experimental State Forest	7-Jun-11	Sterling Blue - 0.9375 gallons, Harness - 1.875 gallons, Roundup Weathermax - 2.58 gallons	15
Cross Plains Ice Age Reserve	22-Dec-11	Element 4 - 256.0 ounces-wet	11
Dane County wildlife areas	14-Dec-11	Beyond - 48.0 ounces-wet	12
Deansville wildlife area	14-Dec-11	Element 3A - 36.0 ounces-wet, Razor pro - 12.0 ounces-wet	5
Deansville Wildlife Area	20-Dec-11	Extreme - 8.1 gallons, Sharpen - 21.6 ounces-wet, Roundup pro max - 4.39 gallons	21.6
Deansville Wildlife Area	20-Dec-11	surestart - 6.7 gallons, Roundup pro max - 6.2 gallons	30.5
Deansville Wildlife Area	20-Dec-11	Warrant - 13.1 gallons, Roundup pro max - 7.1 gallons, Select - 4.4 quarts	35
Dekorrra Public Hunting Grounds	2-Dec-11	Glyphosate Pro - 1.0 gallons	4
Dekorrra Public Hunting Grounds	20-Dec-11	Glyphosate Pro - 2.5 gallons	5
Dell Creek Wildlife Area	14-Dec-11	Sulfometuron methyl - 15.0 ounces-dry	20
Devil's Lake Oak Forest	22-Dec-11	2, 4-D Amine 4 - 2.0 ounces-wet	10
Devils Lake State Park	14-Dec-11	Sulfometuron methyl - 8.5 ounces-dry	8.5
Devil's Lake State Park	5-Dec-11	Garlon 4 - 2.0 gallons	3
Devil's Lake State Park	5-Dec-11	Razor Pro - 5.0 gallons	5
Devil's Lake State Park	5-Dec-11	Round-Up Pro - 5.0 gallons	3
Devil's Lake State Park	5-Dec-11	Spectracide Wasp & Hornet Spray - 450.0 ounces-wet	1
Dewey Heights Prairie	22-Dec-11	Element 4 - 128.0 ounces-wet	5

Duck Creek Wildlife Area	4-Jan-12	Callisto - 21.0 ounces-dry, Tomahawk - 10.5 quarts	11.5
Duck Creek Wildlife Area	4-Jan-12	Pursuit - 30.5 ounces-dry	11.5
Dunbar natural area	10-Feb-11	Transline - 13.0 ounces-wet	4
Dunn County Wildlife and State Natural Areas	12-Dec-11	Milestone - 36.0 ounces-wet, Round up - 1.0 gallons, Garlon 4 - 2.5 gallons	25
Dunnville WA	12-Dec-11	Garlon 4 - 16.0 ounces-wet	2
Dunnville WA	12-Dec-11	Garlon 4 - 6.0 ounces-wet	2.5
Dunnville WA	12-Dec-11	Milestone - 6.0 ounces-wet	0.75
Dunnville Wildlife Area	12-Dec-11	Milestone - 24.0 ounces-wet	6
East Bluff	22-Dec-11	2, 4-D Amine 4 - 8.0 ounces-wet	15
Eldorado Wildlife Area	15-Aug-11	Element 4 - 18.0 gallons	23
Elk Creek Fisheries	29-Dec-11	Garlon 4 Ultra - 64.0 ounces-wet	4
Emmons Creek Fisheries Area	8-Dec-11	Metsulfuron 60EG AG - 1.0 ounces-dry	4
Fern Dell Gorge	22-Dec-11	Element 4 - 8.0 ounces-wet	2
Ferry Bluff	22-Dec-11	Element 4 - 36.0 ounces-wet	2
French Creek WA	2-Dec-11	Element 3A - 2.3 gallons, Escort - 3.0 ounces-dry	4
French Creek WA	15-Nov-11	Glyphomate 41 - 17.5 gallons, Cornbelt - 5.0 gallons	38
French Creek Wildlife Area	1-Dec-11	Milestone - 48.0 ounces-wet	30
Genesee Oak Opening and Fen	22-Dec-11	Element 4 - 1.3 ounces-wet	10
GHRA Popp	14-Dec-11	Element 4 - 64.0 ounces-wet	1
Goose Lake Wildlife Area	15-Dec-11	Element 3A - 67.5 gallons, Milestone - 3.5 gallons, Escourt XP - 11.25 pounds	90
Goose Lake Wildlife Area	15-Dec-11	Element 4 - 1.0 liters	2
Goose Lake Wildlife Area	26-Jan-11	Milestone - 1.0 ounces-wet	1
Goose Lake Wildlife Area	22-Dec-11	Roundup pro max - 8.25 quarts, Parallel - 49.5 ounces-wet, Arrow - 5.2 quarts	33
Gotham Jack Pine Barrens	22-Dec-11	Milestone VM - 37.35 ounces-wet	40
Govenor Thompson State Park	12-Oct-11	Habitat - 1.5 ounces-wet, NSO - 1.5 ounces-wet	0.002
Governor Dodge State Park	6-Dec-11	Brash - 1.0 gallons	5
Governor Dodge State Park	4-Jan-11	Cornerstone Plus - 5.0 quarts	3
Governor Dodge State Park	6-Dec-11	Gly Star Plus - 0.25 gallons	3
Governor Dodge State Park	6-Dec-11	Glyfos Extra - 1.0 gallons	3

Governor Dodge State Park	4-Jan-11	Pramitol 25E - 2.0 gallons	2
Governor Dodge State Park	4-Jan-11	Tordon RTU - 1.0 quarts	1
Governor Dodge State Park	6-Dec-11	Tordon RTU - 5.75 gallons	5
Governor Thompson State Park	6-Jul-11	GardenTech Sevin Ready-To-Use - 1.0 gallons	1
Grand River Marsh Wildlife Area	18-Feb-11	Garlon 3A - 6.0 gallons, Escort Xp - 12.0 ounces-dry	41
Grand River Marsh Wildlife Area	18-Feb-11	Garlon 3A/Element 3A;Tahoe 3A - 12.5 gallons	25
Grand River Marsh Wildlife Area	28-Feb-11	Milestone VM - 34.25 pints	35
Grand River Marsh Wildlife Area	28-Feb-11	Milestone VM - 34.25 pints	35
Grand River Marsh Wildlife Area	18-Feb-11	Oust - 4.0 ounces-dry	70
Grand River Marsh Wildlife Area	28-Feb-11	Garlon 4 - 2.8 gallons	10
Grassy Lake	7-Dec-11	Gly Star Plus - 1.5 gallons	4
Great River Trail	12-Dec-11	Milestone - 8.0 ounces-wet	15
Greenwood Wildlife Area	8-Jun-11	Glyfos X-tra - 36.0 ounces-wet, Crossbow - 36.0 ounces-wet	7
Greenwood Wildlife Area	23-Aug-11	milestone - 5.4 ounces-wet	50
Hagen	22-Dec-11	2-4,D - 2.0 ounces-wet, Milestone - 0.75 ounces-wet	15
Hardscrabble	22-Dec-11	Milestone - 2.2 ounces-wet	10
Harrington Beach State Park	28-Nov-11	Excort XP - 0.19 ounces-dry, Oust XP - 1.61 ounces-dry, Razor Pro - 1.58 gallons	200
Harrington Beach State Park	14-Mar-11	Excort XP - 4.0 ounces-dry, Razor Pro - 18.0 gallons, Round-up - 16.0 ounces-wet	600
Havenwoods State Forest	1-Dec-11	Glyphosate Pro II - 3.0 gallons	5
Havenwoods State Forest	1-Dec-11	Gordon's Trimec - 1.7 gallons	6
Hawkinson Creek Wet Prairie SNA	12-Dec-11	Glyphosate - 88.0 ounces-wet	2
Hinkson Creek F.A.	18-Jan-11	Camix - 2.275 pounds, Touchdown - 1.203 pounds	7
Hinkson Creek Fishery Area-McMillian and Kent Roads	21-Nov-11	RazorPro - 21.3 ounces-wet, Low Vol 4- 2,4D - 5.3 ounces-wet	0.25

Hogback S.N.A.	7-Jun-11	Harness - 11.8 gallons, Sterling Blue - 21.0 pounds, Hornet - 10.5 pounds, Firstrate - 19.44 ounces-wet, Roundup Weathermax - 22.26 gallons, Sharpen - 4.0 pounds	42
Hogback SNA	12-Dec-11	2-4-D AMINE - 74.0 ounces-wet, Oust - 0.82 ounces-wet	40
Hogback SNA	12-Dec-11	Escort - 2.2 ounces-dry	3
Hogback SNA	12-Dec-11	Garlon 4 - 3768.0 ounces-wet	30
Hogback SNA	12-Dec-11	Glyphosate - 55.0 ounces-wet	1
Hogback SNA	12-Dec-11	Milestone - 5.0 ounces-wet	1
Hogback SNA	12-Dec-11	Oust - 0.82 ounces-dry	5
Hook Lake Wildlife Area	15-Dec-11	Roundup pro max - 15.5 pounds	62
Horicon Marsh Wildlife Area	15-Dec-11	Element 4 - 1.0 quarts	8
Horicon Marsh Wildlife Area	15-Dec-11	Element 4 - 1.5 quarts	12
Horicon Marsh Wildlife Area	15-Dec-11	Element 4 - 2.0 gallons	25
Horicon Marsh Wildlife Area	15-Dec-11	Element 4 - 8.0 ounces-wet	4
Horicon Marsh Wildlife Area	15-Dec-11	Habitat - 23.0 gallons	105
Horicon Marsh Wildlife Area	15-Dec-11	Habitat - 6.0 gallons	25
Hull, Pea South, Bob Wright	14-Dec-11	Element 4 - 4.0 gallons	200
Hulls	14-Dec-11	Oust - 100.0 ounces-dry	20
Hwy T Wildlife Area	22-Dec-11	Tahoe 4E - 7.4 gallons	14
Ice Age Trail- Polk Kames	15-Feb-12	Extreme - 57.3 pints	19.1
Inch Lake SNA	19-Dec-11	AquaNeat - 2.0 gallons, Garlon 4 Ultra - 1.0 gallons	1
Ipswich Prairie	22-Dec-11	Milestone VM - 0.25 ounces-wet	10
Ivanhoe	22-Dec-11	Tryclopyr - 81.0 ounces-wet	1.5
Ivanhoe wildlife area	17-Nov-11	Element 4 - 97.0 ounces-wet, transline - 64.0 ounces-wet, Milestone - 6.0 quarts	11
Jackson W.A.	3-Feb-12	Round Up - 256.0 ounces-wet	8
Jackson W.A.	3-Feb-12	Round Up - 514.8 ounces-wet, Round Up - 314.6 ounces-wet, Basis - 4.7 ounces-wet	37.7

Jefferson Marsh Wildlife Area	15-Dec-11	Element 4 - 1.0 gallons	2
Kessler Railroad Prairie	22-Dec-11	Milestone VM - 2.75 ounces-wet, Intensity - 15.0 ounces-wet, 2, 4-D Amine 4 - 5.2 ounces-wet	9
Kettle Moraine Oak Opening	27-Dec-11	Razor Pro - 6.5 ounces-wet, 2, 4-D Amine 4 - 8.0 ounces-wet, Element 4 - 62.0 ounces-wet, Milestone VM - 96.7 ounces-wet, Transline - 263.0 ounces-wet	215
Kettle Moraine State Forest	25-Jan-11	garlon 4 - 4.0 quarts	11
Kettle Moraine State Forest- Northern Unit	25-Jan-11	Escort - 20.0 ounces-dry	10
Kettle Moraine State Forest- Northern Unit	25-Jan-11	Escort - 4.0 ounces-dry, garlon 4 - 8.0 quarts	10
Kettle Moraine State Forest- Northern Unit	25-Jan-11	garlon 4 - 2.0 quarts	4
Kettle Moraine State Forest- Northern Unit	27-Jan-11	garlon 4 - 2.0 quarts	7
Kettle Moraine State Forest- Northern Unit	25-Jan-11	garlon 4 - 4.0 quarts	18
Kettle Moraine State Forest- Northern Unit	27-Jan-11	garlon 4 - 4.0 quarts	21
Kettle Moraine State Forest- Northern Unit	25-Jan-11	garlon 4 - 6.0 quarts	14
Kettle Moraine State Forest- Northern Unit	24-Jan-11	makaze - 16.0 quarts, Oust XP - 8.0 ounces-dry	8
Kettle Moraine State Forest- Northern Unit	27-Jan-11	makaze - 16.0 quarts, Oust XP - 8.0 ounces-dry	8
Kettle Moraine State Forest- Northern Unit	24-Jan-11	makaze - 26.0 gallons, Oust XP - 52.0 ounces-dry	52
Kettle Moraine State Forest- Northern Unit	21-Jan-11	Makaze - 6.0 gallons, Oust XP - 12.0 ounces-dry, transline - 1.5 gallons	12
Kettle Moraine State Forest- Northern Unit	21-Jan-11	Oust XP - 10.0 ounces-dry, Garlon 4 - 30.0 quarts	10
Kettle Moraine State Forest- Northern Unit	21-Jan-11	Oust XP - 14.3 ounces-dry, Garlon 4 - 3.125 gallons	25
Kettle Moraine State Forest- Northern Unit	7-Apr-11	Oust XP - 15.0 ounces-wet	15

Kettle Moraine State Forest-Northern Unit	28-Jul-11	Oust XP - 16.0 ounces-dry, transline - 28.0 pints	28
Kettle Moraine State Forest-Northern Unit	26-Jan-11	Oust XP - 18.0 ounces-dry	9
Kettle Moraine State Forest-Northern Unit	21-Jan-11	Oust XP - 19.0 ounces-dry	19
Kettle Moraine State Forest-Northern Unit	21-Jan-11	Oust XP - 22.0 ounces-dry, Escort - 6.0 ounces-dry, garlon 4 - 6.0 quarts	22
Kettle Moraine State Forest-Northern Unit	7-Apr-11	Oust XP - 32.0 ounces-wet	32
Kettle Moraine State Forest-Northern Unit	29-Jul-11	Oust XP - 34.0 ounces-dry	67
Kettle Moraine State Forest-Northern Unit	24-Jan-11	Oust XP - 4.0 ounces-dry	4
Kettle Moraine State Forest-Northern Unit	28-Jul-11	Oust XP - 4.0 ounces-dry	4
Kettle Moraine State Forest-Northern Unit	21-Jan-11	Oust XP - 4.6 ounces-dry	5
Kettle Moraine State Forest-Northern Unit	29-Jul-11	Oust XP - 5.0 ounces-dry	10
Kettle Moraine State Forest-Northern Unit	29-Jul-11	Oust XP - 5.0 ounces-dry	5
Kettle Moraine State Forest-Northern Unit	24-Jan-11	transline - 1.0 gallons	9
Kettle Moraine State Forest-Northern Unit	28-Jul-11	transline - 26.0 pints, Oust XP - 15.0 pounds	26
Kettle Moraine State Forest-Northern Unit	28-Jul-11	transline - 30.0 pints, Oust XP - 38.0 ounces-dry	38
Kettle Moraine State Forest-Northern Unit	28-Jul-11	transline - 32.0 pints, Oust XP - 18.0 ounces-dry	32
Kettle Moraine State Forest-Northern Unit	24-Jan-11	transline - 8.0 pints	8
Kettle Moraine State Forest-Northern Unit	28-Jul-11	transline - 9.0 pints	9
Kettle Moraine State Forest-NU	8-Jan-11	E-99 ester (2,4-D) - 1.15 gallons, Helosate Plus - 3.2 gallons, Sterling - 0.1 gallons, Glyphogan - 1.25 gallons, Raptor - 0.33 gallons	26.4
Kettle Moraine State Forest-NU	24-Jan-11	RoundUp Ultra - 16.0 gallons	32

