

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 Webster Street
P.O. Box 7921
Madison WI 53707
United States of America
Mark Heyde
www.dnr.wi.gov

CERTIFIED	EXPIRATION
31 December 2013	30 December 2018

DATE OF FIELD AUDIT
17-21 August 2015
DATE OF LAST UPDATE
16 November 2015

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

SCSglobal
SERVICES
Setting the standard for sustainability™

2000 Powell Street, Ste. 600, Emeryville, CA 94608 USA
+1.510.452.8000 main | +1.510.452.8001 fax
www.SCSglobalServices.com

Foreword

Cycle in annual surveillance audits			
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 st annual audit	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2 nd annual audit	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 rd annual audit	<input 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 (WDNR)			

All certificates issued by SCS under the aegis of the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) require annual audits to ascertain ongoing conformance with the requirements and standards of certification. A public summary of the initial evaluation is available on the FSC Certificate Database <http://info.fsc.org/>.

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

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

Organization of the Report

This report of the results of our evaluation is divided into two sections. Section A provides the public summary and background information that is required by the Forest Stewardship Council. This section is made available to the general public and is intended to provide an overview of the evaluation process, the management programs and policies applied to the forest, and the results of the evaluation. Section A will be posted on the FSC Certificate Database (<http://info.fsc.org/>) no less than 90 days after completion of the on-site audit. Section B contains more detailed results and information for the use by the FME.

Table of Contents

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY	4
1. GENERAL INFORMATION	4
1.1 Annual Audit Team.....	4
1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation	5
1.3 Standards Employed	5
2 ANNUAL AUDIT DATES AND ACTIVITIES	5
2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities	5
2.2 Evaluation of Management Systems	14
3. CHANGES IN MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	14
4. RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION.....	15
4.1 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations	15
4.2 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations	21
5. STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS	22
5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted	22
5.2 Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Responses from the Team, Where Applicable	23
6. CERTIFICATION DECISION	23
7. CHANGES IN CERTIFICATION SCOPE	23
8. ANNUAL DATA UPDATE	32
8.1 Social Information.....	32
8.2 Annual Summary of Pesticide and Other Chemical Use	32
SECTION B – APPENDICES (CONFIDENTIAL).....	33
Appendix 1 – List of FMUs Selected For Evaluation.....	33
Appendix 2 – List of Stakeholders Consulted.....	33
Appendix 3 – Additional Audit Techniques Employed.....	35
Appendix 4 – Pesticide Derogations	35
Appendix 5 – Detailed Observations.....	35
Appendix 6 – Chain of Custody Indicators for FMEs.....	49

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY

1. General Information

1.1 Annual Audit Team

Auditor Name:	Brendan Grady	Auditor role:	Lead Auditor, FSC
Qualifications:	Mr. Grady is the Director, Forest Management Certification for SCS. In that role, he provides daily management and quality control for the program. He participated as a team member and lead auditor in forest certification audits throughout the United States, Europe, and Asia. Brendan has a B.S. in Forestry from the University of California, Berkeley, and a Juris Doctorate from the University of Washington School of Law. Brendan is a member of the State Bar of California, and was an attorney in private practice focusing on environmental law before taking his current role at SCS.		
Auditor Name:	Norman Boatwright	Auditor role:	Team Auditor, FSC; Lead Auditor, SFI
Qualifications:	Norman Boatwright is the president of Boatwright Consulting Services, LLC located in Florence, South Carolina. BCS handles typical forestry consulting, SFI, ATF and FSC Audits, Phase I Environmental Site Assessments, Forest Soil Mapping, Wetland Delineation, and other Biological Services. Norman has over twenty-nine years' experience in intensive forest management, eighteen years' experience in environmental services and ten years' experience in forest certification auditing. He has conducted Phase I Assessments on over three hundred and fifty projects covering 3,000,000 acres, Endangered Species Assessments on timberland across the South, and managed soil mapping projects on over 1.3 million acres. From 1985-1991, he was Division Manager at Canal Forest Resources, Inc. and was responsible for all forest management activities on about 90,000 acres of timberland in eastern South Carolina. Duties included budgeting and implementing land and timber sales, site preparation, planting, best management practices, road construction, etc. From 1991-1999, he was manager of Canal Environmental Services which offered the following services: Phase I Environmental Site Assessments, Wetland Delineation and Permitting and Endangered Species Surveys. From 1999-2012 he was the Environmental Services Manager, Milliken Forestry Company. Norman has extensive experience auditing SFI, procurement and land management organizations and American Tree Farm Group Certification Programs. He is also a Lead Auditor for Chain of Custody Audits under SFI, PEFC, and FSC		
Auditor Name:	Mike Thompson	Auditor role:	Ecologist/ team FSC/SFI auditor
Qualifications:	Michael Thompson is a consulting ecologist who is a Certified Wildlife Biologist (CWB) and Professional Wetland Scientist (PWS) with over 30 years of experience in wildlife research, forest ecology, biometrics, ecological risk assessment, rare plant and animal conservation, ecological restoration, wetlands, fisheries, and aquatic ecology. For over 17 years he has served as a third-party auditor under the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) system and he served on the FSC's original Northeast Standards Working Group. Mr. Thompson also conducted some of the first third-party audits of carbon sequestration projects in the United States, Tasmania, and Belize under the Climate,		

	Community & Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA) system. In addition to his consulting work, he is working on a PhD in Forest Ecology at the University of Maine.
--	---

1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation

A. Number of days spent on-site assessing the applicant:	5
B. Number of auditors participating in on-site evaluation:	3
C. Additional days spent on preparation, stakeholder consultation, and post-site follow-up:	3
D. Total number of person days used in evaluation:	18

1.3 Standards Employed

1.3.1. Applicable FSC-Accredited Standards

Title	Version	Date of Finalization
FSC-US Forest Management Standard	1.0	8 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 Standards page (www.scsglobalservices.com/certification-standards-and-program-documents). Standards are also available, upon request, from SCS Global Services (www.SCSGlobalServices.com).		

2 Annual Audit Dates and Activities

2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities

Date: August 17, 2015	
FMU / Location / sites visited	Activities / notes
WI DNR Headquarters, Madison (entire audit team)	Opening Meeting; Review of previous findings; staff interviews; document review
Grady Itinerary	
Site 1: Observatory Hill State Natural Area – tract #101-12	Harvest in a stand-alone State Natural Area (SNA). SNA is the highest point in the county, and provides a panoramic lookout. Has historic value as an early childhood haunt of John Muir, who grew up nearby. The hill also contains rhyolite outcroppings with pre-historic petroglyphs. These areas are excluded from the timber sale. Harvest conducted under an Interim Forest Management plan. Harvest goal is restoration to an oak savannah type. Will focus on mixed hardwood removal, with a small pine thinning area. Minor, but acceptable amount of damage on residual trees so far, although the sale was still in progress. Harvest had begun but was shut down due to updated seasonal restrictions on guidance Cerulean Warbler (see Obs. 2015.2 for details).
Site 2: Plainfield Tunnel Lakes State Natural Area – sale # 7020-102	Stand alone SNA that was created primarily to focus on conservation of Fassett's locoweed, a State Endangered/Federally Threatened plant found in the fluctuating shores of the Plainfield Lakes. Harvest

	<p>in the SNA focused on thinning of legacy planted red pine stands that existed when DNR acquired the property. Harvest areas are geographically separate from the lakes which are the focus of the SNA. Two distinct harvest units, one unit a first thinning with every third row removed. Second unit was a second thinning focusing on removing marked trees with poor vigor trees down to a set basal area. Additional pocket decline from annosum resulted in a group being removed. Portion of the property outside the SNA is being considered for sale under a DNR program to dispose of 10,000 acres statewide and consolidate their holdings within project boundaries.</p>
Thompson Itinerary	
Site 1: Mullet Creek Wildlife Area – Sale Number 2070-12	<p>Marked timber sale in bottomland hardwood forest. Even-aged management intermediate thinning with a focus on releasing crop trees. Target residual basal area 90 square feet per acre. Seasonal restrictions (frozen ground) to prevent rutting on wet soils. Reed canary grass is a common invasive and retention of crown cover is intended to discourage the spread of this species. Harvest conducted under an Interim Forest Management Plan.</p> <p>A nearby parcel is the subject of a minor boundary dispute, which provided an opportunity to discuss how the DNR resolves such issues. If informal discussions fail to resolve the dispute, the DNR retains a surveyor to locate the common boundary. If the landowner is not satisfied with the results of the survey, the County Surveyor is consulted. As a last resort, continuing boundary disputes are settled in court.</p>
Site 2: Killsnake Wildlife Area – Sale Number 834-1	<p>Completed timber sale with a management objective of regenerating oak (red, white, and bur) through even-aged shelterwood harvest. Supplemental planting is planned for the near-term. Residual basal area averages 34 square feet per acre of large sawtimber (red, white, and bur oak) with red maple, hickory, and basswood also designated as leave trees. Harvest restricted to frozen ground conditions to protect sensitive soils.</p>
Site 3: Collins Marsh Wildlife Area – Sale Number 3622-2	<p>Completed harvest intended to regenerate aspen and to increase the area of younger forest on the property to, in part, improve habitat for American woodcock. Coppice harvest with reserve trees and a few small reserve islands. Green tree retention included all conifers and marked trees, which included silver maple, bur oak, cottonwood, white cedar, tamarack, aspen, elm, ash, basswood, and hackberry.</p>
Site 4: Collins Marsh Wildlife Area – Sale Number 3622-1	<p>Partially implemented harvest with one block not cut due to excessively wet soils in swamp hardwoods. The management objective for pole timber was to improve the quality of the crop trees via release on one to three sides, whereas the objective for sawtimber was to improve the quality of the residual stand while also creating gaps for regeneration. The presence of emerald ash</p>