Kickapoo Wildlife Area- Bell Center Unit	7-Jun-11	Roundup - 3.06 gallons	12.27
Kickapoo Wildlife Area- Wauzeka Unit	7-Jun-11	Roundup - 12.5 gallons	50
Kiezer Lake Wildlife Area	15-Dec-11	Milestone - 1.0 ounces-wet, Garlon 3A - 3.5 ounces-wet	6
Killsnake Wildlife Area	16-Apr-12	Garlon 4 Ultra Herbicide - 1.0 gallons	0.5
KMSF-Pike Lake Unit	3-Feb-12	Cornerstone - 7.2 quarts	7.2
KMSF-Pike Lake Unit	3-Feb-12	Round Up - 512.2 ounces-wet	19.7
La Crosse River State Trail	15-Dec-11	Buccaneer Plus - 2.0 gallons	3
La Crosse River Trail	12-Dec-11	Garlon 4 - 205.0 ounces-wet	4
La Crosse River Trail	12-Dec-11	Milestone - 19.5 ounces-wet	30
La Crosse Rivewr State Trail	15-Dec-11	Garlon 4 - 4.0 ounces-wet	1
Lake Keesus	17-Nov-11	transline - 1.0 ounces-wet	0.1
Lake Kegonsa State Park	13-Dec-11	Round-Up Ultra Max - 26.0 ounces-wet, Water - 9.0 gallons	3
Lake Kegonsa State Park	12-Dec-11	Round-Up Ultra Max - 6.0 ounces-wet, Water - 2.0 gallons	20
Lake Mills Wildlife Area (Zeloski)	15-Dec-11	Beyond - 8.0 ounces-wet	4
Lancaster Prairies	6-Jan-12	Milestone - 3.0 ounces-wet	20
Lange Property	24-Feb-11	Rodeo - 5.0 milliliters, Methylated Seed Oil - 0.75 ounces-wet, Habitat - 0.75 ounces-wet	0.1
Lawrence Creek Fisheries Area	8-Jun-11	Glyfos X-tra - 6.0 ounces-wet, Crossbow - 6.0 ounces-wet	1.25
Lawrence Prairie	6-Jan-12	Element 4 - 1.0 ounces-wet, Milestone VM - 2.0 ounces-wet	4
Lawrence Prairie	22-Dec-11	Milestone VM - 1.25 ounces-wet	3
LAX Comp Fish Hornby Prop.	14-Dec-11	Oust XP - 4.5 ounces-dry	12
Lepple	14-Dec-11	Milestone - 10.0 ounces-wet	2
Little Wolf Fisheries Area	8-Dec-11	Garlon 4 Ultra - 16.0 ounces-wet	3
Little Wolf River Sys/Jackson Creek	1-Aug-11	Crossbow - 6.0 ounces-wet	0.75
Little Wolf River Sys/Little Wolf	1-Aug-11	Crossbow - 4.0 ounces-wet	0.5
Little Wolf River Sys/Little Wolf	20-Jun-12	Crossbow - 4.0 ounces-wet	0.5

Little Wolf River Sys/Little Wolf	29-Jul-11	Crossbow - 6.0 ounces-wet	0.75
LO	27-Dec-11	glyphosate - 11.5 ounces-wet, 2,4-D - 12.8 ounces-wet	1.5
LO	27-Dec-11	Tryclopyr - 25.6 ounces-wet	1
Lodi Marsh	22-Dec-11	Razor Pro - 368.0 ounces-wet	18
Lodi Marsh Wildlife Area	9-Dec-11	Element 3A - 40.0 ounces-wet, Razor - 40.0 ounces-wet	15
Lodi Spring Creek Fishery Area	23-Nov-11	RazorPro - 0.42 gallons, Low Vol 4-2,4D - 13.5 ounces-wet	0.3
Lodi Spring Creek Fishery Area- Hwy 113 Lot	21-Nov-11	RazorPro - 0.2 gallons, Low Vol 4-2,4D - 6.4 ounces-wet	0.1
Lodi Spring Creek Fishery Area- Hwy 60 Lot	21-Nov-11	RazorPro - 0.2 gallons, Low Vol 4-2,4D - 6.4 ounces-wet	0.1
Lodi Spring Creek Fishery Area- Hwy J Lot	21-Nov-11	RazorPro - 0.2 gallons, Low Vol 4-2,4D - 6.4 ounces-wet	0.1
Loon Lake Wildlife Area	22-Dec-11	Element 4 - 0.56 gallons	10
Loon Lake Wildlife Area	22-Dec-11	Mad Dog (Glyphosate) - 1.0 gallons	0.6
Lost Lake	22-Dec-11	Element 4 - 8.0 ounces-wet	60
Lower Wisconsin Riverway - Richwood Unit	17-Jan-12	Round Up Weathermax - 28.87 gallons, 2-4D - 10.5 gallons, Raptor - 0.156 gallons	56
Lower Wisconsin Riverway - Wauzeka Unit	17-Jan-12	Harness - 25.0 pints, Hornet - 37.5 ounces-wet, Banvel - 37.5 ounces-wet	12.5
Lower Wisconsin Riverway - Wauzeka Unit	17-Jan-12	Round Up Weathermax - 23.43 quarts	15.62
Lower Wisconsin state Riverway	12-Dec-11	Glypho Extra - 3.0 gallons, Tenkoz 2, 4-D - 3.8 gallons, Buccaneer Plus - 8.0 liters, Ensign - 0.6 gallons	20
Lower Wisconsin state Riverway	12-Dec-11	Glyphos Extra - 3.58 gallons, Buccaneer Plus - 1.95 gallons, Tenkoz 2, 4-D - 3.0 gallons	18
Lower Wisconsin State Riverway	22-Dec-11	Milestone - 18.0 ounces-wet, Element 4 - 65.0 ounces-wet	100
Lulu Lake	22-Dec-11	Element 4 - 131.0 ounces-wet, Milestone - 3.5 ounces-wet, 2, 4-D Amine 4 - 10.8 ounces-wet	43
Lulu Lake SNA	3-Feb-11	Element 4 - 4.25 gallons	7
Lulu Lake SNA	3-Oct-11	Tahoe 4E - 40.3 ounces-wet	10
Lulu Lake SNA	3-Oct-11	Tahoe 4E - 40.3 ounces-wet	10

Lulu Lake SNA	17-Nov-11	Tahoe 4e - 79.0 ounces-wet	4
LWSR - Millville	29-Dec-11	Transline - 32.0 ounces-wet	0.25
LWSR - Munz	29-Dec-11	Garlon 4 Ultra - 96.0 ounces-wet	3.5
LWSR - Prairie Du Bay	29-Dec-11	Garlon 4 Ultra - 96.0 ounces-wet	4
LWSR - The Port	29-Dec-11	Milestone - 0.5 ounces-wet	0.01
Maiden Rock SNA	12-Dec-11	Milestone - 4.0 ounces-wet	1
Maiden Rock SNA	12-Dec-11	Milestone - 6.0 ounces-wet	1.5
Matuszewski	14-Dec-11	2, 4-D - 4.87 gallons	40
McGivra Woods	22-Dec-11	2, 4-D Amine 4 - 3.0 ounces-wet	60
Mead Wildlife Area	6-Dec-11	Buccaneer - 2.0 gallons	41
Mead Wildlife Area	6-Dec-11	Element 4 - 7.5 gallons	6
Mead Wildlife Area	6-Dec-11	Garlon 3A - 300.0 gallons, Habitat - 15.625 gallons	400
Mead Wildlife Area	6-Dec-11	Habitat - 0.4 gallons, Element 3A - 16.0 pounds	14.7
Mead Wildlife Area	6-Dec-11	Milestone - 10.25 ounces-wet	23
Meadow Valley Wildlife Area	14-Jan-11	Milestone VM - 4.0 quarts, Garlon 4/Element 4 - 19.0 ounces-wet, Habitat - 3.0 ounces-wet	10
Mecan River Fisheries Area	8-Jun-11	Glyphos X-tra - 12.0 ounces-wet, Crossbow - 12.0 ounces-wet	0.75
Mecan River Fisheries Area	23-Aug-11	Glyphos X-tra - 25.5 ounces-wet, Crossbow - 6.5 ounces-wet	6
Mecan River System	23-Aug-11	Milestone - 4.6 ounces-wet	10
Menominee River Natural Resources area	10-Feb-11	Transline - 3.0 ounces-wet	2
Michaelis Park	24-Feb-11	Habitat - 6.75 ounces-wet, Methylated Seed Oil - 6.75 ounces-wet	0.1
Mirror Lake Pine Oak Forest	22-Dec-11	Element 4 - 36.0 ounces-wet, Plateau - 1.4 ounces-wet, 2, 4-D Amine 4 - 10.0 ounces-wet	39
Mt. Hope Conservation Area	8-Dec-11	Transline - 12.8 ounces-wet	2
Mud Lake	7-Dec-11	Durango - 8.175 gallons, Extreme - 10.9 gallons, Intensity One - 2.0 gallons	43.6
Mud Lake	7-Dec-11	Round-Up Powermax - 7.5 gallons	21
Mud Lake WA	9-Nov-11	Alligare Panoramic 2SL - 0.5 ounces-wet	0.1

Mud Lake WA	2-Dec-11	Element 4 - 9.0 gallons, Escort - 2.0 ounces-dry	22
Mud Lake WA	2-Dec-11	Milestone VM - 0.85 ounces-wet	10
Mud Lake WA - Grassland fields	15-Nov-11	Element 4 - 21.0 gallons, Escort - 32.0 ounces-dry	53
Mud Lake Wildlife Area	15-Dec-11	Agrisolutions 2,4-d Amine 4 - 4.0 gallons, Agrisolutions Cornerstone Plus Herbicide - 6.0 gallons	16
Mud Lake Wildlife Area	15-Dec-11	Agrisolutions Cornerstone Plus Herbicide - 2.0 gallons, 2,4-d Amine 4 - 1.0 gallons	4
Mud Lake Wildlife Area	15-Dec-11	Aquamaster - 2.5 gallons	40
Mud Lake Wildlife Area	3-Jan-11	Surestart - 10.0 gallons, Durango Glyphosate - 7.5 gallons, Status - 7.5 pounds	40
Namekagon Barrens Wildlife Area	15-Dec-11	Garlon 4 Ultra - 59.5 ounces-wet, Garlon 3A - 176.0 pounds	10
Namekagon Barrens Wildlife Area	2-Aug-11	Milestone - 836.0 ounces-wet	139
Namekagon Barrens Wildlife Area	15-Dec-11	Plateau - 1.0 ounces-wet	1
Namekagon Barrens Wildlife Area	21-Jun-11	Plateau - 1.0 ounces-wet	2
New Glarus Woods State Park	8-Dec-11	tetramethrin - 12.0 ounces-wet, permethrin - 12.0 ounces-wet	1
Newport State Park	5-Apr-12	Round Up Pro - 1.0 gallons	3
Newport State Park	19-Mar-11	Roundup PRO - 1.0 gallons	2
NHAL State Forest	4-Feb-11	Milestone VM - 1.5 ounces-wet	0.25
Northern Highland - American Legion State Forest	22-Sep-11	Accord Concentrate - 116.0 quarts, Oust - 116.0 ounces-dry	116
Northern Highland - American Legion State Forest	22-Sep-11	Accord XRT 2 - 196.0 quarts, Chopper - 1764.0 ounces-wet, Oust - 98.0 ounces-dry	98
Northern Highland - American Legion State Forest	22-Sep-11	Accord XRT 2 - 48.0 quarts, Oust - 24.0 ounces-dry	24
Northern Highland - American Legion State Forest	22-Sep-11	Accord XRT 2 - 6.0 quarts, Garlon XRT - 120.0 ounces-wet, Oust - 3.0 ounces-dry	3

Northern Highland - American Legion State Forest	17-Nov-11	Element 4 - 9.0 gallons	9
Oconomowoc	27-Dec-11	aminopyralid - 1.0 ounces-wet, glyphosate - 1.0 ounces-wet	0.5
Oconto Marsh - Phragmites	16-Feb-11	Habitat - 18.0 ounces-wet, Methylated Seed Oil - 18.0 ounces-wet	15
O'Leary	14-Dec-11	Element 4 - 5.0 gallons	80
Ottawa Dog Trials KMSF	17-May-11	Round Up Power Max - 10.5 ounces-wet	2
Ottawa Lake Pickerel Frog Habitat Area	17-May-11	Round Up Power Max - 1.5 ounces-wet	0.1
Panzer	14-Dec-11	Element 4 - 443.0 ounces-wet	40
Panzer	14-Dec-11	Milestone - 1.0 ounces-dry	2
Paradise Marsh	3-Jan-11	Glyfos Xtra - 10.0 gallons	17
Paradise Marsh Wildlife Area	2-Dec-11	Element 3A - 2.5 gallons, Escort - 3.0 ounces-dry	3
Paradise Marsh Wildlife Area	7-Dec-11	Glyphogan Plus - 6.75 gallons	18
Paradise Marsh Wildlife Area	2-Dec-11	Milestone VM - 2.4 ounces-wet, Escort - 1.0 ounces-dry	0.5
Parfrey's Glen	22-Dec-11	Element 4 - 59.3 ounces-wet	56
Pea	14-Dec-11	Element 4 - 1.0 gallons, Oust - 133.0 ounces-dry	160
Peat Lake State Natural Area	15-Dec-11	Roundup ultraMax - 4.8 gallons	16
Pecatonica River Woods	22-Dec-11	Element 4 - 27.6 ounces-wet	6
Pepin County Wildlife and State Natural Areas	12-Dec-11	Milestone - 10.0 ounces-wet, Garlon 4 - 16.0 ounces-wet	4
Peter Helland	7-Dec-11	Me Too Lachlor - 1.5 quarts, Generic Roundup - 1.0 quarts	0.2
Peter Helland W.A.	18-Jan-11	Touchdown Total - 3.5 gallons	13
Peter Helland WA - Poser and Pardeeville Rd	2-Dec-11	Milestone VM - 0.85 gallons, Escort - 10.0 ounces-dry	11
Peter Helland WA - Sawyer Rd	2-Dec-11	Element 3A - 4.75 gallons, Element 4 - 1.5 gallons, Escort - 6.5 ounces-dry	20
Peter Helland WA, Mud Lake WA, Paradise Marsh WA	2-Dec-11	Milestone VM - 144.0 ounces-wet, Escort - 1.0 ounces-dry, Element 3A - 1.5 gallons	30

Peter Helland WA, Swan Lake, Duck Creek - locust	2-Dec-11	Milestone VM - 96.0 ounces-wet, Escort - 4.0 ounces-dry	14
Peterkin	22-Dec-11	Tryclopyr - 1.7 liters	3
Peterkin	27-Dec-11	Tryclopyr - 11.5 ounces-wet	3
Peterkin Pond	17-Nov-11	Crossbow - 45.0 ounces-wet	1
Pickeral Lake State Natural Area	8-Dec-11	Metsulfuron 60EG AG - 1.0 ounces-dry, Milestone - 3.0 ounces-wet	4
Pierce and st. Croix counties Wildlife Management and Fisheries Areas	13-Dec-11	Milestone VM - 15.0 ounces-dry, Garlon 4 - 20.0 gallons, Escort XP - 4.0 ounces-dry, Oust XP - 5.0 ounces-dry, 2,4-D Amine - 1.0 gallons, Garlon 3A - 1.0 quarts, Rodeo - 1.0 quarts, Cornerstone - 1.0 gallons, Razor Pro - 3.0 gallons	100
Pike Lake Unit - Kettle Moraine State Forest	21-Nov-11	Escort XP - 0.703 ounces-wet, Oust XP - 1.875 ounces-wet, Milestone VM - 1.5 ounces-wet	10
Pike River - Delfosse	14-Feb-12	Milestone - 3.0 ounces-wet, Preference - 3.0 ounces-wet	15
Pike river - Lear rd	14-Feb-12	Milestone - 7.0 ounces-wet, Preference - 7.0 ounces-wet	4
Pike River - Yellow Bridge	14-Feb-12	Milestone - 1.5 ounces-wet, Preference - 1.5 ounces-wet	0.25
Pike River- 141 and K	14-Feb-12	Milestone - 2.0 ounces-wet, Preference - 2.0 ounces-wet	0.25
pike wild river	10-Feb-11	element 3a - 192.0 ounces-wet	5
Pike Wild River	10-Feb-11	Milestone - 18.0 ounces-wet	2
Pine Island WA	2-Dec-11	Element 3A - 1.5 gallons, Escort - 2.0 ounces-dry	10
Pine Island WA	31-Jan-11	Glyphos Xtra - 20.5 gallons	32.8
Pine Island WA	2-Dec-11	Milestone VM - 73.0 ounces-wet	10.5
Pine Island WA - Oak savanna timber cut	2-Dec-11	Element 4 - 15.75 gallons, Escort - 75.0 ounces-dry	38
Pine Island WA - tree release	2-Dec-11	Oust - 12.0 ounces-dry	12
Pine Island WA - Tritz Rd	15-Nov-11	Glyphomate 41 - 10.0 gallons, Cornbelt - 3.5 gallons	20
Pine Island WA - WHIP	2-Dec-11	Glyphosate Pro - 19.5 gallons	128
Pine Island WA - WHIP broadcast	2-Dec-11	Element 4 - 13.75 gallons, Escort - 55.0 ounces-dry	27

Pine Island Wildlife Area	13-Dec-11	Duall 2 Magnum - 50.0 quarts, Glyphospate - 1600.0 ounces-wet, Select - 125.0 ounces-wet	50
Pine Island Wildlife Area	1-Dec-11	Milestone - 2.3 gallons	40
Pine River Sys/Davis Cr., Kaminski Cr., Pine River	16-Aug-11	Crossbow - 22.0 ounces-dry	2.75
Pine River Sys/Pine River	16-Aug-11	Crossbow - 16.0 ounces-wet	2
Pluim	14-Dec-11	Element 4 - 5.0 quarts	60
Popp	14-Dec-11	Oust - 8.0 ounces-dry	10
Portage County State Properties	12-Dec-11	Krenite S - 3.5 gallons, Milestone Herbicide - 9.5 ounces-wet, GlyStar Plus - 48.0 ounces-wet	36
Powell Marsh Wildlife Area	4-Feb-11	Milestone VM - 121.0 ounces-wet	8
Powell Marsh Wildlife Area & Thunder Marsh Wildlife Area	4-Feb-11	Element 4 - 1.25 gallons	2
Princes Point State Wildlife Area	13-May-11	Tahoe 4E herbicide - 0.1 ounces-wet	0.1
Quincy Bluff and Wetlands SNA	12-Dec-11	Cornerstone 5 plus (roundup equiv) - 8.32 gallons	25
Quincy Bluff SNA Triangle Trail	13-Dec-11	Milestone - 3.8 ounces-wet, Element 4 - 22.5 ounces-wet	4
Quincy SNA Jackpine Trail	13-Dec-11	Milestone - 3.5 ounces-wet	2
Radley Creek Sys/ Radley Creek	20-Jun-12	Crossbow - 14.0 ounces-wet	1.75
Radley Creek Sys/Murry Creek	1-Aug-11	Crossbow - 10.0 ounces-wet	1.25
Radley Creek Sys/Radley Creek	1-Aug-11	Crossbow - 26.0 ounces-wet	3.25
Radley Creek Sys/Radley Creek	20-Jun-12	Crossbow - 6.0 ounces-wet	0.75
Railroad ROW- Garlic Mustard	15-Feb-11	oust - 1.25 ounces-wet	1
Rat River Wildlife Area	26-Jun-12	MILESTONE VM - 18.0 ounces-wet	5.6
Rem Peterson Creek	20-Jun-12	Crossbow - 2.0 ounces-wet	0.25
Rem Waupaca/Leer & Griffen	29-Jul-11	Crossbow - 4.0 ounces-wet	0.5
Rem Waupaca/Waupaca River	1-Aug-11	Crossbow - 2.0 ounces-wet	0.25

Rem Waupaca/Waupaca River	1-Aug-11	Crossbow - 2.0 ounces-wet	0.25
Rem Waupaca/Waupaca River	20-Jun-12	Crossbow - 2.0 ounces-wet	0.25
Rem Waupaca/Whitcomb Creek	1-Aug-11	Crossbow - 12.0 ounces-wet	1.5
Richard Bong Recreation Area	15-Dec-11	Transline - 8.0 ounces-wet	0.4
Roche-A-Cri State Park	24-Nov-11	Round Up - 4.0 milliliters	0.05
Roche-A-Cri State Park	24-Nov-11	Round Up - 4.0 milliliters	0.001
Rock and Green County Wildlife lands	14-Dec-11	Beyond - 264.0 ounces-wet	66
Rock and Green County Wildlife lands	14-Dec-11	Milestone - 5.5 gallons, Escort XP - 30.0 ounces-dry	47
Rock and Green County Wildlife lands	14-Dec-11	Tahoe 4E - 5.0 gallons	11
Rock River Prairie	6-Jan-12	Milestone VM - 11.75 ounces-wet, Element 4 - 32.0 ounces-wet	25
Rock River Prairie SNA	22-Dec-11	Milestone - 1.5 ounces-wet	15
Rocky Run Creek Fishery Area	21-Nov-11	RazorPro - 107.0 ounces-wet, Low Vol 4- 2,4D - 31.0 ounces-wet	3
Rome Pond State Wildlife Area	19-May-11	Tahoe 4E - 87.0 ounces-wet	600
Rome Pond State Wildlife Area (Texas Island)	31-May-11	Tahoe 4E - 8.0 ounces-wet	1
Rome Pond Wildlife Area	15-Dec-11	Element 4 - 2.0 gallons	3
Rome Pond Wildlife Area	15-Dec-11	Halex GT Herbicide - 25.7 quarts, Atrazine 4l - 51.4 quarts	25.7
Rome Pond Wildolife Area	15-Dec-11	Basis - 16.0 ounces-wet	4
Rush Creek SNA	12-Dec-11	2-4-D Amine - 100.0 ounces-wet	50
Rush Creek SNA	12-Dec-11	Garlon 4 - 995.0 ounces-wet	16
Rush Creek SNA	12-Dec-11	Milestone - 14.5 ounces-wet	13
Sandhill-Meadow Valley Work Unit	14-Dec-11	Element 4 - 81.0 ounces-wet	1
Sandhill-Meadow Valley Work Unit	12-Dec-11	Milestone VM - 170.1 ounces-wet	2
Sawyer Creek Fishery Area	15-Dec-11	Element 4 - 39.0 ounces-wet	5
Sawyer Creek Fishery Area	15-Dec-11	Rodeo - 5.0 ounces-wet	1
Sawyer Creek FWA	18-Jan-11	Element 4 - 111.0 ounces-wet	15
Sawyer Creek FWA	24-Jan-11	Element 4 - 26.0 ounces-wet	2
Schulz	14-Dec-11	Element 4 - 5.0 gallons	40

Schummacher, Smits	14-Dec-11	Element 4 - 224.0 ounces-wet, Polaris - 2.0 gallons	200
Scuppernong Prairie	22-Dec-11	Element 4 - 2.5 ounces-wet	3
Scuppernong River Habitat Area	17-May-11	Round Up Power Max - 0.3 ounces-wet	0.1
Scuppernong River Habitat Area	17-May-11	Round Up Power Max - 3.0 ounces-wet	0.1
Scuppernong River Habitat Area	4-Aug-11	Transline - 24.0 ounces-wet	0.3
Seagull Bar	15-Feb-11	Habitat - 27.0 ounces-wet, Methylated Seed Oil - 27.0 ounces-wet	50
Seagull Bar - Backpack Spray	23-Jan-12	Habitat - 117.0 ounces-wet, Methylated Seed Oil - 117.0 ounces-wet	40
Seely Tract	3-Jan-11	Harness - 39.0 pints, Hornet - 58.5 ounces-wet, Round Up Power Max - 429.0 ounces-wet	19.5
Seely Tract	3-Jan-11	Hornet - 31.5 ounces-wet, Round Up Power Max - 231.0 ounces-wet, Harness - 21.0 pints	10.5
Sharon	22-Dec-11	Tryclopypyr - 77.0 ounces-wet	1
Shaw Marsh State Wildlife Area	15-Dec-11	Du Pont Oust Xp Herbicide - 5.0 pounds	16
Shrine road openings	10-Feb-11	Transline - 2.0 ounces-wet	1
Smits	14-Dec-11	Milestone - 4.0 ounces-wet	20
Smits/Spirit	14-Dec-11	Element 4 - 2.0 gallons	250
Snow Bottom	22-Dec-11	Element 4 - 1.0 ounces-wet	1
Stauffacher's	22-Dec-11	Element 4 - 42.0 ounces-wet	31
Stopplesworth, Riese	14-Dec-11	Element 4 - 2.0 gallons	80
Swan Lake WA	2-Dec-11	Milestone VM - 35.0 ounces-wet	35
Theresa W.A.	21-Dec-11	2,4-D Ester - 0.25 ounces-wet, glyphosate - 0.38 ounces-wet	0.1
Theresa W.A.	21-Dec-11	2,4-D Ester - 0.5 gallons, Liberate - 0.5 gallons	3
Theresa W.A.	21-Dec-11	2,4-D Ester - 0.5 gallons, Liberate - 0.5 gallons	3
Theresa W.A.	21-Dec-11	2,4-D Ester - 0.5 gallons, Liberate - 0.5 gallons	3

Theresa W.A.	26-Jan-12	Escort - 0.7 ounces-dry, Element 3A - 45.0 ounces-wet, MSO - 11.0 ounces-wet	0.5
Theresa W.A.	21-Dec-11	Escort - 20.0 ounces-dry, Liberate - 15.75 ounces-wet	21
Theresa W.A.	21-Dec-11	Escort - 3.0 ounces-dry, Element 3A - 1.5 gallons, MSO - 1.5 quarts	3
Theresa W.A.	21-Dec-11	Escort - 5.0 ounces-dry, Liberate - 93.75 ounces-wet	5
Theresa W.A.	26-Jan-12	Escort - 6.2 ounces-dry, Element 3A - 3.1 gallons, MSO - 3.1 quarts	5
Theresa W.A.	3-Feb-12	Glyphosate - 44.3 quarts	25.5
Theresa W.A.	26-Jan-12	Halex - 28.6 quarts, Round Up - 30.7 quarts	27.2
Theresa W.A.	3-Feb-12	Round Up - 14.1 quarts	9.4
Theresa W.A.	26-Jan-12	Round Up - 15.0 quarts	7.5
Theresa W.A.	26-Jan-12	Round Up - 17.25 quarts	11.5
Theresa W.A.	26-Jan-12	Round Up - 4.65 quarts, 2,4-D - 3.1 pints	3.1
Theresa W.A.	3-Feb-12	Round Up - 4.65 quarts, 2,4-D - 3.1 pints	3.1
Theresa W.A.	3-Feb-12	Round Up - 55.0 quarts, Round Up - 32.85 quarts, Princep - 16.4 pounds	49.4
Theresa W.A.	3-Feb-12	Touchdown - 28.4 quarts	14.2
Thiede	27-Dec-11	Tryclopvr - 6.4 ounces-wet	0.5
Thunder River Rearing Station	23-Feb-11	bleach -- sodium hypochlorite - 11.0 gallons, sodium thiosulfate pentahydrate - 14.0 pounds	0
Thunder River Rearing Station	23-Feb-11	Paracide-F -- formalin - 10.0 gallons	0
Thunder River Rearing Station	23-Feb-11	salt -- sodium chloride - 41150.0 pounds	0
Thunder River Rearing Station	23-Feb-11	Thunder River Furunculosis vaccine - 7.0 liters	0
Thunder River Rearing Station	23-Feb-11	Virkon Aquatic - 3.0 ounces-dry	0
Tichigan Wildlife Area	16-Dec-11	Rodeo - 5.0 gallons	12
Tiffany SWA	29-Nov-11	Transline - 2.0 gallons, Element 4 - 25.0 gallons	30
Town Corner State Natural Area	12-Oct-11	Polaris - 0.75 ounces-wet, MSO - 0.75 ounces-wet	2