	borer was taken into consideration during harvest planning (i.e., ash targeted for removal).
Date: August 18, 2015	
FMU / Location / sites visited	Activities / notes
Thompson Itinerary	
Site 1: Peninsula State Park – Scotch Pine Treatment	Peninsula State Park (PSP) has several legacy Scotch pine (i.e., Scots pine) plantings that are scheduled within the Master Plan for being transitioned back to a natural species composition. Since original planting (time uncertain), the stands have not been managed and function as natural stands, despite the non-native dominant species. Due to the high public use of PSP, removal of Scotch pine is planned for the window between the end of Fall and the beginning of the winter recreation period to minimize viewer impacts.
Site 2: Peninsula State Park – Scotch Pine Treatment	Similar to the previous site, but in this case the stand is being thinned to minimize the visual impact of the harvest on Park users. Advance regeneration of native species will be promoted to encourage the gradual transition back to natural stand conditions.
Site 3: Mud Lake Wildlife Area	Aspen regeneration through coppice harvesting on four small units. The harvest area had previously been part of a State Natural Area, but was changed to a Wildlife Area in 2010 to better suit the management objectives for that portion of the property. Most blocks are too small for green tree retention, but the one 14-acre block has two islands that total approximately 2 acres. Harvest will be conducted on frozen ground to protect soils.
Site 4: Whitefish Dunes State Park – Sale Number 2	Completed beech harvest within 75 feet of public trails as a preventative safety measure due to the imminent loss of trees to beech bark disease. Harvest conducted in a manner that minimized visual impacts to the visiting public. No invasive species noted during planning process, but significant numbers of non-native invasive thistles observed in roadside portions of the harvest block.
Site 5: Point Beach State Forest – Sale Number 3672-2	Planned harvest at a State Forest with significant recreational use. Management objective is to salvage declining aspen and birch, with the intent to increase the aspen component, to improve the quality of red pine, to reduce non-native Scotch pine, and to harvest mature jack pine. Aspen and birch retained in green tree retention areas. Sale planned for frozen ground conditions and to avoid the 9-day gun deer season.
Grady Itinerary	
Site 1: White River Fishery Area – T&C Sale # 7014-92	Area use is primarily for fishing and hunting. Trout unlimited has done in stream habitat improvement for fish populations.

	<p>Oak, jack pine, and aspen regeneration harvest. Operations were frozen ground only due to proximity to White River. Aspen regeneration area adjacent to river with 15' buffer zone. Review of chain of custody procedures.</p>
<p>Site2: Mekan River Fishery Area</p>	<p>In stream restoration projects for trout. Installation of rip rap and pilings in order to restore depth to the stream and improve fish passage.</p> <p>Mekan River is an extensive fishery area with disparate properties spread over two counties. Fishing and hunting are primary use, along with recreational use of the Ice Age Trail that passes through the property. Harvesting conducted under an Interim Forest Management plan.</p>
<p>Site 3: Mekan River Fishery Area – Gypsy Moth Sale # 7059-93</p>	<p>Two cutting units, oak regeneration harvest, red pine first thinning. Recreational considerations as Ice Age trail runs through harvest area. Discussed accommodations for trail, work with local trail clubs. Unit is close to the Mekan River, but the sale boundaries were sufficiently removed from the banks that separate buffers were not required. Green tree retention clumps in the regeneration unit.</p>
<p>Site 4: Mekan River Fishery Area – Mekan Headwaters Sale #7059-105</p>	<p>Several different treatment areas spread over a large area of the property, including regeneration harvest, pine thinning, and invasive locust removal. Sale harvest area is near embedded Mekan Springs SNA. Active bald eagle nest discovered during recon for the sale, resulted in seasonal restrictions and reduction in harvest intensity around the nest (no overstory removal, harvest will focus on locust removal only within buffer zone). Ice age trail runs through the sale, with accompanying equipment exclusion zone.</p> <p>Public interest in the sale has been high due to the proximity to the Mekan Springs, and relatively long period of time since previous harvesting in this area. DNR has held public meetings and done outreach to interested parties. Original planned harvest area was 300 acres, now closer to 100 based on different considerations taken into account as part of planning.</p>
<p>Site #5 Cougar sale #7059-94</p>	<p>Regeneration harvest, pine thinning, jack pine removal. Ice age trail runs through the sale area. Harvest is in upland area, although Chaffee Creek runs just south of the harvest. Goal of the harvest is to enhance wet mesic prairie species close to the creek.</p>
<p>Site #6 Chaffee Creek Headwaters sale #7059-90</p>	<p>84 acres of pine thinning of former Christmas tree plantation area, mix of first and second thinning. Pine stands showed poor vigor and form that the thinning attempted to eliminate. Additional 29 acres of oak regeneration harvest.</p>
<p>Boatwright Itinerary</p>	
<p>Site 1: Deansville Wildlife Area - Harvest 1312-02</p>	<p>Three areas in this sale: 1) Remove of central hdwd trees to promote an oak savannah, 2) Timber stand improvement cut in oak removing</p>

	<p>undesirable species and aspen and 3) Aspen regen cut. Little damage to residuals and good single tree retention in the aspen cuts.</p> <p>The Wildlife Area is covered in the Glacier Heritage Area Master Plan and also has share cropped agriculture fields, sunflower fields planted for hunters, an agriculture field converted to hay and designated as a dog training area. Contains a large fen in the Deansville Fen SNA. Good signage along public roads.</p>
Site 2: Waunakee Wildlife Area - Harvest 1345-1	<p>Timber stand improvement cut using single tree selection with gaps. Sale not cut. Preharvest invasive treatment included buckthorn, honey suckle and garlic mustard.</p> <p>Good signage along public roads. No Master Plan and the IFMP was appropriate.</p>
Site 3: Rowan Creek Fishery Area - Harvest 1105-0512	<p>Red pine final harvest with good red pine group selection. Good oak, maple and white oak regen and planted with white pine and mixed hardwood.</p>
Site 4: Pine Island Wildlife Area - Harvest 11238-0112	<p>Aspen regen cut with good oak single tree and ash group retention. The Wildlife Area is part of the 15,000 acre Leopold-Pine Island Important Bird Area consisting of the WIDNR and private landowners working under a common management plan. Rich diversity with over 50 NHI hits on-site.</p>
Site 5: French Creek Wildlife Area - Harvest 1117-0611	<p>Timber sale improvement cut to encourage oak regeneration with little damage to residuals. During the initial timber sale recon, a blue heron rockery was identified, buffered and entered into the GIS database as a special place. DNR created a 900 acre wetland by installing a water control structure.</p>
Site 6: French Creek Wildlife Area - Harvest 1117-0511	<p>Many sale types: 1) Red pine removal leaving white pine retention, 2) Timber stand improvement cut with little damage to residuals, 3) White pine thin with little damage to residuals, 4) Aspen regen cut with group retention and 5) Hdwd final harvest leaving oak and hickory to establish a savannah. DNR created a large wetland by installing a water control structure.</p>
Date: August 19, 2015	
FMU / Location / sites visited	Activities / notes
Grady Itinerary	
Wautoma office	Review of WisFIRS, DNR database and harvest planning tools.
Site #1 Mecan River Fishery Area Mecan Camp Sale # 3969-98	<p>Oak regeneration harvest with retention islands. Reserved wetland islands within the harvest unit as well. Selective pine thinning. Harvest conducted during fall/winter. Strong regeneration. Large black locust area, which had been treated with mechanical and chemical control.</p>
Site #2 Grand River Wildlife Area – Dam Road sale #2465-1	<p>Grand River Wildlife Area is a 7,000 acre property featuring a large flowage. A dam was installed in 1969 that allows the DNR to manipulate water levels in order to maintain a variety of waterfowl habitat and wetland restoration. There are also upland prairie and</p>

	<p>oak savannah areas which are maintained for songbird habitat as well as upland nesting for waterfowl (and deer). Goal of timber harvests in the area is a return to oak savannah systems. Property also has significant agricultural activity in the form of sharecropping with private farmers (outside the scope of this certificate). These areas are also planned to be replanted in prairie species over the long-term.</p> <p>Harvest was primary a shelterwood cut, removal of variety of hardwood species. Small pine stand received a second thinning, and an old pine windbreak was removed in order to maintain restored prairie habitat. Lupine was present in the prairie area, but the property is not in a county where Karner blue butterfly restrictions would have been put in place. Harvesting allowed during frozen ground only. Sale was stopped at one point due to wet ground, although rutting was not observed.</p> <p>Review of duck banding procedures and duck banding station. DNR conducts banding as part of nationwide waterfowl population survey and monitoring.</p>
<p>Site #3 Grand River Wildlife Area – Grand River sale #2465-2</p>	<p>Harvest plan spread over four different units on the periphery of the wildlife area. Primary harvest units were oak harvest areas aimed at converting to oak woodland. Second harvest unit is an aspen coppice harvest area. Third is a mixed deciduous planting area, also being converted to oak woodland. Planted area had a variety of species planted before DNR acquired the property, and their harvesting goals now are to return it to a more natural composition to complement the wildlife area.</p> <p>Harvest units are adjacent to county roads, and timber theft is a concern (particularly firewood cutters). Security cameras were set up near landings. Discussed safety concerns and signage related to active harvests near high traffic public roads.</p>
<p>Thompson Itinerary</p>	
<p>Site 1: Kohler-Andrae State Park – Sale Number 1</p>	<p>Ash removal in designated public-use areas as a safety precaution due to emerald ash borer. Ash to be removed meet three criteria: 1) greater than 5” dbh, 2) potential to fall across campsites, roads, or other use areas, and 3) within reach of harvesting equipment from roads or campsite pads. Ash stumps treated with triclopyr.</p>
<p>Site 2: Kohler-Andrae State Park</p>	<p>Thinning in a 13-acre planted stand that includes red pine, white pine, and Norway spruce. Current basal area 240 square feet per acre and residual stand is 144 square feet per acre. Dry or frozen ground skidding only. Triclopyr to be used to control Japanese barberry.</p>
<p>Site 3: Kettle Moraine State Forest – Northern Unit – Sale</p>	<p>Ash tree removal in response to emerald ash borer at Mauthe Lake Recreation Area. Ash to be removed meet three criteria: 1) greater</p>

Number 132	than 5" dbh, 2) potential to fall across campsites, roads, or other use areas, and 3) within reach of harvesting equipment from roads or campsite pads.
Site 4: Kettle Moraine State Forest – Northern Unit – Sale Number 136	Harvest planned for one red pine and one white pine stand and a thinning of one red pine and one spruce stand. Harvest blocks are intended, where possible, to convert to native hardwoods using advance regeneration and planting, depending on site conditions. Norway spruce is present in moderate amounts. Due to the size of the blocks, green tree retention elements were included in harvest plans. Much of the area includes invasive species, such as buckthorn, garlic mustard, honeysuckle, autumn olive, and Japanese barberry, much of which controlled through mechanical mowing and then spraying with herbicides.
Site 5: Kettle Moraine State Forest – Northern Unit – “Over the Hill” Sale	Initial entry to thin northern hardwoods stand dominated by red oak, sugar maple, and ash. Variable retention to control spacing and density while favoring crop trees to achieve residual basal area of 90-100 square feet per acre. Cross-country ski trails and hiking trails pass through a section of the sale and were buffered from intensive management.
Site 6: Kettle Moraine State Forest – Northern Unit – Sale Number 134	Completed sale of four planted stands that included white pine, red pine and Norway spruce (one stand). Management objectives in the red and white pine stands is to restore them to northern hardwoods due to the decline of the pine. The management objective for the Norway spruce stand is to convert to native hardwoods. Green tree retention elements employed throughout the sale blocks. Garlon 4/Element 4 to be sprayed to control buckthorn and Escort will be used on Japanese barberry and honeysuckle. Oust to be used to control garlic mustard.
Boatwright Itinerary	
Site 1 Waterloo Wildlife Area - Harvest (number not provided, Conservation Lane Sale)	Two harvest types: 1) Thin 50 year old Norway spruce plantation and 2) Aspen regen harvest with oak and cherry retention. Not cut and no issues.
Site 2 Waterloo Wildlife Area - Harvest (number not provided, Hwy 19 Sale)	Aspen regen cut leaving oak, hickory walnut and cherry with little damage to residuals.
Site 3 Mud Lake – Harvest (number not provided, Hwy 19 Sale)	Three harvest types: 1) Aspen regen, 2) Ash removal and 3) Timber stand improvement cut favoring oak, cherry and hickory. Frozen ground harvest restriction due to Indian mound on-site and no issues.
Site 4 Mud Lake – Harvest (number not provided, Hubbleton Sale)	Two types of cuts: 1) White pine final harvest to increase prairie and 2) Aspen regen cut with oak and cherry retention. No issues.

Site 5 Mud Lake – Harvest (number not provided, Johnson Creek Sale)	Two types of cuts: 1) Red pine final harvest due to beetle infestation and 2) White pine thin with little damage to residuals.
Site 6 Rome Pond Wildlife Area - Harvest 2841-01	Ash removal and hdwd timber sale improvement cut with good stocking and little damage to residuals. A water bar should have been placed on a steep part of the main skid trail.
Site 7 LuLu Lake State Natural Area – Harvest 6816-1	4 types of cuts: 1) Norway spruce 1st thin – marked, 2) Norway spruce 1st thin 3rd row, 3) Red pine 1st thin 3rd row and 4) Red pine final harvest with oak and walnut retention. Good stocking with little residual damage.
Date: August 20, 2015	
FMU / Location / sites visited	Activities / notes
Grady Itinerary	
Site #1 Rat River Wildlife Area – Tract #1-14	Wildlife area managed under the Lower Wolf River Bottomlands master plan. Planned entry into bottomland hardwood forest, yet to be harvested. First entry in the rotation, intermediate thinning. Small pockets of aspen were entirely marked for coppice regeneration. Species selection marked to discourage ash given the presence of Emerald Ash Borer. Reed canary grass is an invasive of concern that they are trying to control by maintaining a closed canopy. Harvest area was close to adjoining private property, reviewed boundary procedures.
Site #2 Glacial Habitat Restoration Area (GHRA)- Orton/Brooks – tract #2-09	GHRA is a regional approach to wildlife management planning. The program aimed to create a patchwork of restored grassland and wetland areas throughout a four county area. Existing farmland throughout the project area were assessed for habitat value, and expressions of interest to purchase the properties were made. The result is approximately 16,000 acres spread over 75 small properties throughout the project area. These properties are dedicated to natural habitat in areas that are predominantly agricultural and undergoing gradual development pressure from urban areas. Orton/Brooks property is primarily grassland for ducks and songbirds, conversion of farmland to prairie and wetland. Planned harvest area is clearing 3 acre area of aspen and maple with goal to regenerate a younger aspen stand.
Site #3 Glacial Habitat Restoration Area – Soltysik – tract #3-09	Planned harvest, first thinning of 7 acre stand of northern hardwood. Harvest goal is to promote greater tree size and age diversity. Archeological site present (burial mound) which requires winter only harvesting on frozen ground. Property is adjacent to Rush Lake wetland area.
Site #4 Glacial Habitat Restoration Area – Baber – tract 2-14	Planned sale, approximately 40 acres. Property had previously been owned by a timber company and highgraded using a diameter limit cut. Harvest prescription was to improve species composition by

	removing box elder and ash. Small pockets of aspen to be regenerated.
Site #5 Horicon Marsh Wildlife Area	Property overview of Horicon Marsh – the largest freshwater cattail marsh in the U.S. Tour of new interpretive feature at the visitor center; museum level quality exhibits devoted to the natural history of the marsh.
Thompson Itinerary	
Site 1: Kettle Moraine State Forest – Northern Unit – Sale Number 131	Completed sale for an initial entry thinning to promote tree health and vigor in oak and northern hardwood stand types. Initial stocking ranged from 95 to 152 square feet per acre and residual stocking was 84 to 103 square feet per acre. Escort used to control Japanese barberry. The Ice Age Recreational Trail runs through a portion of the block and was buffered from intensive management.
Site 2: Kettle Moraine State Forest – Northern Unit – “Old Phone Pole Sale”	The management objective for this proposed sale in an oak stand is an initial thinning to control stand density and structure while promoting the health of the residual stand. Much of the oak is in decline and this stand will gradually convert to northern hardwoods. Uneven-aged management using single-tree and group selection thinning is the proposed silvicultural system. Garlon 3A will be used to control Japanese barberry.
Site 3: Kettle Moraine State Forest – Northern Unit – Sale Number 137	Completed sale in red pine, white pine, and northern hardwood planting blocks. The management objectives for the planted stands are to reduce density to promote vigor in the residual stand and to convert planted pines to northern hardwoods. Even-age thinning based on basal area control was used. Single tree selection (low thinning) was also used to release crop red and white pines as well as native hardwoods. Scattered red and white pines left as green tree retention. Buckthorn treated with Garlon; Escort used for honeysuckle and Japanese barberry; and Oust used to treat garlic mustard.
Site 4: Horicon Marsh Wildlife Area – “Horicon East Timber Sale” (Thompson and Grady)	Variable block being treated, primarily, with thinning. Small patches of aspen are being regenerated for their wildlife value. A small band of bottomland hardwoods are being converted to grasslands as part of waterfowl management efforts associated with Horicon Marsh. Oak, hickory, walnut, cherry, and hackberry left in clearcut blocks as green tree retention. Herbicides will be used on stumps in areas being converted to grasslands.
Boatwright Itinerary	
Site 1 Prince’s Point Wildlife Area - Harvest (number not provided, Bottomland Hardwood Sale)	Ash removal and timber stand improvement cut to encourage oak regen. Not cut and no issues.
Site 2 Prince’s Point Wildlife Area - Harvest (number not provided, Koch Lane Sale)	Ash removal and timber stand improvement cut. Not cut and no issues.
Site 3 Avon Bottoms Wildlife	Hdwd final harvest to encourage the oak savannah cover type with

Area - Harvest 5406-1	little damage to residuals. Part of the sale area included the Swenson Wet Prairie State Natural Area.
Site 4 Avon Bottoms Wildlife Area - Harvest 5406-2	Christmas tree final harvest to establish grassland.
Site 5 Avon Bottoms Wildlife Area – Hdwd tree planting	Hdwd tree planting on an 8x8 foot grid under mature ash and mixed bottomland hardwood stand. The objective is to attempt to get some growth on the seedlings before the ash final harvest to get a jump on the Canary grass.
Date: August 25, 2014	
FMU / Location / sites visited	Activities / notes
WI DNR Headquarters, Madison (entire audit team)	Staff interviews; Additional documentation review; Closing Meeting

2.2 Evaluation of Management Systems

SCS deploys interdisciplinary teams with expertise in forestry, social sciences, natural resource economics, and other relevant fields to assess an FME’s conformance to FSC standards and policies. Evaluation methods include document and record review, implementing sampling strategies to visit a broad number of forest cover and harvest prescription types, observation of implementation of management plans and policies in the field, and stakeholder analysis. When there is more than one team member, team members may review parts of the standards based on their background and expertise. On the final day of an evaluation, team members convene to deliberate the findings of the assessment jointly. This involves an analysis of all relevant field observations, stakeholder comments, and reviewed documents and records. Where consensus between team members cannot be achieved due to lack of evidence, conflicting evidence or differences of interpretation of the standards, the team is instructed to report these in the certification decision section and/or in observations.

3. Changes in Management Practices

No major changes in management practices had occurred during the past year. However several departmental wide initiatives will need to be monitored in future years:

- A requirement that the department reduce its headcount by 100 staff (from approximately 2600 to 2500)
- Strategic alignment process – an attempt to analyze and focus on the core strengths and responsibilities of the department
- A state directive to reclassify land management areas will move land in the northern forests from 66% to 75% land classified as forest production areas. DNR has a year and half to undertake this shift

- A mandate that DNR make available for sale 10,000 acres of property by June 30, 2017. By statute these lands must be outside established project boundaries.