Town Corner Wildlife Area	24-Feb-11	Habitat - 2.0 ounces-wet	3.1
Tozer Springs	26-Jan-11	Escort - 2.0 grams	5
Trout-Nace FA	29-Jul-11	Crossbow - 2.0 ounces-wet	0.25
Troy	22-Dec-11	Tryclopyr - 51.0 ounces-wet	2.5
Troy Wildlife Area	17-Nov-11	glyphomax - 5.0 ounces-wet, Tahoe 4e - 64.0 ounces-wet	13.5
Turtle Creek	22-Dec-11	Tryclopyr - 11.0 pints	2.25
Turtle Creek	27-Dec-11	Tryclopyr - 35.0 ounces-wet	2.25
Turtle Creek	27-Dec-11	Tryclopyr - 58.0 ounces-wet	5
Turtle Lake	27-Dec-11	Tryclopyr - 20.3 ounces-wet	1
Turtle Lake	22-Dec-11	Tryclopyr - 6.8 ounces-wet	1
Turtle Lake Wildlife Area	17-Nov-11	Tahoe 4e - 14.0 ounces-wet	0.5
Turtle Valley	22-Dec-11	Tryclopyr - 13.0 pints	2.7
Turtle Valley	27-Dec-11	Tryclopyr - 42.0 ounces-wet	2.7
Turtle Valley wildlife area	17-Nov-11	Tahoe 4e - 16.0 ounces-wet, glyphomax - 16.0 ounces-wet	2.7
Van Buren	14-Dec-11	Element 4 - 1.0 gallons	100
Van Loon Floodplain Savanna SNA	12-Dec-11	Garlon 4 - 154.0 ounces-wet	18
Vernon	22-Dec-11	Clopyralid - 214.0 ounces-wet, Tryclopyr - 123.0 ounces-wet, 2,4-D - 210.0 ounces-wet	21
Vernon Wildlife Area	17-Nov-11	glyphomax - 27.0 ounces-wet, transline - 91.0 ounces-wet, Tahoe 4e - 178.0 ounces-wet	55.7
Vernon Wildlife Area	17-Nov-11	Transline - 34.0 ounces-wet, Makaze - 11.0 ounces-wet	10
Vielbig, Pea North	14-Dec-11	Element 4 - 5.0 gallons	150
Vosse Coulee SNA	12-Dec-11	glyphosate - 88.0 ounces-wet	18
W. Br. Little Pine Fishery Area	23-Aug-11	Milestone - 0.1 ounces-wet, Crossbow - 0.5 ounces-wet, Glyfos X-tra - 1.0 ounces-wet	0.5
Waterloo Wildlife Area	15-Dec-11	Beyond - 32.0 ounces-wet	8
Waterloo Wildlife Area	14-Dec-11	capreno - 26.4 ounces-wet, Roundup Powermax - 422.4 ounces-wet	13.2
Waterloo Wildlife Area	15-Dec-11	Element 4 - 2.5 gallons	5
Waterloo Wildlife Area	14-Dec-11	Halex GT Herbicide - 11.6 quarts	5.8
Waterloo Wildlife Area	14-Dec-11	Halex GT Herbicide - 18.8 quarts	9.4
Waterloo Wildlife Area	14-Dec-11	Halex GT Herbicide - 27.6 quarts	13.8
Waterloo Wildlife Area	14-Dec-11	Halex GT Herbicide - 42.4 quarts	21.2

Waterloo Wildlife Area	15-Dec-11	Pursuit - 23.6 ounces-wet	5.9
Waterloo Wildlife Area	15-Dec-11	Pursuit - 23.6 ounces-wet	5.9
Waterloo Wildlife Area	15-Dec-11	Roundup - 16.2 pints	8.1
Waterloo Wildlife Area	14-Dec-11	Roundup - 20.0 quarts	10
Waterloo Wildlife Area	14-Dec-11	Roundup - 32.2 pints	16.1
Waterloo Wildlife Area	14-Dec-11	Select Max - 188.8 ounces-wet	5.9
Waterloo Wildlife Area	14-Dec-11	Surpass Ec - 11.7 pints	3.9
Waterloo Wildlife Area	15-Dec-11	Surpass Ec - 24.3 pints	8.1
Waterloo Wildlife Area	14-Dec-11	Surpass Ec - 38.1 pints	12.7
Waterloo Wildlife Area	15-Dec-11	Valoron - 10.4 ounces-wet, Synchrony XP - 1.95 ounces-wet, Touchdown Total - 1.3 quarts	5.2
Waubesa Wetlands	22-Dec-11	Garlon 3A - 112.0 ounces-wet	4
Waubesa Wetlands	3-Feb-11	Garlon 3A - 8.0 gallons	4
Wedde Creek	23-Aug-11	Glyphos X-tra - 1.0 ounces-wet, Crossbow - 0.5 ounces-wet	0.2
West Br. White River Fisheries Area	23-Aug-11	Milestone - 4.0 ounces-wet, Glyphos X-tra - 1.0 ounces-wet, Crossbow - 0.5 ounces-wet	5.5
West Branch Little Pine	8-Jun-11	Glyphos X-tra - 1.0 ounces-wet, Crossbow - 1.0 ounces-wet	0.025
Westford	14-Dec-11	Roundup - 30.0 gallons, 2, 4-D - 6.0 gallons	48
White River Fisheries Area	8-Jun-11	Glyphos X-tra - 2.0 ounces-wet, Crossbow - 2.0 ounces-wet	0.25
Wild Rose Fish Hatchery	30-Jan-12	Aquashade - 3.0 gallons, Calcium Chloride - 150.0 pounds, Copper Sulfate - 3.0 pounds, Furunculosis vaccine - 46.0 liters, Hydrogen Peroxide - 0.5 gallons, Induchlor (chlorine) dry - 5.0 pounds, Induchlor (chlorine) liquid - 14.0 gallons, MS 222 - 105.0 grams, Muratic acid - 4.5 gallons, Parasite-S - 156.0 gallons, PVP Iodine (Argentyne) - 9.0 gallons, Sodium Hydroxide - 2.0 liters, Sodium Thiosulfate - 73.0 pounds, Virkon - 40.0 pounds	200

Wild Rose Fish Hatchery	1-Feb-11	Calcium Chloride - 350.0 pounds, Copper Sulfate - 4.0 pounds, Furunculosis vaccine - 42.0 liters, Hydrogen Peroxide - 6.0 liters, Induchlor (chlorine) - 4.0 pounds, Induchlor - 4.0 gallons, MS 222 - 280.0 grams, Muratic acid - 3.0 gallons, Parasite-S - 331.0 gallons, P.V.P. Iodine (Argentyne) - 14.0 gallons, Sodium Hydroxide - 2.5 liters, Sodium Thiosulfate - 140.0 pounds, Virkon - 43.0 pounds	200
Wildcat Mountain State Park	15-Dec-11	Buccaneer Plus - 2.0 gallons	2
Willow Creek Fishery Area	8-Jun-11	Glyfos X-tra - 20.0 ounces-wet, Crossbow - 20.0 ounces-wet	4
Willow Creek Sys/Cedar Springs Creek	15-Aug-11	Crossbow - 4.0 ounces-wet	0.5
Willow Creek Sys/Silver Spring Creek	15-Aug-11	Crossbow - 4.0 ounces-wet	0.5
Willow Creek Sys/Willow Creek	15-Aug-11	Crossbow - 14.0 ounces-wet	1.75
Willow Creek Sys/Willow Creek	15-Aug-11	Crossbow - 16.0 ounces-wet	2
Willow Creek Sys/Willow Creek	15-Aug-11	Crossbow - 4.0 ounces-wet	0.5
Willow Creek Wildlife Area	29-Dec-11	Garlon 4 Ultra - 124.0 ounces-wet	1
Willow River State Park	30-Oct-11	Cornerstone Plus - 0.5 gallons	1
Wilton Rd Pine Plantation	17-May-11	Round Up Power Max - 3.0 ounces- wet	0.1
Wisconsin River- Dekorra Lot	21-Nov-11	RazorPro - 18.25 ounces-wet, Low Vol 4- 2,4D - 4.5 ounces-wet	0.1
Woodman Lake Sand Prairie and Dead Lake	22-Dec-11	Milestone VM - 3.0 ounces-wet	10
Wyalusing State Park	8-Dec-11	Roundup Ultra Dry - 9.5 ounces-dry	1
Wynegar Pond - Peshtigo Harbor WA	15-Feb-11	Habitat - 54.0 ounces-wet, Methylated Seed Oil - 54.0 ounces- wet	40
Yellow River Fisheries Area	22-Dec-11	Element 4 - 0.6 gallons	15

Yellowstone Wildlife Area	21-Jan-11	milestone - 10.0 pints, escort - 20.0 ounces-dry, garlon 4 - 10.0 gallons	100
Zills	14-Dec-11	Element 4 - 64.0 ounces-wet	5
Zuelke	14-Dec-11	Roundup - 13.75 gallons, 2, 4-D - 2.75 gallons	24

SECTION B – APPENDICES (CONFIDENTIAL)

Appendix 1 – List of FMUs Selected For Evaluation

- FME consists of a single FMU
 FME consists of multiple FMUs or is a Group

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

Appendix 2 – Evaluation of Management Systems

Appendix 3 – List of Stakeholders Consulted

List of FME Staff Consulted in Meetings and Personal Interviews:

Opening Meeting, August 13, 2012

Mark Heyde, Division of Forestry, Forest Certification Coordinator, WDNR
Curt Wilson, DNR Northeast District Forester
Teague Prichard, DNR State Forest Planner
Amy Mercer, DNR State Forest Planner
Deanna Sell, State Forest Operations
Carmen Hardin, DNR Forest Hydrologist, Rhinelander
Michelle Woodford, DNR Wildlife Manager (Biologist)
Ryan Magana, DNR Endangered Resources Ecologist
Ron Eckstein, Wildlife Volunteer (Biologist)
Steve Petersen, NHAL Superintendent
Jeff Olsen, WDNR, NHAL Forestry Team Leader
Karl Martin, Section Chief, Science Services
Craig Thompson, Bureau of Endangered Resources
Carmen Hardin, DNR Forest Hydrologist, Rhinelander
Michelle Woodford, DNR Wildlife Manager (Biologist)
Ryan Magana, DNR Endangered Resources Ecologist
Ron Eckstein, Wildlife Volunteer (Biologist)

Curt Wilson, DNR Northeast Regional Supervisor
Steve Petersen, NHAL Superintendent
Jeff Olsen, WDNR, NHAL Forestry Team Leader
Chase Christopherson, DNR Forester, Trout Lake
Adam Wallace, DNR Forester, Trout Lake
Todd Anderson, DNR Forester, Trout Lake
Jim Wetterau, DNR Forester, Woodruff
Craig Dalton, DNR Forester, Woodruff
Paul Schultz, DNR Forester, Woodruff

Northern Highland American Legion State Forest, August 13, 2012:

Mark Heyde, Division of Forestry, Forest Certification Coordinator, DNR
Teague Prichard, DNR State Forest Planner
Amy Mercer, DNR State Forest Planner
Deanna Sell, State Forest Operations
Carmen Hardin, DNR Forest Hydrologist, Rhinelander
Michelle Woodford, DNR Wildlife Manager (Biologist)
Ryan Magana, DNR Endangered Resources Ecologist
Ron Eckstein, Wildlife Volunteer (Biologist)
Curt Wilson, DNR Northeast Regional Supervisor
Steve Petersen, NHAL Superintendent
Jeff Olsen, WDNR, NHAL Forestry Team Leader
Chase Christopherson, DNR Forester, Trout Lake
Adam Wallace, DNR Forester, Trout Lake
Todd Anderson, DNR Forester, Trout Lake
Jim Wetterau, DNR Forester, Woodruff
Craig Dalton, DNR Forester, Woodruff
Paul Schultz, DNR Forester, Woodruff

Thunder Lake Wildlife Area, Spur Lake SNA, August 14, 2012

Craig Thompson, Bureau of Lands
Jeremy Holtz, Bureau of Wildlife , Rhinelander
John Gillen, Forestry, Rhinelander
Tim Friedrich, Forestry Team Leader
Ron Eckstein, Bureau of Wildlife, Retired
Curt Wilson Northeast Region Supervisor

Little Rice Wildlife Area, August 14, 2012

Craig Thompson, Bureau of Lands
Jeremy Holtz, Bureau of Wildlife , Rhinelander
John Gillen, Forestry, Rhinelander
Craig Williams, Forestry,
Brian Spencer, Forestry
Tim Friedrich, Forestry Team Leader
Ron Eckstein, Bureau of Wildlife, Retired
Curt Wilson Northeast Region Supervisor

Pine Popple Wild River, Spread Eagle Natural Area, August 14, 2012

Stu Boren, DNR Forester
Henry Sullivan, DNR Forester
Jeff Pennucci, DNR Northern Region Lands Supervisor
Chuck McCullough, DNR Wildlife Supervisor, Antigo
Anna Jahns, DNR Wildlife Technician, Invasive plants
Teague Prichard, DNR State Forest Planner
Amy Mercer, DNR State Forest Planner

Menominee River State Park and Recreation Area, August 14, 2012

Cole Couvillion, DNR Forestry Team Leader
Maggie Kailhofer, Parks Superintendent
Dave Halfmann, DNR Wildlife
Bruce Djupstrom, DNR Forester
Teague Prichard, DNR State Forest Planner
Amy Mercer, DNR State Forest Planner
Craig Williams, DNR Forester

Turtle Flambeau Scenic Waters Area, August 14, 2012

Chris Niehaus, Bureau of Lands
Heather Berklund, DNR Forester
Jay Gallagher, Forestry Team Leader
Colleen Matula, Forestry Ecologist
Fred Strand, DNR Wildlife Supervisor
Jim Warren, Public and Private Forestry Section Chief
Mark Heyde, Forestry Certification Coordinator
Deanna Sell, State Forest Operations

Hay Creek-Hoffman Lake Wildlife Area, August 14, 2012

Chris Niehaus, Bureau of Lands
Heather Berklund, DNR Forester
Jay Gallagher, Forestry Team Leader
Colleen Matula, Forestry Ecologist
Fred Strand, DNR Wildlife Supervisor
Tom Onchuck, DNR Forester
Greg Mitchell – Forestry Team Leader
Jim Warren, Public and Private Forestry Section Chief
Deanna Sell, State Forest Operations

Willow Flowage Scenic Waters Area, August 14, 2012

Tom Shockley, DNR Forester
Jeff Olsen, NHAL Forestry Team Leader
Michelle Woodford, DNR Wildlife Manager
Jim Warren, Public and Private Forestry Section Chief
Deanna Sell, State Forest Operations

Peshtigo River State Forest, Governor Thompson State Park, August 15, 2012

Craig Thompson, Bureau of Lands
Dan Mertz, Forestry
Maggie Kailhofer, Parks and Recreation
John Lubbers, Forestry
Chris Duncan, Forestry
Steve Kaufman, MFL,
McKenzie Siglinsky, Forestry
Mike Folgert, Forestry

Wausaukee Timber Demonstration Forest, North Branch Beaver Creek Fishery Area, August 15, 2012

Craig Thompson, Bureau of Lands
Joe Schwantes, Forestry
Cole Couvillion, Forestry
Kate Lenz, Forestry
Steve Kaufman, Forestry

Pike Wild River and Amberg Wildlife Area, August 15, 2012

Dave Halfmann, DNR Wildlife
Joe Schwantes, DNR Forest Specialist
Amy Mercer, DNR State Forest Planner
Teague Prichard, DNR State Forest Planner

Lake Noquebay Wildlife Area and Green Bay Shores Wildlife Area, August 15, 2012

Kay Brockman-Mederas, DNR Wildlife
Aaron McCollough, DNR Wildlife
Kate Lenz, DNR Forester
Fred Freeman, DNR Forester
Amy Mercer, DNR State Forest Planner
Teague Prichard, DNR State Forest Planner