4. Results of the Evaluation

4.1 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations

Finding Number: 2014.1	
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 Forest Management Standard v1.0, 9.4.a
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): Monitoring of HCVF Areas follow quite different procedures depending on the location of the area. In particular, State Natural Areas (SNA) have been classified as HCVF areas. SNAs that are stand alone undergo direct monitoring using an SNA inspection form, several of which were reviewed during the audit. However SNAs that are embedded within other DNR properties (state forests, for example), are monitored through a different site inspection form as part of routine property inspections.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): Systems for monitoring of HCVF should be harmonized in order to better demonstrate that DNR is using a consistent level of scrutiny in its HCVF monitoring.	

<p>FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i></p>	<p>Approximately two-thirds of the ~425 SNAs that are owned by the State are embedded in other program projects (e.g., Wildlife Management, Parks, and State Forests), making consistent monitoring of SNAs a challenge. We are approaching this difficulty on a number of fronts, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review the history of SNA site inspection rules/guidance – done (available upon request). In short, SNAs are to be inspected annually unless stated otherwise in the Management/Master plan. 2. We will facilitate an effort to establish a site inspection schedule that ensures that we are monitoring SNAs with enough frequency to capture significant events/changes/concerns as early as possible, yet take into consideration community type, location, staffing levels and any other relevant issues. 3. Utilize our eight SNA/Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) Ecologists, including 3 hired relatively recently, to not only help conduct SNA inspections on the ~140 SNAs that are owned by our program (i.e., “stand-alone), but also, to facilitate monitoring efforts by our DNR partners across the State. Prior to 2013, NHC Ecologists did not have SNA responsibilities, thus, this change could significantly improve site inspection compliance. This will include a concerted effort to inform our partner programs of the need to conduct site inspections using the SNA Form, and train as necessary and feasible. 4. We will solicit help from (non-SNA) Natural Heritage Conservation biologists that are conducting biotic inventories for numerous projects/planning efforts across the state, including SNAs.
<p>SCS review</p>	<p>DNR is making active efforts towards addressing this observation, but variability still exists in methods of monitoring HCVF. The observation has been addressed, but this topic should be reviewed by future audit teams.</p>
<p>Status of CAR:</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i></p>

Finding Number: 2014.2	
<p>Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation</p>	
<p>FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):</p>	
<p>Deadline</p>	<p><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):</p>
<p>FSC Indicator:</p>	<p>FSC-US Forest Management Standard v1.0, 6.3.f</p>

Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): When observing even aged harvest units, retention trees left on site were not always representative of the dominant species in the stand, particularly in the case of aspen dominated stands. A common justification was the poor longevity of aspen would mean that the retention trees would be short lived and not survive until the next rotation. However in some wildlife areas, the expectation was that retention trees would likely become snags or downed trees that provide large wood for wildlife habitat. So in certain cases this justification would not be warranted.

Corrective Action Request (or Observation): DNR should consider providing written justification for situations in which it opts to not maintain dominant species found on site, particularly in aspen stands.

<p>FME response (including any evidence submitted)</p>	<p>Timber Sale - Dominant Tree Species Retention Decision Documentation (FSC Obs 2014.2)</p> <p>By <u>Joe Schwantes</u>, County & Public Forest Specialist Published: 4/17/2015</p> <p>This article is follow-up on a finding (FSC Obs 2014.2) from last summer’s FSC® state lands audit. Coincidentally, nearly the same finding was issued as a result of the FSC county forest group certification audit as well.</p> <p>2014.2 – FSC Observation</p> <p>DNR should consider providing written justification for situations in which it opts to not maintain dominant species found on site, particularly in aspen stands. (FSC Indicators 6.3.f)</p> <p>This CAR was issued based on the observation that on a number of timber sales the green tree retention did not retain species that were dominant or co-dominant in the stand prior to harvest. Indicator 6.3.f includes the following, “trees selected for <i>retention</i> are generally representative of the dominant species naturally found on the site.” This was most often observed in aspen and jack pine regeneration harvests, where little or no aspen or jack pine were left. Foresters were typically able to fully describe the reasons for their choices (e.g. forest health concerns, blow-down potential, desire to shift stand composition, site prep limitations, etc.), but those reasons were not always clearly described on the 2460. Additionally the auditors noted that in some cases on certain properties, the expectation may be that short-lived retention trees would become snags or downed trees that provide wildlife habitat, and in those cases retaining short-lived species may be warranted.</p> <p>Some questions foresters should consider when thinking about retention during timber sale establishment and administration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Do foresters generally select trees for retention that are generally <u>representative of the dominant species naturally found on the site?</u></i> ○ <i>Do foresters consider both the risks and benefits of leaving a variety of species, both long and short-lived that are found on the site?</i> ○ <i>Do foresters consider retaining small patches of trees for retention, patches including a mix of dominant species, particularly when it might be impractical or unadvised to retain scattered individuals of that species?</i> ○ <i>When retention is not generally representative of the dominant species naturally found on the site, <u>is justification documented in the 2460?</u></i> <p>* In order to successfully address this FSC observation, all foresters should <u>provide reasonable written justification in the Timber Sale Cutting Notice (Form 2460) narrative</u> when green tree retention does not maintain species that are representative of the dominant species naturally found on the site.</p>
---	--

SCS review	The DNR response is sufficient to close the observation, although no instances of the new written justifications were viewed during this audit. The observation has been addressed, but this topic should be reviewed by future audit teams.
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i>

Finding Number: 2014.3	
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 Forest Management Standard v1.0, 6.3.a.1
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):	
<p>Observations during the audit made it clear that DNR staff have embraced the “young forest initiative” effort to increase the amount of early seral forest. On the other hand, it was unclear how DNR set landscape level goals for maintaining or recruiting older forest throughout their management area. Currently landscape analysis future age and size class distribution of habitats is done through the NR 44 Master Plans. However, not all properties are covered by these plans yet, and areas outside these plans may not receive the same level of attention.</p>	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): DNR could improve its conformance by evaluating how it is maintaining under-represented successional stages throughout its entire ownership, especially areas not already covered by NR 44 plans.	

<p>FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i></p>	<p>DNR does take into account cover types, age classes and habitats in the context of the larger landscape. These considerations are made during the property planning (both NR44 and IFMP) process, writing of individual timber stand prescriptions, and during timber sale establishment. District ecologists, along with property managers and foresters, address the landscape context of the property and its forest stands in the property management plan. District ecologists confirmed that landscape context of a property is considered and addressed in IFMPs. The interim forest management plan (IFMP) template has a section which specifically addresses the ecological landscape description and property context.</p> <p>Aspen, jack pine, scrub oak and other early successional species have been declining species on the landscape and the proportion of forest lands in early successional stages has also been in decline, consequently many DNR properties have made concerted efforts to encourage early successional stand conditions, including in the aspen, jack pine, and scrub oak cover types. Managing for early successional habitats is one niche that can be met in part on DNR lands relative to the Wisconsin landscape.</p> <p>Species summaries for many common tree species are available on the DNR website at: http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/ForestBusinesses/publications.html. Excerpts for aspen, jack pine, and scrub oak are included below, along with current age class distributions of these species on DNR lands. Within the information included below, the trend of decline for these species across the landscape of Wisconsin, particularly the decrease in the young age classes is readily apparent. Also notable in the age distribution graphs is the fact that despite the focus on maintaining early successional habitat on DNR lands, there remains substantial acreages of each species in older age classes as well. Additionally, older age classes of other species are also managed for on DNR lands as indicated in the age class distributions included for red pine, white pine, oak, and northern hardwoods.</p>
<p>SCS review</p>	<p>At this point the “Young Forest Initiative” is focused on private lands in a four county area. DNR staff may use the term as shorthand, but it is not actually being implemented on public lands. The audit team reviewed the DNR response and supporting inventory data, and is satisfied that DNR is purposefully considering the degree of representation of different age classes as part of their planning process.</p>
<p>Status of CAR:</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i></p>

4.2 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations

Finding Number: 2015.1	
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 type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify): 6 months from finalization of report
FSC Indicator:	FSC-US Forest Management Standard v1.0, 6.6.d
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): Reviews of prescriptions for pesticide use during this audit indicated partial conformance with the requirements in this indicator that in some cases maps were being used as part of prescriptions, and in other cases not. A new draft manual code was prepared in anticipation of being implemented by the 2015 field season, but the new procedures had not been put in place. A Minor CAR with a short term deadline is being issued in order to ensure that progress on this issue is made before the next field season.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): The DNR must assure that written prescriptions for use of chemicals address the required elements of this indicator, specifically including a map of the treatment area.	
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)

Finding Number: 2015.2	
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 Forest Management Standard v1.0, 7.2.a

Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): There is an opportunity for adapting prescriptions to new guidance or information that becomes available after a sale has been planned and sold. The particular instance triggering the observation occurred at the Observatory Hill State Natural Area. The NHI search done on the property had been conducted in 2012 as part of the timber sale preparation. Seasonal restrictions were put into the contract in part to meet the nesting requirements of a threatened bird (the cerulean warbler). The sale finally began harvest in July 2015, at which point the seasonal restrictions had been extended until the end of August. The logger began harvesting, and then was shut down after one day following the updated guidance. While this particular instance was caught by the land management team, similar situations could arise on other sales when NHI data is prepared years before the actual land disturbing activities occur.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): There is an opportunity for improvement to analyze when it is necessary to incorporate the results of monitoring or new scientific and technical information, or change in policy into land management prescriptions (including harvesting, prescribed fire).	
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. Stakeholder Comments

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

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

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

5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted

Logging contractors	

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

<input type="checkbox"/> FME has not received any stakeholder comments from interested parties as a result of stakeholder outreach activities during this annual audit.	
Stakeholder comments	SCS Response
Economic concerns	
No complaints. DNR is generally easy to work with.	Comment noted as evidence of conformance.
Social concerns	
Environmental concerns	

6. Certification Decision

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

7. Changes in Certification Scope

Any changes in the scope of the certification since the previous audit are highlighted in **yellow** in the tables below.

Name and Contact Information

Organization name	State of Wisconsin, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources		
Contact person	Mark Heyde		
Address	101 S. Webster Street	Telephone	608-267-0565
	P.O. Box 7921	Fax	608-266-8576

	Madison, WI 53707-7921	e-mail	Mark.Heyde@Wisconsin.gov
		Website	dnr.wi.gov

FSC Sales Information

FSC salesperson	Sabina Dhungana, WDNR, Forest Products Services		
Address	101 S. Webster Street	Telephone	608-261-0754
	P.O. Box 7921	Fax	608-266-8576
	Madison, WI 53707-7921	e-mail	Sabina.Dhungana@wisconsin.gov
		Website	dnr.wi.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				
Geographic location of non-SLIMF FMU(s)	<i>Latitude & Longitude:</i>			
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				
state managed	1,558,761			
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	0			
Division of FMUs into manageable units:				
Properties are divided into compartments and then 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)	751,035 scheduled for management (WisFIRS Rpt 101)
Area of production forest classified as 'plantation'	0
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by replanting or by a	92,310 (PR, SW and 2/3 PJ)

combination of replanting and coppicing of the planted stems	(Rpt.102)
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by natural regeneration, or by a combination of natural regeneration and coppicing of the naturally regenerated stems	658,724 (Total area minus replanting)
Silvicultural system(s)	Area under type of management
Even-aged management	
Clearcut (clearcut size range 18)	~315,000 (A, 1/3 PJ, OX (Rpt.102))
Shelterwood	~200,000 (PW and O)
Other:	~240,000 (Other types – variety of even-age methods)
Uneven-aged management	
Individual tree selection	~100,000 (NH)
Group selection	~125,000 (BH, SH, CH)
Other:	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (e.g. nursery, recreation area, windbreak, bamboo, silvo-pastoral system, agro-forestry system, etc.)	
The sustainable rate of harvest (usually Annual Allowable Harvest or AAH where available) of commercial timber (m3 of round wood)	26,945 acres of all forest types (area control) -Rpt. 303 Planning year 2014.
Non-timber Forest Products (NTFPs)	
Area of forest protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for the production of NTFPs or services	0
Other areas managed for NTFPs or services	0
Approximate annual commercial production of non-timber forest products included in the scope of the certificate, by product type	Balsam boughs 68 tons; Christmas trees 6,372
Explanation of the assumptions and reference to the data source upon which AAH and NTFP harvest rates estimates are based:	
Data are derived from "WisFIRS" which is a database that contains all recon, treatment, and timber sale data for State and County Lands.	
Species in scope of joint FM/COC certificate: <i>Scientific/ Latin Name (Common/ Trade Name)</i>	
Aspen/Popple:	Populus tremuloides Populus grandidentata
Balsam poplar	Populus balsamifera
White birch	Betula papyrifera
Eastern Cottonwood	Populus deltoides
Swamp white oak	Quercus bicolor
Silver maple	Acer saccharinum
American elm	Ulmus americana
River birch	Betula nigra
Green ash	Fraxinus pennsylvanica
White oak	Quercus alba
Bur oak	Quercus macrocarpa
Black oak	Quercus velutina
Northern pin oak	Quercus ellipsoidalis
Black walnut	Juglans nigra

Butternut	Juglans cinerea
Shagbark hickory	Carya ovata
Bitternut hickory	Carya cordiformis
Black cherry	Prunus serotina
Red maple	Acer rubrum
Hackberry	Celtis occidentalis
Scotch pine	Pinus sylvestris
European larch	Larix decidua
Norway spruce	Picea abies
Eastern redcedar	Juniperus virginiana
Blue spruce	Picea pungens
Norway maple	Acer platanoides
Boxelder	Acer negundo
Black locust	Robinia pseudoacacia
Honey locust	Gleditsia triacanthos
Eastern Hophornbeam, Ironwood	Ostrya virginiana
Musclewood, Bluebeech	Carpinus caroliniana
Sugar maple	Acer saccharum
Yellow birch	Betula alleghaniensis
White ash	Fraxinus americana
American beech	Fagus grandifolia
American basswood	Tilia americana
Northern red oak	Quercus rubra
Northern white cedar	Thuja occidentalis
Balsam fir	Abies balsamea
Eastern hemlock	Tsuga canadensis
Red Pine	Pinus resinosa
Jack Pine	Pinus banksiana
Eastern white pine	Pinus strobus
Black spruce	Picea mariana
Tamarack	Larix laricina
Black ash	Fraxinus nigra
White spruce	Picea glauca.

FSC Product Classification

Timber products		
Product Level 1	Product Level 2	Species
W1 Rough wood	Roundwood (logs)	6,495 MBF and 237,000 cds, all species (Completed sales FY 15 Rpt 28B minus fuelwood and chips reported below)
W1 Rough wood	Fuel wood	3,475 cds, all species (WisFIRS export – prod code 23)
W3 Wood in chips	Wood chips	21,275 cd eqs all species

Non-Timber Forest Products

Conservation Areas

Total area of forest and non-forest land protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for conservation objectives	275,853 stands not scheduled for management (with WisFIRS prefix R,Y, Z)
---	--

High Conservation Value Forest/ Areas

High Conservation Values present and respective areas: Units: ha or ac

	Code	HCV Type	Description & Location	Area
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV1	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g. endemism, endangered species, refugia).	<p>Driftless Area: Large rivers, complex floodplains, sand terraces; Large Blocks of Southern Forest; Prairie & Savanna Remnants</p> <p>Northwoods: Old-growth Developmental Stages HH and NH; Old-growth Developmental Stages Pines; Embedded Wetlands</p> <p>Glacial Outwash Plains & Lakebeds: Xeric Pine-Oak Forests; Pine-Oak Barrens; Large Peatlands, Sedge Meadow, & Wetlands</p> <p>Lake Michigan: Ridge & Swale Communities (inc. Lakeplain Prairie); Beach and Dune Formations; Level Bedrock Influenced Communities; estuaries, Green Bay Marshes</p> <p>Lake Superior: Freshwater Estuaries; Sandscapes; Dunes & Pine Forest; Boreal Clay Plain Forest; Apostle Islands Cliffs & Maritime Forest; Red Clay Wetlands</p> <p>Glaciated Southeast Wisconsin Prairies, Fens, Savannas</p> <p>Niagara Escarpment: Niagara Escarpment</p> <p>Ecological Landscape Features:</p>	19,787

			<p>Central Lake Michigan Central Sand Hills Central Sand Plains Forest Transition North Central Forest Northeast Sands Northern Highland Northern Lake Michigan Northwest Lowlands Northwest Sands Southeast Glacial Plains Southern Lake Michigan</p>	
☒	HCV2	<p>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.</p>	<p>Driftless Area: Large rivers, complex floodplains, sand terraces; Large Blocks of Southern Forest; Prairie & Savanna Remnants; Springs and Cold Water Streams; Cliffs, Caves and Talus Slopes; Relic Conifer Stands and Algific Slopes</p> <p>Northwoods: Old-growth Developmental Stages HH and NH; Old-growth Developmental Stages Pines ;Embedded Wetlands; Biologically Rich Freshwater Lakes</p> <p>Glacial Outwash Plains & Lakebeds: Xeric Pine-Oak Forests; Pine-Oak Barrens; Large Peatlands, Sedge Meadow, & Wetlands</p> <p>Lake Michigan: Ridge & Swale Communities (inc. Lakeplain Prairie); Beach and Dune Formations; Level Bedrock Influenced Communities; estuaries, Green Bay Marshes</p> <p>Lake Superior: Freshwater Estuaries; Sandscapes; Dunes & Pine Forest; Boreal Clay Plain Forest; Apostle Islands Cliffs & Maritime Forest; Red Clay Wetlands</p>	104,189

			<p>Glaciated Southeast Wisconsin Prairies, Fens, Savannas, Kettle Moraine Forest, Emergent Marshes</p> <p>Niagara Escarpment: Niagara Escarpment</p> <p>Ecological Landscape Features: Central Lake Michigan Central Sand Hills Central Sand Plains Forest Transition North Central Forest Northeast Sands Southeast Glacial Plains Southern Lake Michigan</p> <p>Key Ecological Features: Marl Lakes, Lower Wolf River</p>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV3	Forests or areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems.	<p>Driftless Area: Large rivers, complex floodplains, sand terraces; Large Blocks of Southern Forest; Prairie & Savanna Remnants; Springs & Cold Water Streams; Cliffs, Caves, and Talus Slopes; Relict Conifer Stands & Algific Slopes</p> <p>Northwoods: Old-growth Developmental Stages HH and NH; Old-growth Developmental Stages Pines; Embedded Wetlands; Biologically Rich Wild Freshwater Lakes</p> <p>Glacial Outwash Plains & Lakebeds Xeric Pine-Oak Forests Pine-Oak Barrens Large Peatlands, Sedge Meadow, & Wetlands</p> <p>Lake Michigan: Ridge & Swale Communities (inc. Lakeplain Prairie); Beach and Dune Formations;</p>	184,997

			<p>Level Bedrock Influenced Communities; Estuaries; Green Bay Marshes</p> <p>Lake Superior Freshwater Estuaries; Sandscapes, Dunes & Pine Forest; Boreal Clay Plain Forest; Apostle Islands Cliffs & Maritime Forest; Red Clay Wetlands</p> <p>Glaciated Southeast Wisconsin: Prairies, Fens, Savannas; Kettle Moraine Forests; Emergent Marshes;</p> <p>Wisconsin's Key Ecological Features Marl Lakes; Lower Wolf River</p> <p>Niagara Escarpment: Niagara Escarpment</p> <p>Ecological Landscape Features: Central Lake Michigan Central Sand Hills Central Sand Plains Forest Transition North Central Forest Northeast Sands Northern Highland Northern Lake Michigan Northwest Lowlands Northwest sands Southeast Glacial Plains Southwest Grasslands Superior Coastal Plain Western Coulees & Ridges Western Prairie</p>	
<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 checked="" 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).	776
Total Area of forest classified as 'High Conservation Value Forest/ Area'			309,749