Menard Island Resource Area, Peters Marsh WA, Upper Wolf River FA, Woods Flowage FA, August 15, 2012

Chuck McCullough
Andy Shaney
Mike Lietz
Terry Trapp
Pam Freeman-Gillen
Gary Bartz
Deanna Sell, State Forest Operations
Mark Heyde, Forestry Certification Coordinator

Closing Meeting, Northeast District Office, Green Bay, August 16, 2012

Mark Heyde, Division of Forestry, Forest Certification Coordinator
Teague Prichard, DNR State Forest Planner
Amy Mercer, DNR State Forest Planner
Deanna Sell, State Forest Operations
Craig Thompson, Endangered Resources

Randy Hoffman, Endangered Resources
 Jean Romback-Bartels, Customer and Employee Services Division Director
 Tim Mella, Bureau of Lands

List of FME Staff Consulted by Telephone Participation in Meetings:

Opening Meeting, August 13, 2012

Steve Miller, Lands and Facilities Bureau Director
 Jeff Pritzl, Wildlife Supervisor, Northeast District
 Sanjay Olson, Division of Lands Deputy Division Administrator
 Randy Hoffman, Endangered Resources, State Natural Area Coordinator
 Rebecca Schroeder, Endangered Resources Section Chief
 Darrell Zastrow, Division of Forestry Deputy Division Administrator
 Robert (Bob) Mather, Bureau of Forest Management Director
 Kevin Wallenfang, Bureau of Wildlife, Big Game Biologist

Closing Meeting, August 16, 2012

Steve Miller, Lands and Facilities Bureau Director
 Sanjay Olson, Division of Lands Deputy Division Administrator
 Rebecca Schroeder, Endangered Resources Section Chief
 Darrell Zastrow, Division of Forestry Deputy Division Administrator
 Bob Mather, Director, Bureau of Forest Management
 Jeff Pritzl, DNR Wildlife
 Bill Vander Zouwen, DNR Wildlife
 JoAnn Farnsworth, DNR Wildlife
 Kurt Theide, Division of Lands Administrator
 Jeff Prey, Bureau of Lands
 Joe Schwantes, Forestry
 Wendy McCown, Forestry Business Services Director
 Jim Warren, Public and Private Forestry Section Chief

List of other Stakeholders Consulted

No other stakeholders were consulted.

Appendix 5 – Pesticide Derogations

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> There are no active pesticide derogations for this FME.

Appendix 6 – Detailed Observations

Evaluation Year	FSC P&C Reviewed
2008	All – (Re)certification Evaluation
2009	P3 and P7
2010	P6
2011	Criteria 1.2, 1.5, 1.6, 2.3, 3.2, 4.2, 4.4, 4.5, 5.5, 5.6,

	6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.9, 6.10, 7.1, 8.1, 8.2, and 9.4.
2012	Criteria 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.2, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 5.6, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.9, 8.2, 8.3, 8.4 and 8.5, and P9.

C= Conformance with Criterion or Indicator

NC= Non-Conformance with Criterion or Indicator

NA = Not Applicable

NE = Not Evaluated

REQUIREMENT	C/N C	COMMENT/CAR
P1 Forest management shall respect all applicable laws of the country in which they occur, and international treaties and agreements to which the country is a signatory, and comply with all FSC Principles and Criteria.		
C1.1 Forest management shall respect all national and local laws and administrative requirements.	C	
1.1.a. Forest management plans and operations demonstrate compliance with all applicable federal, state, county, municipal, and tribal laws, and administrative requirements (e.g., regulations). Violations, outstanding complaints or investigations are provided to the Certifying Body (CB) during the annual audit.	C	There is no evidence that DNR is not in compliance with any applicable federal, state, county, municipal, or tribal law. No outstanding violations were reported to the CB.
1.1.b. To facilitate legal compliance, the forest owner or manager ensures that employees and contractors, commensurate with their responsibilities, are duly informed about applicable laws and regulations.	NC	DNR has not compiled a listing of the applicable federal, state, county, municipal, and tribal laws to facilitate determination of conformance with FSC US 1.1.a and to ensure that employees and contractors are duly informed about applicable laws and regulations. See CAR 2012.1.
C1.3. In signatory countries, the provisions of all binding international agreements such as CITES, ILO Conventions, ITTA, and Convention on Biological Diversity, shall be respected.	C	
1.3.a. Forest management plans and operations comply with relevant provisions of all applicable binding international agreements.	C	Relevant international statutes concern trade in endangered species and employment conditions. The State of Wisconsin and DNR comply with these statutes.
C1.4. Conflicts between laws, regulations and the FSC Principles and Criteria shall be evaluated for the purposes of certification, on a case by case basis, by the certifiers and the involved or affected parties.	C	
1.4.a. Situations in which compliance with laws or regulations conflicts with compliance with FSC Principles, Criteria or Indicators are documented and referred to the CB.	C	There are no situations whereby laws or regulations conflict with FSC Principles, but the client is aware of the protocol in the event of such a conflict.
C1.5. Forest management areas should be protected from illegal harvesting, settlement and other unauthorized activities.	C	
1.5.a. The forest owner or manager supports or implements measures intended to prevent illegal and unauthorized activities on the Forest Management Unit (FMU).	C	DNR demonstrates measures to mark boundaries (especially when shared with private owners), post signs, and enforce unauthorized use. Many DNR field staff are certified as law enforcement agents.
1.5.b. If illegal or unauthorized activities occur, the forest owner or manager implements actions designed to curtail such activities and correct the situation to the extent possible for meeting all land management objectives with consideration of available resources.	C	Numbers of illegal and authorized activities are relatively low, considering the large number of parcels of state lands. Several examples were provided to the audit team where illegal activities were pursued and resolved in the past year.

P2 Long-term tenure and use rights to the land and forest resources shall be clearly defined, documented and legally established.		
C2.1. Clear evidence of long-term forest use rights to the land (e.g., land title, customary rights, or lease agreements) shall be demonstrated.	C	
2.1.a. The forest owner or manager provides clear evidence of <i>long-term</i> rights to use and manage the FMU for the purposes described in the management plan.	C	A number of state statutes reviewed by the auditors confirm the rights to acquire lands into long-term state ownership and to manage these lands as directed by authorizing legislation.
2.1.b. The forest owner or manager identifies and documents legally established use and access rights associated with the FMU that are held by other parties.	C	Auditors were presented with several examples of access rights on state lands. Use rights are clearly defined in current management plans, e.g., Master Plan for Northern Highlands American Legion State Forest (NHAL).
2.1.c. Boundaries of land ownership and use rights are clearly identified on the ground and on maps prior to commencing management activities in the vicinity of the boundaries.	C	Boundaries are clearly marked and maintained regularly, especially where adjacent lands are privately owned. In addition, signs are normally posted at boundary corners, along key roads, and at major access points.
C2.2. Local communities with legal or customary tenure or use rights shall maintain control, to the extent necessary to protect their rights or resources, over forest operations unless they delegate control with free and informed consent to other agencies.	C	
2.2.a. The forest owner or manager allows the exercise of <i>tenure</i> and <i>use rights</i> allowable by law or regulation.	C	Examples of conformance vary by parcel. Some acquisitions of state lands specify certain traditional uses (e.g., snowmobile trails on Amberg Wildlife Area). All lands offer opportunities for traditional uses to American Indian tribes, mostly the harvest of various plant products (e.g., berries, bark, boughs on NHAL).
2.2.b. In FMUs where tenure or use rights held by others exist, the forest owner or manager consults with groups that hold such rights so that management activities do not significantly impact the uses or benefits of such rights.	C	Such consultation is common, e.g., formal consultation with Indian Tribes, agreements with ATV and snowmobile clubs, hiking clubs, hunting clubs, etc.
C2.3. Appropriate mechanisms shall be employed to resolve disputes over tenure claims and use rights. The circumstances and status of any outstanding disputes will be explicitly considered in the certification evaluation. Disputes of substantial magnitude involving a significant number of interests will normally disqualify an operation from being certified.	C	
2.3.a. If <i>disputes</i> arise regarding tenure claims or use rights then the forest owner or manager initially attempts to resolve them through open communication, negotiation, and/or mediation. If these good-faith efforts fail, then federal, state, and/or local laws are employed to resolve such disputes.	C	A written request from a DNR administrator in Madison to property managers of state lands resulted in a listing of 6-10 disputes over property rights in the past year. Resolutions were being sought in all cases, some by the property managers, and others by DNR legal staff.
2.3.b. The forest owner or manager documents any significant disputes over tenure and use rights.	C	See above.
P3 The legal and customary rights of indigenous peoples to own, use and manage their lands, territories, and resources shall be recognized and respected.		
C3.2. Forest management shall not threaten or diminish, either directly or indirectly, the resources or tenure rights of indigenous peoples.	C	
3.2.a. During management planning, the forest owner or manager consults with American Indian groups that have legal rights or other binding agreements to the FMU to avoid harming their resources or rights.	C	DNR has a long history of consultation with the 11 American Indian tribes in Wisconsin. Jim Warren is the supervisory liaison with tribes, but eight other DNR personnel serve as liaisons for individual tribes. There also is a task force for off-reservation communication.

		There are no significant disputes over resources or rights, and numerous examples where DNR has allowed the harvest of traditional resources (berries, bark, boughs, maple sap), which are tracked by tribal officials and reported to DNR.
3.2.b. Demonstrable actions are taken so that forest management does not adversely affect tribal resources. When applicable, evidence of, and measures for, protecting tribal resources are incorporated in the management plan.	C	Known sites of importance to tribes are protected during management. Comments are solicited from tribal members during the development of master plans as well as pre-harvest planning.
P4 Forest management operations shall maintain or enhance the long-term social and economic well-being of forest workers and local communities.		
C4.1. The communities within, or adjacent to, the forest management area should be given opportunities for employment, training, and other services.	C	
4.1.a. Employee compensation and hiring practices meet or exceed the prevailing <i>local</i> norms within the forestry industry.	C	Wisconsin has a history of competitive compensation and benefits for natural resource professionals employed by the state. Employees have lost ground in recent years, however, receiving no salary increases in four years in addition to increasing co-payments for retirement programs and health insurance. These losses have occurred during a period of economic distress for many state and local governments, however, thus compensation has not deviated significantly from the local norm.
4.1.b. Forest work is offered in ways that create high quality job opportunities for employees.	C	Wisconsin DNR is a large agency with a diversity of job descriptions and ample opportunities for advancement.
4.1.c. Forest workers are provided with fair wages.	C	As a state agency, Wisconsin has consistent standards for wages. Wages are not established for logging contractors, independent business people who bid for timber sales.
4.1.d. Hiring practices and conditions of employment are non-discriminatory and follow applicable federal, state and local regulations.	C	Human resources staff for state government assures that hiring and working conditions are non-discriminatory and compliant with application laws.
4.1.e. The forest owner or manager provides work opportunities to qualified local applicants and seeks opportunities for purchasing local goods and services of equal price and quality.	C	Most logging contractors are local, and sales are advertised in different sizes to provide opportunities for both large and small businesses. DNR offices are located throughout the state, offering local employment for office staff, maintenance workers, and local vendors.
4.1.f. Commensurate with the size and scale of operation, the forest owner or manager provides and/or supports learning opportunities to improve public understanding of forests and forest management.	C	Examples of learning opportunities are numerous: teaching in local schools, field trips for various groups, special opportunities for teen-agers from local tribes; displays at county fairs (during audit); interpretive center (visited in Pembine).
4.1.g. The forest owner or manager participates in local economic development and/or civic activities, based on scale of operation and where such opportunities are available.	C	Many DNR offices are in small communities, where employees of DNR often serve their communities on local boards and committees, coaching sports for youth, etc. Six DNR employees were questioned about their participation in local civic activities, and five responded with personnel examples.
C4.2. Forest management should meet or exceed all applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of employees and their families.	C	
4.2.a. The forest owner or manager meets or exceeds all applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of employees and their families (also see Criterion 1.1).	C	Health and safety of employees and the public is an important concern of state government. DNR employees participate in periodic safety training, and demonstrate safe practices. Wall posters in DNR offices serve as

		reminders.
4.2.b. The forest owner or manager and their employees and contractors demonstrate a safe work environment. Contracts or other written agreements include safety requirements.	C	DNR employees participate in periodic safety training, and demonstrate safe practices. Contracts with loggers specify compliance with OSHA requirements. However, loggers interviewed in the field were not employing personal protective gear. See OBS 2012.2
4.2.c. The forest owner or manager hires well-qualified service providers to safely implement the management plan.	C	Service providers observed during the field audit appeared to be well qualified, as assured by the language of state contracts. The audit provided only a single opportunity to interview a logging contractor, who was current in FISTA training, a certification course for loggers.
C4.3 The rights of workers to organize and voluntarily negotiate with their employers shall be guaranteed as outlined in Conventions 87 and 98 of the International Labor Organization (ILO).	C	
4.3.a. Forest workers are free to associate with other workers for the purpose of advocating for their own employment interests.	C	Although Wisconsin state employees have recently lost much of the bargaining power of their unions, employees are still free to belong to unions and to advocate for wages.
4.3.b. The forest owner or manager has effective and culturally sensitive mechanisms to resolve disputes between workers and management.	C	Detailed procedures are available for resolving disputes between workers and management, as would be expected of state government.
C4.4. Management planning and operations shall incorporate the results of evaluations of social impact. Consultations shall be maintained with people and groups (both men and women) directly affected by management operations.	C	
4.4.a. The forest owner or manager understands the likely social impacts of management activities, and incorporates this understanding into management planning and operations. Social impacts include effects on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Archeological sites and sites of cultural, historical and community significance (on and off the FMU); • Public resources, including air, water and food (hunting, fishing, collecting); • Aesthetics; • Community goals for forest and natural resource use and protection such as employment, subsistence, recreation and health; • Community economic opportunities; • Other people who may be affected by management operations. A summary is available to the CB.	C	In response to CAR 2011.2, DNR presented a summary of the mechanisms employed on a regular basis to assess the social impacts of state land ownership and management.
4.4.b. The forest owner or manager seeks and considers input in management planning from people who would likely be affected by management activities.	C	Input from the public is requested as part of the Wisconsin Environmental Policy Act (WEPA); Act 21, which requires an economic analysis of agency rules; master planning for state lands; and meetings to discuss integrated property management; among others. Special consideration is shown to tribal members in all cases.
4.4.c. People who are subject to direct adverse effects of management operations are apprised of relevant activities in advance of the action so that they may express concern.	C	Although the effects are not necessarily adverse, DNR land managers routinely contact adjacent landowners—especially private owners—before initiating and site disturbing practices.
4.4.d. For public forests , consultation shall include the		See 4.4.b above for a list of opportunities for