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:	<p>The following DNR owned properties (about 30,477 total acres) are excluded from the scope of forest certification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agricultural fields subject to share-crop agreements (approximately 20,600 acres – (Stands with cover-type F in WisFIRS) • Specific intensive non-forest use areas, as provided below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Fish Hatcheries, Rearing Ponds & Rough Fish Stations (180 acres – LMS¹ (4 ac./site)) • State Forest Nurseries (297 acres – WisFIRS) • Poynette Game Farm and McKenzie Environmental Center (621 acres - WisFIRS) • Boat Access Sites (718 acres – LMS² (1 ac./access)) • Fire & Radio Tower Sites (143 acres – LMS³ (1 ac./tower)) • Ranger Stations, Administrative Offices and Storage Buildings (6,818 acres – LMS⁴ (2.5 ac./building)) • State Park Intensively Developed Recreation Areas (200 acres – WisFIRS) e.g. Peninsula State Park golf course, Blue Mound State Park swimming pool, Granite Peak Ski Area <p>Additionally, lands leased or eased from other owners who have retained vegetative management authority are also excluded.</p> <p>*Included in the scope of forest certification are DNR fee title owned properties and the leased Meadow Valley, McMillian, and Wood County Wildlife Areas.</p>
Control measures to prevent mixing of certified and non-certified product (C8.3):	Excised areas are not managed for timber and logs are not sold from these areas, thus there is no risk of mixing.
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. Annual Data Update

8.1 Social Information

Number of forest workers (including contractors) working in forest within scope of certificate (differentiated by gender):		
# of male workers 297 DNR division of forestry	# of female workers 90 DNR division of forestry	
 2014 OSHA 300 form.pdf	Serious: # 89 (data is only available at the level of the whole DNR, not just forestry related accidents)	Fatal: # 0

8.2 Annual Summary of Pesticide and Other Chemical Use

<input type="checkbox"/> FME does not use pesticides.				
Commercial name of pesticide / herbicide	Active ingredient	Quantity applied annually (kg or lbs)	Size of area treated during previous year	Reason for use
 Copy of Pesticide Use2014_FSC final.xl				

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.

FMU Name	FMU Size Category: - SLIMF - non-SLIMF - Large > 10,000 ha	Forest Type: - Plantation - Natural Forest	Rationale for Selection: - Random Sample - Stakeholder issue - Ease of access - Other – please describe

Appendix 2 – List of Stakeholders Consulted

List of FME Staff Consulted

Name	Title	Contact Information	Consultation method
Mark Heyde	Forest Cert. Coord. Madison DNR		Interview
Andy Paulios	Wildlife Biologist, Property Manager		Interview
Rachel McDonald	Staff Specialist		Interview
Randy Stampfl	Forester		Interview
Steve Holaday	Forester		Interview
Nate Fayram	District Ecologist		Interview
Nathan Nye	Fisheries Biologist, Property Manager		Interview
Bruce Henderson	Forester		Interview
Joel Green	Forester		Interview
Sarah Kehrl	Wildlife Biologist, Property Manager		Interview
Mark Witecha	Wildlife Biologist, Property Manager		Interview
Dave Sample	State Natural Areas Ecologist		Interview

Sharene Smith	Real Estate Area Supervisor		Interview
Sharon Fandel	District Ecologist		Interview
Paul Samerdyke	Wildlife Biologist, Property Manager		Interview
Mike Seiger	Forester		Interview
Aaron Young	Forester		Interview
Nathan Holoubek	Wildlife Biologist		Interview
Nick Koltz	Forester		Interview
RJ Wickham	Forestry Team Leader		Interview
Scott Sullivan	Forester		Interview
John Robaidek	Ecologist, Property Manager		Interview
Jake Fries	Wildlife Biologist, Property Manager		Interview
Jim Holzwart	Wildlife Biologist, Property Manager		Interview
Ellen Barth	Area Wildlife Supervisor		Interview
Jason Hennes	Forestry Tech		Interview
Mackenzie Siglinski	Forester		Interview
Tom Vanden Elzen	Forester		Interview
Bryan Woodbury	Wildlife Biologist, Property Manager		Interview
Rachel Brookins	Wildlife Biologist, Property Manager		Interview
James Christopolous	Wildlife Biologist, Property Manager		Interview
Aaron Buchholz	District Land Representative		Interview
Matt Zine	Conservation Biologist, Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation		Interview
Dan Weidert	Wildlife Biologist, Wildlife Biologist		Interview
Tom Vanden Elzen	Forester		Interview
Natanya Hayden	Wildlife Biologist, Property Manager		Interview
Andy Noth	Forester		Interview
Steve Kaufman	Forester		Interview
Kate Lenz	Forestry Staff Specialist		Interview
Josh Martinez	Wildlife Biologist, Property Manager		Interview

Kelli Bruns	Park Superintendent		Interview
John Lubbers	Forestry Team Leader		Interview
Chris Plzak	Forester		Interview
Bill Ruff	Forester		Interview
Guy Willman	Park Superintendent		Interview
Fred Viste	Park Manager		Interview
Carolyn Morgen	Park Superintendent		Interview
Adam Zirbel	Forester		Interview
Julie Peltier	Forester		Interview
Clint Gilman	Forester		Interview
Jason Quast	Park Superintendent		Interview
Jeff Weatherly	Forestry Area Supervisor		Interview

List of other Stakeholders Consulted

List of other Stakeholders Consulted

Name	Organization	Contact Information	Consultation method	Requests Cert. Notf.
Scott Koerner	Koerner Forest Products			N
Andrew Komassa	Weekly Timber and Pulp			N
Pete Johnson	AAA Hardwoods			N

Appendix 3 – Additional Audit Techniques Employed

No additional audit techniques were used.

Appendix 4 – Pesticide Derogations

Compliance with pesticide derogation conditions was not reviewed during this audit. Wisconsin DNR is in the process of reapplying to FSC International for pesticide derogations in order to continue using these normally prohibited chemicals. If the derogations are granted, compliance with the conditions will be reviewed during the next audit.

Appendix 5 – Detailed Observations

Evaluation Year	FSC P&C Reviewed
2013	All – (Re)certification Evaluation
2014	1.5, 2.3, P3, P4, 5.6, 6.2, 6.3, 6.9, 8.2, and 9.4
2015	P1, P2, P5, 6.2, 6.3, 6.9, 8.2, and 9.4

2016	
2017	

C= Conformance with Criterion or Indicator
 NC= Nonconformance 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. <i>Forest</i> 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. The only active court case of significance in this manner regards the methods that may be used by tribes with treaty rights to hunt off reservation areas (specifically whether tribal hunters may use firearms at night). DNR legal staff were interviewed as a part of the audit.
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.	C	Forest Management Guidelines include list of applicable laws as an appendix.
C1.2. All applicable and legally prescribed fees, royalties, taxes and other charges shall be paid.	C	
1.2.a. The forest owner or manager provides written evidence that all applicable and legally prescribed fees, royalties, taxes and other charges are being paid in a timely manner. If payment is beyond the control of the landowner or manager, then there is evidence that every attempt at payment was made.	C	State land is not subject to taxes, but DNR does make payments in lieu of taxes. The tax payment deadline is equivalent to when private land taxes are due. Calculation of the payment differs depending on whether the land was acquired pre or post 1992. No evidence of non-payment, as such a situation would be very apparent to DNR stakeholders. There are no other timber harvesting taxes.
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	International treaties in the U.S. are implemented through applicable federal and state laws. No evidence of non-conformance.
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	No conflicts between laws and certification criteria have arisen. DNR is in close communication with their CB.
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	As a state agency WDNR has its own law enforcement staff, including forestry law enforcement specialists and game wardens. Most common forest related crimes involve timber theft and unauthorized fires. DNR foresters are empowered to seize and impound wood if there is evidence of illegal harvesting. This occurs approximately 6 times per year, with maybe one being on DNR land. The magnitude of

		cases vary widely, with simply cutting over a property line being the most common.
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	WDNR staff law enforcement work cooperatively with local law enforcement and county prosecutors when cases are brought to court.
C1.6. Forest managers shall demonstrate a long-term commitment to adhere to the FSC Principles and Criteria.	C	
1.6.a. The forest owner or manager demonstrates a long-term commitment to adhere to the FSC Principles and Criteria and FSC and FSC-US policies, including the FSC-US Land Sales Policy, and has a publicly available statement of commitment to manage the FMU in conformance with FSC standards and policies.	C	The commitment to the P&C is communicated throughout the organizations via the DNR – Public Lands Handbook.
1.6.b. If the certificate holder does not certify their entire holdings, then they document, in brief, the reasons for seeking partial certification referencing FSC-POL-20-002 (or subsequent policy revisions), the location of other managed forest units, the natural resources found on the holdings being excluded from certification, and the management activities planned for the holdings being excluded from certification.	C	All DNR managed forest lands are included in the scope of the certificate. Agricultural and intensively managed non-forest lands (hatcheries, golf courses, etc.) owned by DNR are excluded. Management activities on these excluded lands are not related to forest management, so the chance of mixing certified wood from these areas is non-existent.
1.6.c. The forest owner or manager notifies the Certifying Body of significant changes in ownership and/or significant changes in management planning within 90 days of such change.	C	WDNR is in regular communication with SCS.
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 long-term rights to use and manage the FMU for the purposes described in the management plan.	C	DNR maintains a full time real estate department to cover land exchanges. Real estate personnel were interviewed as part of the audit. Clear title to all property is maintained.
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	Deeds and other property records indicate presence of easements, use rights, and other third part rights.
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 always clearly identified prior to activities beginning. If borders are unclear or in dispute, land is surveyed and boundaries are re-established. Multiple property boundaries were reviewed during the audit, and all were clearly marked with paint and signage.
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. <i>Applicability Note: For the planning and management of publicly owned forests, the local community is defined as all residents and property owners of the relevant jurisdiction.</i>	C	
2.2.a. The forest owner or manager allows the exercise of tenure and use rights allowable by law or regulation.	C	Type of use rights present vary by the parcel and management designation. Recreation use is common on park lands. Hunting varies with the season, but DNR properties are intensively used during deer season.
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	Consultation occurs regularly, chiefly through the management planning process when property master plans are created. Consultation over tribal use rights is done at a senior level in a government to government relationship.
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	C	

considered in the certification evaluation. Disputes of substantial magnitude involving a significant number of interests will normally disqualify an operation from being certified.		
2.3.a. If <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	No significant disputes over tenure rights have occurred. Extensive stakeholder consultation in formal and informal (open door policy) is undertaken to diffuse any potential disputes.
2.3.b. The forest owner or manager documents any significant disputes over tenure and use rights.	C	There are no significant disputes over tenure and use rights. Should such disputes arise they are to be handled through the State Natural Resources Board.
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	Consultation is undertaken at several levels. DNR has a statewide tribal liaison to interact with tribes at a government to government level. Individual staff serve as liaison and contacts for individual tribes. Tribes are formally consulted during the master planning process to make sure that their resource rights are preserved. Examples of protection viewed during this audit were chiefly archeological sites protected during harvesting, such as burial mounds. All harvests are screened through the state archeological office, which provides protection measures based on the type of resource to be protected – usually buffering out of sites. Location of the exact areas is kept confidential from DNR staff and contractors.
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 archeological and cultural sites are protected. (see 3.2.b)
P4 Forest management operations shall maintain or enhance the long-term social and economic well-being of forest workers and local communities.		
C4.2. Forest management should meet or exceed all applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of employees and their families.		
4.2.a. The forest owner or manager meets or exceeds all applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of employees and their families (also see Criterion 1.1).	C	Staff has access to relevant laws, including state statutes and administrative codes using the internet. The Department maintains an intranet that houses manual codes and handbooks for all Department programs. A list of applicable laws and regulations was updated in 2011 and is maintained in the Division of Forestry's Forest Management Guidelines publication, Appendix D.
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	No active harvesting was reviewed during the audit, but safety discussions were held prior to field days. Contracts contain language requiring that contractors follow OSHA safety regulations.
4.2.c. The forest owner or manager hires well-qualified service providers to safely implement the management plan.	C	Interviews with several logging contractors during the audit emphasized safety protocols and training courses that are undertaken. Loggers are required to undergo FISTA training, focusing on safety and logging techniques.
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.		

<p>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:</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. <p>A summary is available to the CB.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>WDNR takes affirmative steps to understand the social impacts of their management. A summary document was prepared in response to a previous CAR indicating where discussion of each impact could be identified.</p> <p>DNR has staff sociologists dedicated to understanding the social impact of forest management. The Wisconsin Environmental Policy act requires an evaluation of social impacts, including historic, cultural, scenic, and recreational resources. Archeological sites are mapped in state database and protections measures are put in place prior to activities beginning.</p> <p>Individual master plans include discussion of social impacts as part of a regional property analysis.</p> <p>Examples of interaction with stakeholders during this audit include a timber sale in Mekan River Fishery Area. Public interest in the sale has been high due to the proximity to the Mekan Springs, and relatively long period of time since previous harvesting in this area. DNR has held public meetings and done outreach to interested parties. Original planned harvest area was 300 acres, now closer to 100 based on different considerations taken into account as part of planning.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Input from the public is a standard part of management planning. All planning documents are posted online. In cases of higher interest like Mekan River, public meetings are held to discuss individual plans.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Local neighbors are contacted by individual property managers when activities begin. At a larger level, there is a government email distribution list that allows for interested parties to opt into notifications on certain topics and properties.</p>
<p>4.4.d. For public forests, consultation shall include the 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>Government email distribution list that allows for interested parties to opt into notifications on certain topics and properties.</p> <p>At an individual harvest level, managers communicate with neighboring owners when they are harvesting on a boundary. WEPA process provides opportunity for public input. Issues on a site level basis happen more informally. Harvest planning done on annual basis, with an opportunity for comment as part of that. All planning activities are presented on the DNR website for comment.</p> <p>Parties can avail themselves of administrative hearing process. Any decision by the department can be appealed (a decision being defined as any plan or permit). The aggrieved party has the opportunity to have appeal heard in front of hearing examiner.</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>DNR State Lands expenses are paid from revenues put into the Conservation Fund. This fund is a segregated (SEG) trust fund used to finance many of the state's resource management programs administered by the Department of Natural Resources (DNR). DNR programs supported by conservation fund revenues include wildlife</p>

		<p>and fish management, forestry, the state parks system, the endangered resources program, and several recreational vehicle programs. The conservation fund also supports programs and operations in other agencies. Revenues are generated by charging fees for hunting and fishing stamps and licenses, property millage tax, Forest Tax Law program, campsite and motor vehicle admission fees, boat, snowmobile and ATV registration fees and state and federal grants (refer to the Conservation Fund Informational Paper 62). The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation is funded mostly by grants.</p> <p>In the 2015 budget passed just prior to this audit, DNR has been asked to reduce expenditures by the legislature, primarily through reducing headcount by 100 positions (out of approximately 2600). DNR staff was in the process of identifying positions to be eliminated. It remains to be seen how this will effect on the ground management, and this topic will be reviewed in future years. DNR's efforts at streamlining and prioritizing their work through a strategic alignment process should also allow them to focus on their core activities.</p>
5.1.b. Responses to short-term financial factors are limited to levels that are consistent with fulfillment of this Standard.	C	Recent staff cuts have not been in place long enough to result in possible non-conformities with the standard, although this needs to be monitored during future audits.
C5.2. Forest management and marketing operations should encourage the optimal use and local processing of the forest's diversity of products.	C	
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.	C	All sales on state lands are approved by the Timber Sales Manager and Forest Supervisor. Timber sale notices are placed in a newspaper that has general circulation in the county where the sale is located. DNR also maintains a list of interested buyers and send sales prospectus to them. Interviews with logging contractors during the audit indicated that all were local, from within Wisconsin and often within the same county. There is some variation in the type of products being merchandized on the forest depending on the local markets (e.g. distance from the nearest chip mill). In the southern part of the state that was the focus of this audit the markets for chips is more difficult, but the market for sawlogs is strong.
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.	C	The Forest Product Services Group addresses this at a statewide level. The group has assisted in identifying timber baskets (e.g. sourcing areas) for potential industry looking to set up in the state. Potential industries range from toothpicks to ethanol (in which case the requested resource needed was more than could be sustained).
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.	C	Most timber sales are relatively small and potentially suitable for purchase by most small businesses. The DNR also offers a deferred payment option for most pay-as-cut sales. In addition, DNR allows buyers of lump sum timber sales to break them up into smaller cutting units and pay for them individually.
C5.3. Forest management should minimize waste associated with harvesting and on-site processing operations and avoid damage to other forest resources.	C	
5.3.a. Management practices are employed to minimize the loss and/or waste of harvested forest products.	C	Harvesting contracts inspected during the audit stress the careful utilization of forest products, and inspections of recent harvests confirm conformance by contractors. Residual tree damage during the audit was at a low level, although DNR is considering a policy to quantify tree damage in order to more fairly identify when it is excessive.

<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 minimized; • 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>C</p>	<p>Soil maps are included in the assessment of each site before harvest, as are water and other sensitive resources. An example of a timber harvest area that had been shut down during the wet season due to rutting was reviewed, although the ruts were not perceptible, indicative of DNR's precautionous approach.</p> <p>Residual tree damage was low.</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. DNR has a Forest Products lab where economists track forest trends in markets for forest products.</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>The Forest Product Services Group works with businesses to expand markets, including exports. As a public agency, DNR manages for much more than economic uses. On most DNR properties, recreational hunting and fishing are the chief management goals, with timber harvesting as a side benefit.</p>
<p>C5.5. Forest management operations shall recognize, maintain, and, where appropriate, enhance the value of forest services and resources such as watersheds and fisheries.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>5.5.a. In developing and implementing activities on the FMU, the forest owner or manager identifies, defines and implements appropriate measures for maintaining and/or enhancing forest services and resources that serve public values, including municipal watersheds, fisheries, carbon storage and sequestration, recreation and tourism.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>As a state agency with a mandate to manage for a diversity of uses, DNR is focused on providing a wide variety of values beyond timber. Much of the audit focused on wildlife areas, whose chief land management goals are providing habitat for fish and game. Another excellent example of the recreational focus is the attention paid to the Ice Age trail, a statewide hiking and skiing trail which runs throughout multiple properties.</p>
<p>5.5.b The forest owner or manager uses the information from Indicator 5.5.a to implement appropriate measures for maintaining and/or enhancing these services and resources.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>DNR actively manages its non-timber resources for public benefit. Examples reviewed during this audit was the modulation of water levels at the Grand River Wildlife Area in order to restore wetlands and maintain a variety of different waterfowl habitats.</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>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>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>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>	C	<p>The 15-year projected AAH is 24,610, which includes the smoothed backlog of harvesting due, in part, to the addition of “other” state lands into the universe of managed lands. DNR will on average have 18,000 acres per year of established sales. In 2014 18,605 acres were established and sold.</p>
<p>5.6.c. Rates and methods of timber harvest lead to achieving desired conditions, and improve or maintain health and quality across the FMU. Overstocked stands and stands that have been depleted or rendered to be below productive potential due to natural events, past management, or lack of management, are returned to desired stocking levels and composition at the earliest practicable time as justified in management objectives.</p>	C	<p>Master plans clearly set desired conditions for different forest types and age classes on each property. Management codes for each stand are established to move the land unit toward these conditions. Several site visits during the audit were to stands that were being restored to historical conditions.</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>	C	<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>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 the management of RTE species. Prior to master planning, Rapid Ecological Assessments are conducted by ecologists from the Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation. 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 Natural Heritage Inventory (NHI) databases are referenced. Interviews with a number of NHC ecologists during field visits revealed descriptions of numerous surveys designed to assess rare species and important indicator species.</p> <p>A notable example of the system in action during this year’s audit was the harvest at Observatory Hill SNA. Harvesting was shut down due to an NHI hit from a population of cerulean warbler.</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</p>	C	<p>As above, pre-management reviews are conducted with an integrated team 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.</p>