<p>following components:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clearly defined and accessible methods for public participation are provided in both long and short-term planning processes, including harvest plans and operational plans; 2. Public notification is sufficient to allow interested stakeholders the chance to learn of upcoming opportunities for public review and/or comment on the proposed management; 3. An accessible and affordable appeals process to planning decisions is available. <p>Planning decisions incorporate the results of public consultation. All draft and final planning documents, and their supporting data, are made readily available to the public.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>consultation. Except for instances where master plans are not current (See 6.1) DNR provides numerous opportunities for public participation, and follows through by including responses to such input in appropriate documents. DNR websites offer a wide range draft and final planning documents, although there are some inconsistencies in maintaining web sites.</p>
<p>P5 Forest management operations shall encourage the efficient use of the forest’s multiple products and services to ensure economic viability and a wide range of environmental and social benefits.</p>		
<p>C5.1. Forest management should strive toward economic viability, while taking into account the full environmental, social, and operational costs of production, and ensuring the investments necessary to maintain the ecological productivity of the forest.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>5.1.a. The forest owner or manager is financially able to implement core management activities, including all those environmental, social and operating costs, required to meet this Standard, and investment and reinvestment in forest management.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The Division of Forestry is well-funded through a statewide property tax. Wildlife, Parks, and Endangered Resources rely mostly on user fees and grants, but funding remains adequate for essential management activities.</p>
<p>5.1.b. Responses to short-term financial factors are limited to levels that are consistent with fulfillment of this Standard.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Short-term fluctuations in finances are not as significant for state agencies that do not rely directly on revenues from timber sales.</p>
<p>C5.2. Forest management and marketing operations should encourage the optimal use and local processing of the forest’s diversity of products.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>5.2.a. Where forest products are harvested or sold, opportunities for forest product sales and services are given to local harvesters, value-added processing and manufacturing facilities, guiding services, and other operations that are able to offer services at competitive rates and levels of service.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Auditors visited more than 30 sites where contract work was in progress or had been completed in recently years, and observed that most contractors were local.</p>
<p>5.2.b. The forest owner or manager takes measures to optimize the use of harvested forest products and explores product diversification where appropriate and consistent with management objectives.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>DNR employs Forest Products Specialists to work with forest industry to develop markets, assure the best use of fiber, and to pilot new logging technologies.</p>
<p>5.2.c. On public lands where forest products are harvested and sold, some sales of forest products or contracts are scaled or structured to allow small business to bid competitively.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>DNR consciously establishes sales of various sizes to allow a diversity of businesses to compete for contracts. Site visits confirmed the practice.</p>
<p>C5.3. Forest management should minimize waste associated with harvesting and on-site processing operations and avoid damage to other forest resources.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>5.3.a. Management practices are employed to minimize the loss and/or waste of harvested forest products.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Harvesting contracts inspected during the audit stress the careful utilization of forest products, and inspections of recent harvests confirm conformance by contractors. In anticipation of a growing market for biomass, DNR is preparing a Biomass Harvesting handbook.</p>
<p>5.3.b. Harvest practices are managed to protect residual trees and other forest resources, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • soil compaction, rutting and erosion are 	<p>C</p>	<p>Soil maps are included in the assessment of each site before harvest, as are water and other sensitive resources. Almost all harvesting on state lands is done</p>

<p>minimized;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> residual trees are not significantly damaged to the extent that health, growth, or values are noticeably affected; damage to NTFPs is minimized during management activities; and techniques and equipment that minimize impacts to vegetation, soil, and water are used whenever feasible. 		<p>with processors and forwarders. Field inspections confirmed an exceptionally low incidence of damage to residual trees, soils, and regeneration. Led by a department hydrologist, DNR is developing a regional reputation for its careful protection of soil and water resources during harvesting.</p>
<p>C5.4. Forest management should strive to strengthen and diversify the local economy, avoiding dependence on a single forest product.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>5.4.a. The forest owner or manager demonstrates knowledge of their operation’s effect on the local economy as it relates to existing and potential markets for a wide variety of timber and non-timber forest products and services.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>DNR makes every effort to respond to markets for both timber and non-timber products from their lands. Recreational opportunities, in particular, are abundant and well managed. Numerous examples of working with local clubs (snowmobiles, ATV, silent sports, etc.) were observed during the audit.</p>
<p>5.4.b The forest owner or manager strives to diversify the economic use of the forest according to Indicator 5.4.a.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>As public lands, DNR manages for much more than economic uses, but still responds to legislative mandates for pursuing allowable harvest.</p>
<p>C5.6. The rate of harvest of forest products shall not exceed levels which can be permanently sustained.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>5.6.a. In FMUs where products are being harvested, the landowner or manager calculates the sustained yield harvest level for each sustained yield planning unit, and provides clear rationale for determining the size and layout of the planning unit. The sustained yield harvest level calculation is documented in the Management Plan.</p> <p>The sustained yield harvest level calculation for each planning unit is based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> documented growth rates for particular sites, and/or acreage of forest types, age-classes and species distributions; mortality and decay and other factors that affect net growth; areas reserved from harvest or subject to harvest restrictions to meet other management goals; silvicultural practices that will be employed on the FMU; management objectives and desired future conditions. <p>The calculation is made by considering the effects of repeated prescribed harvests on the product/species and its ecosystem, as well as planned management treatments and projections of subsequent regrowth beyond single rotation and multiple re-entries.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The sustained yield harvest in an output of the Wisconsin Forest Inventory and Reporting System (WisFIRS), and is routinely projected for 15 years. At present, growth rates are not used in projections, although a CFI system is being implemented that will allow calculation of growth. Instead, forest stands are visited on a 10-year cycle for reconnaissance, which includes measurements of volume. Recon data are considered in the annual update of 15-year harvest projections.</p>
<p>5.6.b. Average annual harvest levels, over rolling periods of no more than 10 years, do not exceed the calculated sustained yield harvest level.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>In 2011, timber sales were scheduled or completed for 27,165 acres. The 15-year projected AAH is 26,130, which includes the smoothed backlog of harvesting due, in part, to the addition of “other” state lands into the universe of managed lands.</p>
<p>5.6.c. Rates and methods of timber harvest lead to achieving desired conditions, and improve or maintain</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Master plans clearly set desired conditions for different forest types and age classes on each property.</p>

<p>health and quality across the FMU. Overstocked stands and stands that have been depleted or rendered to be below productive potential due to natural events, past management, or lack of management, are returned to desired stocking levels and composition at the earliest practicable time as justified in management objectives.</p>		<p>Management codes for each stand are established to move the land unit toward these conditions. Several site visits during the audit were to stands that were being restored to historical conditions and to stands that were being managed to accelerate development of old-growth conditions.</p>
<p>5.6.d. For NTFPs, calculation of quantitative sustained yield harvest levels is required only in cases where products are harvested in significant commercial operations or where traditional or customary use rights may be impacted by such harvests. In other situations, the forest owner or manager utilizes available information, and new information that can be reasonably gathered, to set harvesting levels that will not result in a depletion of the non-timber growing stocks or other adverse effects to the forest ecosystem.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>NTFPs include firewood, berries, bark, and boughs. Permits are issued for firewood cutting, in small quantities; berry picking occurs in several locations, but there is no indication that any of it is commercial. Tribes track the harvest of their members and report to DNR annually.</p>
<p>P6 Forest management shall conserve biological diversity and its associated values, water resources, soils, and unique and fragile ecosystems and landscapes, and, by so doing, maintain the ecological functions and the integrity of the forest.</p>		
<p>C6.1. Assessments of environmental impacts shall be completed -- appropriate to the scale, intensity of forest management and the uniqueness of the affected resources -- and adequately integrated into management systems. Assessments shall include landscape level considerations as well as the impacts of on-site processing facilities. Environmental impacts shall be assessed prior to commencement of site-disturbing operations.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>6.1.a. Using the results of credible scientific analysis, best available information (including relevant databases), and local knowledge and experience, an assessment of conditions on the FMU is completed and includes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Forest community types and development, size class and/or successional stages, and associated natural disturbance regimes; 2) Rare, Threatened and Endangered (RTE) species and rare ecological communities (including plant communities); 3) Other habitats and species of management concern; 4) Water resources and associated riparian habitats and hydrologic functions; 5) Soil resources; and 6) Historic conditions on the FMU related to forest community types and development, size class and/or successional stages, and a broad comparison of historic and current conditions. 	<p>C</p>	<p>Except where planning documents are out of date (see below), assessments of environmental impacts include all elements presented in this indicator.</p>
<p>6.1.b. Prior to commencing site-disturbing activities, the forest owner or manager assesses and documents the potential short and long-term impacts of planned management activities on elements 1-5 listed in Criterion 6.1.a.</p> <p>The assessment must incorporate the best available information, drawing from scientific literature and experts. The impact assessment will at minimum include identifying resources that may be impacted by management (e.g., streams, habitats of management</p>	<p>NC</p>	<p>For lands not covered by either a NR44-compliant master plan or a landscape-focused plan, there are examples of site disturbing activities are being carried out without completing an Interim Forest Management Plan. See CAR 2012.3.</p>

<p>concern, soil nutrients). Additional detail (i.e., detailed description or quantification of impacts) will vary depending on the uniqueness of the resource, potential risks, and steps that will be taken to avoid and minimize risks.</p>		
<p>6.1.c. Using the findings of the impact assessment (Indicator 6.1.b), management approaches and field prescriptions are developed and implemented that: 1) avoid or minimize negative short-term and long-term impacts; and, 2) maintain and/or enhance the long-term ecological viability of the forest.</p>	C	<p>Plans inspected during the audit, when current, clearly present methods to avoid negative environment impacts and to enhance the long-term viability of the forest. Even where plans are out-dated, a number of guidance handbooks (e.g., silviculture handbook, old-growth handbook) and other documents assure conformance when used as guides for field prescriptions.</p>
<p>6.1.d. On public lands, assessments developed in Indicator 6.1.a and management approaches developed in Indicator 6.1.c are made available to the public in draft form for review and comment prior to finalization. Final assessments are also made available.</p>	C	<p>The process for developing property-specific master plans and interim plans does include steps for involving the public in developing draft and final plans. Final assessments are available to the public on departmental web sites or by request in DNR offices.</p>
<p>C 6.2. Safeguards shall exist which protect rare, threatened and endangered species and their habitats (e.g., nesting and feeding areas). Conservation zones and protection areas shall be established, appropriate to the scale and intensity of forest management and the uniqueness of the affected resources. Inappropriate hunting, fishing, trapping, and collecting shall be controlled.</p>	C	
<p>6.2.a. If there is a likely presence of RTE species as identified in Indicator 6.1.a then either a field survey to verify the species' presence or absence is conducted prior to site-disturbing management activities, or management occurs with the assumption that potential RTE species are present.</p> <p>Surveys are conducted by biologists with the appropriate expertise in the species of interest and with appropriate qualifications to conduct the surveys. If a species is determined to be present, its location should be reported to the manager of the appropriate database.</p>	C	<p>DNR has a thorough process for addressing this indicator. Prior to master planning, field surveys are conducted by ecologists from the Bureau of Endangered Resources. Thus, any RTE species known to the ecologists or documented in the survey is considered in the planning process. In addition, any planned harvesting activity is reviewed by representatives from all relevant divisions of DNR, and NHI databases are referenced.</p>
<p>6.2.b. When RTE species are present or assumed to be present, modifications in management are made in order to maintain, restore or enhance the extent, quality and viability of the species and their habitats. Conservation zones and/or protected areas are established for RTE species, including those S3 species that are considered rare, where they are necessary to maintain or improve the short and long-term viability of the species. Conservation measures are based on relevant science, guidelines and/or consultation with relevant, independent experts as necessary to achieve the conservation goal of the Indicator.</p>	C	<p>As above, pre-management reviews are conducted with a diverse group of personnel. Also, Form 2460 is required as part of a timber sale. This forms lists, among other things, descriptions of a number of ecological considerations, and the appropriate management response. Several sites visited during the audit had known occurrences of the Wood Turtle, a listed species, leading to a restriction of logging to the winter months.</p>
<p>6.2.c. For medium and large public forests (e.g. state forests), forest management plans and operations are designed to meet species' recovery goals, as well as landscape level biodiversity conservation goals.</p>	C	<p>These priorities are evident when reviewing a number of Form 2460s and observing the close working relationship among DNR foresters, wildlife and fisheries biologist, and ER ecologists.</p>
<p>6.2.d. Within the capacity of the forest owner or manager, hunting, fishing, trapping, collecting and other activities are controlled to avoid the risk of impacts to</p>	C	<p>Obviously, on lands managed by the Department that controls hunting, fishing, and trapping, risks to vulnerable communities and species are minimized. A</p>

vulnerable species and communities (See Criterion 1.5).		caveat, however, is that the state legislation can override recommendations from DNR concerning harvest regulations for wildlife. A concern may be the level of the deer population in the state and effects of over-browsing on the forest community.
C6.3. Ecological functions and values shall be maintained intact, enhanced, or restored, including: a) Forest regeneration and succession. b) Genetic, species, and ecosystem diversity. c) Natural cycles that affect the productivity of the forest ecosystem.	C	
C6.3.a. Landscape-scale indicators	C	
6.3.a.1. The forest owner or manager maintains, enhances, and/or restores under-represented successional stages in the FMU that would naturally occur on the types of sites found on the FMU. Where old growth of different community types that would naturally occur on the forest are under-represented in the landscape relative to natural conditions, a portion of the forest is managed to enhance and/or restore old growth characteristics.	C	Sites visited in 2012 have active management plans to maintain and restore hemlock and pine forest habitats. Active burning programs in SNAs are implemented to maintain open wetland and barrens type habitats. They are also participating with the USFWS to shear decadent alder habitat to provide early successional habitat for wildlife species (American woodcock and golden-winged warbler).
6.3.a.2. When a rare ecological community is present, modifications are made in both the management plan and its implementation in order to maintain, restore or enhance the viability of the community. Based on the vulnerability of the existing community, conservation zones and/or protected areas are established where warranted.	C	If a rare ecological community is present, it is identified in the state's NHI database. This database is searched for rare elements in the planning of management activities on all sales. If an NHI hit is found, an appropriate biologist/ecologist is consulted and the site is protected by buffers or by limiting harvest to the winter season (as examples).
<p>6.3.a.3. When they are present, management maintains the area, structure, composition, and processes of all Type 1 and Type 2 old growth. Type 1 and 2 old growth are also protected and buffered as necessary with conservation zones, unless an alternative plan is developed that provides greater overall protection of old growth values.</p> <p>Type 1 Old Growth is protected from harvesting and road construction. Type 1 old growth is also protected from other timber management activities, except as needed to maintain the ecological values associated with the stand, including old growth attributes (e.g., remove exotic species, conduct controlled burning, and thinning from below in dry forest types when and where restoration is appropriate).</p> <p>Type 2 Old Growth is protected from harvesting to the extent necessary to maintain the area, structures, and functions of the stand. Timber harvest in Type 2 old growth must maintain old growth structures, functions, and components including individual trees that function as refugia (see Indicator 6.3.g).</p> <p>On public lands, old growth is protected from harvesting, as well as from other timber management activities, except if needed to maintain the values associated with the stand (e.g., remove exotic species, conduct controlled burning, and thinning from below in forest types when and where restoration is appropriate).</p>	C	DNR is very aware of the importance of identifying and protecting old-growth forests. To that end, systematic reconnaissance of all forest stands on state lands uses three codes to designate different levels of late successional forests: relict forest, old-growth forest, and old forest. The relict forest designation corresponds to FSC Type 1 old growth; these forests are also coded as reserved. Auditors visited several sites (e.g., old-growth research plots, NHAL, and Savage Lake sale) where late seral forest stands are being managed to accelerate the development of old-growth characteristics. DNR also have developed an Old-Growth and Old Forest Handbook to assist in the assessment, classification, and management of old forests. In short, the Department is demonstrating exemplary efforts to protect to promote old-growth forest stands of a range of forest types.