<p>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>		<p>Protection measures observed during the audit take a variety of forms, including seasonal restrictions, like around cerulean warbler areas, or conservation zones established around particular locations, such as the bald eagle nest in the Mekan Headwaters sale.</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>	<p>C</p>	<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 NHC 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 vulnerable species and communities (See Criterion 1.5).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Since DNR is also the state agency that regulates hunting and fishing, it has capacity to regulate collection of vulnerable species on its land. Hunting and gathering is monitored by game wardens and other law enforcement personnel, as well as DNR staff.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>C6.3.a. Landscape-scale indicators</p>		
<p>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.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>See response to OBS 2014.3 in this report</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>If a rare ecological community is present, it is identified in the state's NHI database, at which point the land manager consults with an ecologist in the Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation to develop appropriate management options. More commonly, rare communities are already identified and may be part of an SNA, with a management plan developed to feature a viable community.</p> <p>SNA's visited during the audit included sites focused on the protection of rare fens, aquatic plants at Plainfield Tunnel Lakes, and the headwaters of the Mekan river.</p>
<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</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>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. DNR also has developed an Old-Growth and Old Forest Handbook to assist in the assessment, classification, and management of old forests.</p>

<p>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). 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’s forest management goals are ecologically oriented, and management is conducted to maintain ecological habitat conditions that are suited to each site. These decisions are aided by the habitat classification that is done as a component of reconnaissance surveys for each site. Examples include harvesting around Grand River Wildlife area included the removal of planted pine in order to favor natural regeneration of mixed hardwood and native prairie systems.</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 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>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.</p> <p>The BMPs are no longer seen as “new” rules, and foresters, logging contractors, and other agency staff were all knowledgeable of their details.</p>
<p>Stand-scale Indicators</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>	C	<p>Management prescriptions for sites visited were consistently written to enhance or maintain current or desired composition of plant species on the site. This is done primarily by favoring natural regeneration, and focusing harvesting on removal of non-native species that had historically been planted on the FMU. DNR also uses extensive chemical, controlled burning, and mechanical treatments to combat invasive exotic species and maintain native plant communities.</p>
<p>6.3.e. When planting is required, a local source of known</p>		<p>Planting stock is provided by Wisconsin state nurseries, and seed</p>

<p>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>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 written 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 in the Wis FIRS database. DNR response to OBS 2014.2 encourages DNR foresters to record reasons why retention trees may not be representative of the dominant tree on site, particularly in aspen stands. Implementation of this new guidance will be monitored in future audits.</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. The Silviculture Handbook, Section 24-17, has detailed guidelines for retention of trees in managed stands.</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. 4. Demonstrates that the variations will result in equal or greater benefit to wildlife, water quality, and other values compared to the normal opening size limits, including for sensitive and rare species. 5. Is reviewed by independent experts in wildlife biology, hydrology, and landscape ecology, to confirm the preceding findings. 	<p>C</p>	<p>There are no opening-size limits for the Lake States-Central Hardwoods region.</p>
<p>6.3.h. The forest owner or manager assesses the risk of,</p>		

<p>prioritizes, and, as warranted, develops and implements 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; 3. eradication or control of established invasive populations when feasible: and, 4. monitoring of control measures and management practices to assess their effectiveness in preventing or controlling invasive species. 	<p>C</p>	<p>Auditors consistently observed efforts to limit the introduction and spread of exotic plants. Many contracts specify that logging equipment is cleaned before harvest is initiated. Staff are well-trained in invasive species BMPs. DNR monitors the effectiveness of their control measures and routinely make changes to 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>DNR developed, in response to legislative directives, A Statewide Strategic Plan for Invasive Species. Invasive plants are a widespread problem on state lands, but DNR employees are well trained to identify and respond to the need for management.</p> <p>DNR continues to have an aggressive system to monitor and control the spread of invasive species. Focus species for sites visited during the 2015 audit were buckthorn, Japanese barberry, honeysuckle, and garlic mustard. While invasive species remain a challenge, their management continues to be a strong element of DNR’s overall performance.</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>	<p>C</p>	<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>C6.9. 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 exotic species is contingent on the availability of credible scientific data indicating that any such species is non-invasive and its application does not pose a risk to native biodiversity.</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. Historic plantings of non-native species such as Norway spruce are being phased out and not replanted.</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>None used, so not applicable.</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>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><i>Applicability Note: On small and medium-sized forests (see Glossary), an informal, qualitative assessment may be appropriate. Formal, quantitative monitoring is required on large forests and/or intensively managed forests.</i></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</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Wisconsin Forest Inventory Reporting System (WisFIRS), Public Lands Handbook chapter 100</p>

<p>e) stand and forest composition and structure; and f) timber quality.</p>		<p>The main timber inventory is done through forest compartment reconnaissance (recon). Recon is a stand level assessment used to populate the Wisconsin Forest Inventory Reporting System (WisFIRS). Plots include measurements of species, volume (merchantable log tally and basal area reading), stocking, site index, timber quality, and general forest conditions.</p> <p>Recon is done on an as needed basis depending on several triggers (timber sale establishment, closeout, land acquisition, etc.) but no longer than every 15 years on state land.</p> <p>DNR has also started a Continuous Forest Inventory system on state forests only. Started in 2007, the first 5 year report has been completed, "Wisconsin Continuous forest Inventory Report." The CFI system captures more in-depth information than the recon, but is done on an annual basis for a smaller area.</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>	C	<p>Recon is conducted after large scale loss events to reassess timber volumes. Since DNR operates on an area control rather than volume, timber loss in these cases would result in other areas being taken out of planned harvest.</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>	C	<p>Post-harvest reports in the WisFIRS system capture records of harvested material.</p>
<p>8.2.c. The forest owner or manager periodically obtains data needed to monitor presence on the FMU of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Rare, threatened and endangered species and/or their habitats; 2) Common and rare plant communities and/or habitat; 3) Location, presence and abundance of invasive species; 4) Condition of protected areas, set-asides and buffer zones; 5) High Conservation Value Forests (see Criterion 9.4). 	C	<p>CFI captures data on plant communities.</p> <p>Invasive species monitoring currently done as part of recon. Recommendations in the statewide strategic plan for invasives call for a more all-encompassing approach that would incorporate monitoring from members of the public.</p> <p>State Natural areas are monitored through inspection reports.</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>	C	<p>Monitoring of this type is done through timber sale administration. The Timber sale handbook details how active timber sales are reviewed and closed out. Individual reports are prepared as part of monitoring visits, numerous examples of which are included in sale notes for the timber sales reviewed during this audit.</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>	C	<p>Interviews with facilities managers indicate that road monitoring is an ongoing process. DNR recently completed a formal review of roads and parking lots and identified areas for improvement.</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>	C	<p>Statewide forest action plan looks into detail of effects of timber on state economy, updated every 5 years, looking at state of forest products industry, salaries of foresters, etc. DNR has daily interaction with state forest products sector.</p>
<p>8.2.d.4. Stakeholder responses to management activities are monitored and recorded as necessary.</p>	C	<p>Stakeholder responses are reviewed on a property level as part of annual management planning process.</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>	C	<p>Opportunities for joint monitoring are provided to local tribes.</p>
<p>8.2.e. The forest owner or manager monitors the costs and</p>	C	<p>Although financial return is not the primary motivation of the state</p>

revenues of management in order to assess productivity and efficiency.		agency, revenue and costs are tracked and detailed as part of standard financial record keeping.
<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). <p>Examples of forest areas that <i>may have</i> high conservation value attributes include, but are not limited to:</p> <p>Central Hardwoods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Old growth – (see Glossary) (a) • Old forests/mixed age stands that include trees >160 years old (a) • Municipal watersheds –headwaters, reservoirs (c) • Rare, Threatened, and Endangered (RTE) ecosystems, as defined by GAP analysis, Natural Heritage Inventory, and/or the World Wildlife Fund's Forest Communities of Highest Conservation Concern, and/or Great Lakes Assessment (b) • Intact forest blocks in an agriculturally dominated landscape (refugia) (a) • Intact forests >1000 ac (valuable to interior forest species) (a) • Protected caves (a, b, or d) • Savannas (a, b, c, or d) • Glades (a, b, or d) • Barrens (a, b, or d) • Prairie remnants (a, b, or d) <p>North Woods/Lake States:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Old growth – (see Glossary) (a) • Old forests/mixed age stands that include trees >120 years old (a) • Blocks of contiguous forest, > 500 ac, which host RTEs (b) • Oak savannas (b) • Hemlock-dominated forests (b) • Pine stands of natural origin (b) • Contiguous blocks, >500 ac, of late successional species, that are managed to create old growth (a) • Fens, particularly calcareous fens (c) • Other non-forest communities, e.g., barrens, prairies, distinctive geological land forms, vernal pools (b or c) • Other sites as defined by GAP analysis, Natural Heritage Inventory, and/or the World Wildlife Fund's Forest Communities of Highest Conservation Concern (b) <p><i>Note: In the Lake States-Central Hardwoods region, old growth (see Glossary) is both rare and invariably an HCVF.</i></p> <p><i>In the Lake States-Central Hardwoods region, cutting timber is not permitted in old-growth stands or forests.</i></p> <p><i>Note: Old forests (see Glossary) may or may not be designated HCVFs. They are managed to maintain or recruit: (1) the existing abundance of old trees and (2) the landscape- and stand-level structures of old-growth forests, consistent with the composition and structures produced by natural processes.</i></p> <p><i>Old forests that either have or are developing old-growth attributes, but which have been previously harvested, may be designated HCVFs and may be harvested under special plans that account for the ecological attributes that make it an HCVF.</i></p> <p><i>Forest management maintains a mix of sub-climax and climax old-forest conditions in the landscape.</i></p>		
C9.4. Annual monitoring shall be conducted to assess the		

<p>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 inspected at least every other year (with the exception of very remote sites that are difficult to access). 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>SNA monitoring reports were sampled during the audit (including Sohlberg Silver Lake). Methodology for conducting the these monitoring efforts continues to have some variability, which DNR is trying to address in its response to OBS 2014.1</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 6 – Chain of Custody Indicators for FMEs

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