<p>On American Indian lands, timber harvest may be permitted in Type 1 and Type 2 old growth in recognition of their sovereignty and unique ownership. Timber harvest is permitted in situations where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Old growth forests comprise a significant portion of the tribal ownership. 2. A history of forest stewardship by the tribe exists. 3. High Conservation Value Forest attributes are maintained. 4. Old-growth structures are maintained. 5. Conservation zones representative of old growth stands are established. 6. Landscape level considerations are addressed. 7. Rare species are protected. 		
<p>6.3.b. To the extent feasible within the size of the ownership, particularly on larger ownerships (generally tens of thousands or more acres), management maintains, enhances, or restores habitat conditions suitable for well-distributed populations of animal species that are characteristic of forest ecosystems within the landscape.</p>	C	<p>DNR forests management goals are ecologically oriented and management is conducted to maintain ecological habitat conditions that are suited to each site. These decisions are aided by the habitat classification that is done as a component of reconnaissance surveys for each site. Sites visited in 2012 had prescriptions that would allow natural regeneration and succession to occur on the site. For example, old pine plantations will be allowed to succeed to hardwoods where natural regeneration allows.</p>
<p>6.3.c. Management maintains, enhances and/or restores the plant and wildlife habitat of Riparian Management Zones (RMZs) to provide:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) habitat for aquatic species that breed in surrounding uplands; b) habitat for predominantly terrestrial species that breed in adjacent aquatic habitats; c) habitat for species that use riparian areas for feeding, cover, and travel; d) habitat for plant species associated with riparian areas; and, e) stream shading and inputs of wood and leaf litter into the adjacent aquatic ecosystem. 	C	<p>Revisions to the Wisconsin Best Management Practices took effect in January 2011; these specify additional protection for all wetlands, particularly seasonal wetlands, many of which are small but some of which are ecologically significant; foresters and loggers are aware of these provisions and work to implement them.</p> <p>Water quality considerations including lakes or rivers potentially affected by the harvest are documented for each proposed harvest on a Form 2460 and this information is reflected in the harvesting requirements within the timber sale contracts.</p> <p>Sale and/or harvest unit boundaries are designed to avoid or buffer wetlands, stream, lakes, and other water bodies. Riparian buffers associated with harvests are shown on maps and marked on the ground. Confirmed by field observations that non-forested wetlands are protected by excluding them from sales where possible, and by buffering them using special colors of paint to indicate “no harvest” or “no equipment,” or by not marking any trees for harvest. Very small non-forested wetlands are generally protected; loggers try to avoid these, and foresters work to communicate their locations, but some are entered on occasion. Many sites with significant areas of included wetlands (forested and/or non-forested) are designated for winter harvest only.</p> <p>Field audits in 2012 confirmed that foresters are knowledgeable of BMP requirements to protect these wetland elements and are doing an excellent job of implementing them on harvest sites.</p>
<p>Stand-scale Indicators</p>	C	<p>Management prescriptions for sites visited in 2012 were</p>

<p>6.3.d Management practices maintain or enhance plant species composition, distribution and frequency of occurrence similar to those that would naturally occur on the site.</p>		<p>written to enhance or maintain current or desired composition of plant species on the site. Foresters are concerned that regeneration of some desired species like white pine and red oak are difficult to achieve due to high deer browse.</p>
<p>6.3.e. When planting is required, a local source of known provenance is used when available and when the local source is equivalent in terms of quality, price and productivity. The use of non-local sources shall be justified, such as in situations where other management objectives (e.g. disease resistance or adapting to climate change) are best served by non-local sources. Native species suited to the site are normally selected for regeneration.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Planting stock is provided by Wisconsin state nurseries, and seed sources are local.</p>
<p>6.3.f. Management maintains, enhances, or restores habitat components and associated stand structures, in abundance and distribution that could be expected from naturally occurring processes. These components include: a) large live trees, live trees with decay or declining health, snags, and well-distributed coarse down and dead woody material. Legacy trees where present are not harvested; and b) vertical and horizontal complexity. Trees selected for retention are generally representative of the dominant species found on the site.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>DNR personnel employ statewide silvicultural guidelines for retaining structural diversity in even-aged management systems. Personnel attended training to gain understanding and application of the new green tree retention standards. Based on recent revisions to the wildlife chapter in the Silviculture Manual foresters are marking more leave trees (individual) and painting off more pockets or clumps of leave trees, especially around wetlands. The definition of Legacy trees is working its way into the silviculture handbook. The new provisions, which they are using already, require that legacy trees be described in the 2460 narrative and then indicated on the GIS (WisFIRs).</p>
<p>6.3.g.1 In the Southeast, Appalachia, Ozark-Ouachita, Mississippi Alluvial Valley, and Pacific Coast Regions, when even-aged systems are employed, and during salvage harvests, live trees and other native vegetation are retained within the harvest unit as described in Appendix C for the applicable region. In the Lake States Northeast, Rocky Mountain and Southwest Regions, when even-aged silvicultural systems are employed, and during salvage harvests, live trees and other native vegetation are retained within the harvest unit in a proportion and configuration that is consistent with the characteristic natural disturbance regime unless retention at a lower level is necessary for the purposes of restoration or rehabilitation. See Appendix C for additional regional requirements and guidance.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>DNR foresters routinely retain green trees in a harvest by prescription and by marking wildlife trees. In addition, native vegetation is retained in riparian buffers and in retention islands.</p>
<p>6.3.g.2 Under very limited situations, the landowner or manager has the option to develop a qualified plan to allow minor departure from the opening size limits described in Indicator 6.3.g.1. A qualified plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is developed by qualified experts in ecological and/or related fields (wildlife biology, hydrology, landscape ecology, forestry/silviculture). 2. Is based on the totality of the best available information including peer-reviewed science regarding natural disturbance regimes for the FMU. 3. Is spatially and temporally explicit and includes maps of proposed openings or areas. 	<p>NA</p>	<p>There are no opening-size limits for the Lake States-Central Hardwoods region.</p>

<p>4. Demonstrates that the variations will result in equal or greater benefit to wildlife, water quality, and other values compared to the normal opening size limits, including for sensitive and rare species.</p> <p>5. Is reviewed by independent experts in wildlife biology, hydrology, and landscape ecology, to confirm the preceding findings.</p>		
<p>6.3.h. The forest owner or manager assesses the risk of, prioritizes, and, as warranted, develops and implements a strategy to prevent or control <i>invasive species</i>, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. a method to determine the extent of invasive species and the degree of threat to native species and ecosystems; 6. implementation of management practices that minimize the risk of invasive establishment, growth, and spread; 7. eradication or control of established invasive populations when feasible: and, 8. monitoring of control measures and management practices to assess their effectiveness in preventing or controlling invasive species. 	C	<p>All areas visited in 2012 have strong programs to limit the introduction and spread of exotic plants. Many contracts specify that logging equipment is cleaned before harvest is initiated. Staff are well-trained in invasive species BMPs. DNR monitors the effectiveness of their control measures and routinely make changes to methodology to control invasive species. Parks are especially active in controlling invasive species. Recon inventories, at least every 10 years, document the nature and extent of invasive species.</p>
<p>6.3.i. In applicable situations, the forest owner or manager identifies and applies site-specific fuels management practices, based on: (1) natural fire regimes, (2) risk of wildfire, (3) potential economic losses, (4) public safety, and (5) applicable laws and regulations.</p>	C	<p>DNR uses prescribed fire in wildlife management work to maintain open habitat characteristics of lowland and upland habitat. Prescribed fires are planned and controlled to meet safety and risk requirements. Many DNR personnel are certified fire fighters, and respond to wildfires when necessary.</p>
<p>C6.4. Representative samples of existing ecosystems within the landscape shall be protected in their natural state and recorded on maps, appropriate to the scale and intensity of operations and the uniqueness of the affected resources.</p>	C	
<p>6.4.a. The forest owner or manager documents the ecosystems that would naturally exist on the FMU, and assesses the adequacy of their representation and protection in the <i>landscape</i> (see Criterion 7.1). The assessment for medium and large forests include some or all of the following: a) <i>GAP analyses</i>; b) collaboration with state natural heritage programs and other public agencies; c) regional, landscape, and watershed planning efforts; d) collaboration with universities and/or local conservation groups.</p> <p>For an area that is not located on the FMU to qualify as a Representative Sample Area (RSA), it should be under permanent protection in its natural state.</p> <p>.</p>	C	<p>DNR has identified ecosystems that occurred naturally across the landscape. A GAP analysis has been completed and Wisconsin's SNA program has documented locations of native ecosystems and have protected many of these sites as SNA's.</p>
<p>6.4.b. Where existing areas within the landscape, but external to the FMU, are not of adequate protection, size, and configuration to serve as representative samples of existing ecosystems, forest owners or managers, whose properties are conducive to the establishment of such areas, designate ecologically viable RSAs to serve these purposes.</p>	C	<p>The state's SNA program is still filling gaps in the protected area network and has identified candidate sites to be added to the network. When sites are identified as future SNAs they go through an evaluation process (usually a biotic inventory) and are then ranked as to their uniqueness in representation of the representative sample ecosystem.</p>

<p>Large FMUs are generally expected to establish RSAs of purpose 2 and 3 within the FMU.</p>		
<p>6.4.c. Management activities within RSAs are limited to low impact activities compatible with the protected RSA objectives, except under the following circumstances: a) harvesting activities only where they are necessary to restore or create conditions to meet the objectives of the protected RSA, or to mitigate conditions that interfere with achieving the RSA objectives; or b) road-building only where it is documented that it will contribute to minimizing the overall environmental impacts within the FMU and will not jeopardize the purpose for which the RSA was designated.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>SNAs are not exclusively passive management. Management plans where SNAs are present document the management activities that will be allowed on individual SNAs. Some examples of management on SNAs include the use of fire to retain open habitat conditions of some wetland types. One site (Spur Lake) visited in 2012 had a timber sale that was conducted to enhance old forest features. The SNA website outlines management activities that are allowed on SNAs (http://dnr.wi.gov/org/land/er/sna/napc.htm).</p>
<p>6.4.d. The RSA assessment (Indicator 6.4.a) shall be periodically reviewed and if necessary updated (at a minimum every 10 years) in order to determine if the need for RSAs has changed; the designation of RSAs (Indicator 6.4.b) is revised accordingly.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Established in 1985 by the Wisconsin legislature, Wisconsin's Natural Heritage Inventory program (NHI) is part of an international network of inventory programs. The program is responsible for maintaining data on the locations and status of rare species, natural communities, and natural features throughout the state. Species and natural communities tracked by the Wisconsin NHI Program can be found on the NHI Working List. New locations of rare species and communities are entered into the NHI database as they are found. The list is updated regularly (at least every 5 years).</p>
<p>6.4.e. Managers of large, contiguous public forests establish and maintain a network of representative protected areas sufficient in size to maintain species dependent on interior core habitats.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Where possible, the SNA program in WI identifies the largest stands and or blocks of representative ecosystems that are present on the landscape. Wisconsin has a program to identify and protect LSNA (Landscape Scale Natural Areas), which are required to be 640 acres in size.</p>
<p>C6.6. Management systems shall promote the development and adoption of environmentally friendly non-chemical methods of pest management and strive to avoid the use of chemical pesticides. World Health Organization Type 1A and 1B and chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides; pesticides that are persistent, toxic or whose derivatives remain biologically active and accumulate in the food chain beyond their intended use; as well as any pesticides banned by international agreement, shall be prohibited. If chemicals are used, proper equipment and training shall be provided to minimize health and environmental risks.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>6.6.a. No products on the FSC list of Highly Hazardous Pesticides are used (see FSC-POL-30-001 EN FSC Pesticides policy 2005 and associated documents).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Three instances of use of FSC-prohibited chemicals were discovered during internal audits by DNR (see 6.6.d). Corrective actions have already been taken to prevent such use in the future, thus it was determined that DNR is now in conformance.</p>
<p>6.6.b. All toxicants used to control pests and competing vegetation, including rodenticides, insecticides, herbicides, and fungicides are used only when and where non-chemical management practices are: a) not available; b) prohibitively expensive, taking into account overall</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>DNR has an intranet site that describes policies, procedures, required training and certification, as well as requirements for written plans and record keeping. In addition, a publication, "Wisconsin's Forestry Best Management Practices for Invasive Species," is readily</p>

<p>environmental and social costs, risks and benefits; c) the only effective means for controlling invasive and exotic species; or d) result in less environmental damage than non-chemical alternatives (e.g., top soil disturbance, loss of soil litter and down wood debris). If chemicals are used, the forest owner or manager uses the least environmentally damaging formulation and application method practical.</p> <p>Written strategies are developed and implemented that justify the use of chemical pesticides. Whenever feasible, an eventual phase-out of chemical use is included in the strategy. The written strategy shall include an analysis of options for, and the effects of, various chemical and non-chemical pest control strategies, with the goal of reducing or eliminating chemical use.</p>		<p>available on DNRs public web pages. The handbook discussed a variety of strategies for combating invasive species, which include chemical use.</p>
<p>6.6.c. Chemicals and application methods are selected to minimize risk to non-target species and sites. When considering the choice between aerial and ground application, the forest owner or manager evaluates the comparative risk to non-target species and sites, the comparative risk of worker exposure, and the overall amount and type of chemicals required.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Aerial applications are rarely used on state lands. The vast majority of chemical applications is on small areas of land and directed toward invasive plants. Auditors visited a jack pine clearcut on NHAL where herbicides were sprayed from ground-based equipment as the first step in site preparation, with hopes that aerial applications will not be necessary after planting.</p>
<p>6.6.d. Whenever chemicals are used, a written prescription is prepared that describes the site-specific hazards and environmental risks, and the precautions that workers will employ to avoid or minimize those hazards and risks, and includes a map of the treatment area. Chemicals are applied only by workers who have received proper training in application methods and safety. They are made aware of the risks, wear proper safety equipment, and are trained to minimize environmental impacts on non-target species and sites.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>CAR 2011.7 was issued to address an instance where chemicals were being applied without a written prescription. DNRs respond to this has been to form a Pesticide Use Team, which is revising manuals, developing a training plan, and establishing better channels for communication and reporting. As the team conducted its work in 2012, three instances were discovered of use of FSC-banned chemicals. All were applied in small amounts and all were across-the-counter products, purchased locally.</p>
<p>6.6.e. If chemicals are used, the effects are monitored and the results are used for adaptive management. Records are kept of pest occurrences, control measures, and incidences of worker exposure to chemicals.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Adequate requirements for record-keeping are posted on DNR's intranet. Adaptive management is a product of a Citizen's Advisory Committee on Invasive Species.</p>
<p>C6.9. The use of exotic species shall be carefully controlled and actively monitored to avoid adverse ecological impacts.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>6.9.a. The use of <i>exotic species</i> is contingent on the availability of credible scientific data indicating that any such species is non-invasive and its application does not pose a risk to native biodiversity.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Only native tree species are planted on DNR state lands, and seed sources are local. Where grasses and other herbaceous vegetation are planted on log landings or openings for wildlife, approved seed mixes are used. Any non-native species in these mixes are known not to be invasive.</p>
<p>6.9.b. If exotic species are used, their provenance and the location of their use are documented, and their ecological effects are actively monitored.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>See above.</p>
<p>6.9.c. The forest owner or manager shall take timely action to curtail or significantly reduce any adverse impacts resulting from their use of exotic species</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>No examples surfaced during the audit to suggest the need for such actions.</p>
<p>P7 A management plan -- appropriate to the scale and intensity of the operations -- shall be written, implemented, and kept up to date. The long-term objectives of management, and the means of achieving them, shall be clearly stated.</p>		
<p>C7.1. The management plan and supporting documents shall provide:</p>	<p>C</p>	

<p>a) Management objectives. b) description of the forest resources to be managed, environmental limitations, land use and ownership status, socio-economic conditions, and a profile of adjacent lands. c) Description of silvicultural and/or other management system, based on the ecology of the forest in question and information gathered through resource inventories. d) Rationale for rate of annual harvest and species selection. e) Provisions for monitoring of forest growth and dynamics. f) Environmental safeguards based on environmental assessments. g) Plans for the identification and protection of rare, threatened and endangered species. h) Maps describing the forest resource base including protected areas, planned management activities and land ownership. i) Description and justification of harvesting techniques and equipment to be used.</p>		
<p>7.1.f. If invasive species are present, the management plan describes invasive species conditions, applicable management objectives, and how they will be controlled (see Indicator 6.3.j).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>DNR works with numerous cooperators in the state to address invasive species. As described in C.6.6 above, the DNR addresses the prevention and control of invasive species at all levels of planning and management. A public web page, "Herbicides for Forest Management," provides specific recommendations on herbicide use for specific species.</p>
<p>P8 Monitoring shall be conducted -- appropriate to the scale and intensity of forest management -- to assess the condition of the forest, yields of forest products, chain of custody, management activities and their social and environmental impacts.</p>		
<p>8.2. Forest management should include the research and data collection needed to monitor, at a minimum, the following indicators: a) yield of all forest products harvested, b) growth rates, regeneration, and condition of the forest, c) composition and observed changes in the flora and fauna, d) environmental and social impacts of harvesting and other operations, and e) cost, productivity, and efficiency of forest management.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>8.2.a.1. For all commercially harvested products, an inventory system is maintained. The inventory system includes at a minimum: a) species, b) volumes, c) stocking, d) regeneration, and e) stand and forest composition and structure; and f) timber quality.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>DNR's inventory system is the Forest Compartment Reconnaissance (recon) tool, described in detail in the Public Forest Lands Handbook. Data from forest recon are maintained, analyzed, and reported from the Wisconsin Inventory and Reporting System (WisFIRS). The inventory system includes all elements listed in this indicator.</p>
<p>8.2.a.2. Significant, unanticipated removal or loss or increased vulnerability of forest resources is monitored and recorded. Recorded information shall include date and location of occurrence, description of disturbance, extent and severity of loss, and may be both quantitative and qualitative.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Each land unit updates the WisFIRS database annually, entering harvest data, updated recon information, and revised management codes for all stands where management recommendations change as a result unanticipated perturbations, new findings, etc.</p>
<p>8.2.b The forest owner or manager maintains records of harvested timber and NTFPs (volume and product and/or grade). Records must adequately ensure that the requirements under Criterion 5.6 are met.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>DNR tracks harvest levels carefully and updates AAH levels annually. An annual report to the state legislature requires this.</p>
<p>8.2.c. The forest owner or manager periodically obtains data needed to monitor presence on the FMU of: 1) Rare, threatened and endangered species and/or their <i>habitats</i>; 2) Common and rare plant communities and/or</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Close working relationships among foresters, wildlife biologists, and ecologists (from ER) assure periodic updates on the occurrence and status of RTE species and communities. Likewise, monitoring of protected areas (SNAs) and HCVF is done by or coordinated with ER.</p>

<p>habitat;</p> <p>3) Location, presence and abundance of invasive species;</p> <p>4) Condition of protected areas, set-asides and buffer zones;</p> <p>5) High Conservation Value Forests (see Criterion 9.4).</p>		
<p>8.2.d.1. Monitoring is conducted to ensure that site specific plans and operations are properly implemented, environmental impacts of site disturbing operations are minimized, and that harvest prescriptions and guidelines are effective.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Foresters visit harvest sites frequently (1-3 times per week) to assure that prescriptions are being followed and environmental impacts are minimized. Written records are kept of their visits (inspected by auditors)</p>
<p>8.2.d.2. A monitoring program is in place to assess the condition and environmental impacts of the forest-road system.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>An OBS during the 2011 surveillance audit recommended an improved monitoring system for assessing the condition of forest roads. DNR responded that the Division of Forestry completed an assessment of roads and parking lots, and implemented a \$5 million plan for improving roads. The Wildlife Bureau has a new initiative (LMS—Land Management System), which includes the framework for an assessment of roads.</p>
<p>8.2.d.3. The landowner or manager monitors relevant socio-economic issues (see Indicator 4.4.a), including the social impacts of harvesting, participation in local economic opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.g), the creation and/or maintenance of quality job opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.b), and local purchasing opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.e).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>DNR employs Forest Products Specialists to work with forest industry to develop markets, assure the best use of fiber, and to pilot new logging technologies. Monitoring is a key component of what these employees do.</p>
<p>8.2.d.4. Stakeholder responses to management activities are monitored and recorded as necessary.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>As a state agency, DNR makes a practice of recording comments from the public and responding to those comments. Formal responses are part of the planning process for state land management (e.g., appendices in master plans).</p>
<p>8.2.d.5. Where sites of cultural significance exist, the opportunity to jointly monitor sites of cultural significance is offered to tribal representatives (see Principle 3).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>DNR excels in communicating with the 11 tribes and offering opportunities to monitor sites of cultural significance. Most commonly, tribal representatives do not wish to reveal locations of such sites that are not already known to managers.</p>
<p>8.2.e. The forest owner or manager monitors the costs and revenues of management in order to assess productivity and efficiency.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Clearly, as a state agency with legislative oversight, costs and revenues are closely monitored.</p>
<p>C8.3. Documentation shall be provided by the forest manager to enable monitoring and certifying organizations to trace each forest product from its origin, a process known as the "chain of custody."</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>8.3.a. When forest products are being sold as FSC-certified, the forest owner or manager has a system that prevents mixing of FSC-certified and non-certified forest products prior to the point of sale, with accompanying documentation to enable the tracing of the harvested material from each harvested product from its origin to the point of sale.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>DNR has a unique system of advertising sales of timber products for bid, but determining payment based on actual volumes sold. In doing so, the standard three-part trip ticket system is used. Tickets are available at the harvest site. When a load of wood leaves the site, the trucker deposits one part of the ticket in a lock box. After being delivered to a mill and scaled or weighed, the mill keeps a copy and returns a third to DNR. Occasionally, though, lump sum sales are conducted, whereby mill tally is not used in billing. Some misunderstanding about chain of custody on such sales</p>

		was revealed during the audit. See OBS 2011.4
8.3.b The forest owner or manager maintains documentation to enable the tracing of the harvested material from each harvested product from its origin to the point of sale.	C	Three part trip tickets provide this documentation, with one part of the ticket being returned to the appropriate DNR office once wood is delivered to the mill.
C8.4. The results of monitoring shall be incorporated into the implementation and revision of the management plan.	C	
8.4.a. The forest owner or manager monitors and documents the degree to which the objectives stated in the management plan are being fulfilled, as well as significant deviations from the plan.	C	Frequent revisions are made to management plans, as amendments, in order to meet state objectives. Examples of such amendments are posted on the web page for NHAL.
8.4.b. Where monitoring indicates that management objectives and guidelines, including those necessary for conformance with this Standard, are not being met or if changing conditions indicate that a change in management strategy is necessary, the management plan, operational plans, and/or other plan implementation measures are revised to ensure the objectives and guidelines will be met. If monitoring shows that the management objectives and guidelines themselves are not sufficient to ensure conformance with this Standard, then the objectives and guidelines are modified.	C	WisFIRS is designed to revise projected levels of harvest each year, in response to new recon data and/or alterations of management codes for selected stands.
C8.5. While respecting the confidentiality of information, forest managers shall make publicly available a summary of the results of monitoring indicators, including those listed in Criterion 8.2.	C	
8.5.a. While protecting landowner confidentiality, either full monitoring results or an up-to-date summary of the most recent monitoring information is maintained, covering the Indicators listed in Criterion 8.2, and is available to the public, free or at a nominal price, upon request.	C	DNR readily provides monitoring information to the public upon request. An abundance of such information is available on public web pages. Annual reports to the legislature also are available to the public.
<p>P9 Management activities in high conservation value forests shall maintain or enhance the attributes which define such forests. Decisions regarding high conservation value forests shall always be considered in the context of a precautionary approach.</p> <p>High Conservation Value Forests are those that possess one or more of the following attributes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Forest areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant: concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g., endemism, endangered species, refugia); and/or large landscape level forests, contained within, or containing the management unit, where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance b) Forest areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems c) Forest areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g., watershed protection, erosion control) d) Forest areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g., subsistence, health) and/or critical to local communities' traditional cultural identity (areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in cooperation with such local communities). 		
C9.1. Assessment to determine the presence of the attributes consistent with High Conservation Value Forests will be completed, appropriate to scale and intensity of forest management.	C	

<p>9.1.a. The forest owner or manager identifies and maps the presence of High Conservation Value Forests (HCVF) within the FMU and, to the extent that data are available, adjacent to their FMU, in a manner consistent with the assessment process, definitions, data sources, and other guidance described in Appendix F.</p> <p>Given the relative rarity of old growth forests in the contiguous United States, these areas are normally designated as HCVF, and all old growth must be managed in conformance with Indicator 6.3.a.3 and requirements for legacy trees in Indicator 6.3.f.</p>	C	<p>There is a significant overlap of SNAs and HCVF designation. These areas have been identified and mapped and are contained in the NHI database. WI DNR works with numerous cooperators to locate and identify these areas.</p>
<p>9.1.b. In developing the assessment, the forest owner or manager consults with qualified specialists, independent experts, and local community members who may have knowledge of areas that meet the definition of HCVs.</p>	C	<p>DNR has undergone extensive review and assessment of HCVF within the SNA program. An Ecological Landscape Handbook for Wisconsin is almost complete (in the editing process in 2012).</p>
<p>9.1.c. A summary of the assessment results and management strategies (see Criterion 9.3) is included in the management plan summary that is made available to the public.</p>	C	<p>Confirmed that a summary is available for NR 44 compliant master plans and that it was made available to the public.</p>
<p>C9.2. The consultative portion of the certification process must place emphasis on the identified conservation attributes, and options for the maintenance thereof.</p>	C	
<p>9.2.a. The forest owner or manager holds consultations with stakeholders and experts to confirm that proposed HCVF locations and their attributes have been accurately identified, and that appropriate options for the maintenance of their HCV attributes have been adopted.</p>	C	<p>Biotic inventories of areas that will undergo master planning are completed prior to planning activities. HCVFs are identified and mapped by staff and also with stakeholders and regional experts. Appropriate measures to maintain HCVF attributes are developed.</p>
<p>9.2.b. On public forests, a transparent and accessible public review of proposed HCV attributes and HCVF areas and management is carried out. Information from stakeholder consultations and other public review is integrated into HCVF descriptions, delineations and management.</p>		<p>All NR 44 compliant master plans go through an extensive public review process.</p>
<p>C9.3. The management plan shall include and implement specific measures that ensure the maintenance and/or enhancement of the applicable conservation attributes consistent with the precautionary approach. These measures shall be specifically included in the publicly available management plan summary.</p>	C	
<p>9.3.a. The management plan and relevant operational plans describe the measures necessary to ensure the maintenance and/or enhancement of all high conservation values present in all identified HCVF areas, including the precautions required to avoid risks or impacts to such values (see Principle 7). These measures are implemented.</p>	C	<p>Management plans identify when special circumstances occur that require a modification to the General Forest Management Prescriptions in order to maintain and enhance those unique features. Examples of unique features commonly located in The Flambeau Master Plan forest production management areas include small acreages of High Conservation Value Forests (HCVF) (e.g. hemlock stands and wetland complexes), rustic campgrounds, and unique scenic geological and cultural features. The SNA web site includes management plans for each SNA.</p>
<p>9.3.b. All management activities in HCVFs must maintain or enhance the high conservation values and the extent of the HCVF.</p>	C	<p>DNR is careful in protecting HCVFs for their attributes. Some individual species management plans have been written and utilized to protect HCVF (old-forest characteristic management).</p>

<p>9.3.c. If HCVF attributes cross ownership boundaries and where maintenance of the HCV attributes would be improved by coordinated management, then the forest owner or manager attempts to coordinate conservation efforts with adjacent landowners.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Quincy Bluff is a HCFV that is co-owned and co-managed by DNR and TNC (a large wetland complex and bluff). DNR also cooperates with Chequamegon-Nicollet National Forest in managing HCFV areas.</p>
<p>C9.4. Annual monitoring shall be conducted to assess the effectiveness of the measures employed to maintain or enhance the applicable conservation attributes.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>9.4.a. The forest owner or manager monitors, or participates in a program to annually monitor, the status of the specific HCV attributes, including the effectiveness of the measures employed for their maintenance or enhancement. The monitoring program is designed and implemented consistent with the requirements of Principle 8.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The SNA web site has an inspection report that is filled out whenever significant changes occur on the site/or when a site is visited. Most sites are visited at least every other year (with the exception of very remote sites that are difficult to get to). Although formal monitoring many not occur annually, virtually all SNA sites are visited by DNR personnel or cooperators capable of reporting any significant changes in the attributes of the SNA, e.g., serious invasion of unwanted plants or animal, storm damage, unauthorized site disturbance.</p>
<p>9.4.b. When monitoring results indicate increasing risk to a specific HCV attribute, the forest owner/manager re-evaluates the measures taken to maintain or enhance that attribute, and adjusts the management measures in an effort to reverse the trend.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The inspection report identifies risk to the HCVF attribute (presence of invasives) and appropriate measures are taken to control the risks to the HCFV attributes on the site.</p>

Appendix 7 – Chain of Custody Indicators for FMEs

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