



**FSC Certification Report for the
2009 Annual Audit of the:
Wisconsin State Forests managed by
the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Certificate Number: SCS-FM/COC-00070N**

**Under the
SCS Forest Conservation Program
(An FSC-Accredited Certification Program)**

**Date of Field Audit: August 12-14, 2009
Date of Report:**

**Scientific Certification Systems
2200 Powell Street, Suite 725
Emeryville, CA 94608**

SCS Contact: Dave Wager, Program Director
dwager@scscertified.com

Client Contact: Paul Pingrey, paul.pingrey@dnr.state.wi.us

Section 2.0 (Surveillance Decision and Public Record) will be made publicly available on the SCS website (www.scscertified.com) no later than 60 days after the report is finalized.

1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1 CONTACT INFORMATION

- Wisconsin DNR, Division of Forestry
- Contact person: Paul Pingrey
- Address: 101 S. Webster St., P.O. Box 7921, Madison, WI 53707-7921
- Telephone: (608) 266-1727
- Fax: (608) 266-8576
- E-mail: paulpingrey@dnr.state.wi.us
- Certificate Type: single Forest management certificate with Forest gate chain-of-custody
- Certified products: Hardwood and softwood stumpage
- Number of Acres/hectares seeking to be certified: approximately 1.5 million acres. All lands are state managed including 513,000 acres of state forests and 984,157 acres of Land Division properties.
- Nearest Town: Madison, Wisconsin
- Tenure: Public, state owned
- Forest Composition: A mosaic of conifer and hardwood cover types, classified by species dominance; e.g., White Pine, Spruce-Fir, Northern Hardwoods, Central Hardwood, Oak, Red Maple, Aspen, Pine Plantations
- Managed as: Natural Forest

1.2 General Background

This report covers the first annual audit after the 2008/2009 recertification and scope expansion of the Wisconsin DNR State Forests and “Other State Lands” pursuant to the FSC guidelines for annual audits as well as the terms of the forest management certificate, as awarded by Scientific Certification Systems initially on May, 2003 and then again on January 13, 2009¹ (SCS-FM/COC-00070N). All certificates issued by SCS under the aegis of the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) require annual audits to ascertain ongoing compliance with the requirements and standards of certification. A public summary of the initial evaluation is available on the SCS website www.scs-certified.com.

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

- A focused assessment of the status of any outstanding conditions or corrective action requests
- Follow-up inquiry into any issues that may have arisen since the award of certification or prior audit

¹ The field work for the recertification and scope expansion was completed September 15-19, 2008, the audit report was finalized December 16, 2008 and the certificate was issued on January 13, 2009. An annual audit was required in 2009 in order to meet the FSC requirement that all certificates receive an annual audit each calendar year.

- 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. The 2009 team completed a full audit of the Department's conformance to Principles 3 and 7, as elaborated by the Lake States Regional Standard.

At the time of the August 2009 annual audit, there were nine open Corrective Action Requests (CARs). The WI DNR's response to these CAR's was a major focus of the annual audit: see discussion, below, for a listing of those CARs and their disposition as a result of this annual audit.

1.3 Guidelines/Standards Employed

For this annual audit, the SCS auditor team evaluated the extent of conformance to selected elements of the FSC Lake States Regional Standard, Version 3.0.

2.0 SURVEILLANCE DECISION AND PUBLIC RECORD

2.1 Assessment Dates

The field and office components of this surveillance audit took place during August 12-14, 2009.

2.2 Assessment Personnel

Dr. Robert J. Hrubes, Lead Auditor: Dr. Hrubes is Senior Vice-President of Scientific Certification Systems. He is a registered professional forester and forest economist with 27 years of professional experience in both public and private forest management issues. Dr. Hrubes worked in collaboration with SCS to develop the programmatic protocol that guide all SCS Forest Conservation Program evaluations. Dr. Hrubes has led numerous SCS Forest Conservation Program evaluations of North American (U.S. and Canada) industrial forest ownerships, as well as operations in Scandinavia, Chile, and Japan. He also has professional work experience in Brazil, Germany, Guam (U.S.), Hawaii (U.S.), and Malaysia. Dr. Hrubes is the principal author of this audit report.

Mr. Michael Ferrucci, Team Member: Michael Ferrucci is a founding partner and President of Interforest, LLC, and a partner in Ferrucci & Walicki, LLC, a land management company that has served private landowners in southern New England for 18 years. Its clients include private citizens, land trusts, municipalities, corporations, private water companies, and non-profit organizations. He has a B.Sc. degree in forestry from the University of Maine and a Master of Forestry degree from the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies. Mr. Ferrucci's primary expertise is in management of watershed forests to provide timber, drinking water, and the protection of other values; in forest inventory and timber appraisal; hardwood forest silviculture and marketing; and the ecology and silviculture of natural forests of the eastern United States. He also lectures on private sector forestry, leadership, and forest resource management at the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies.

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

JoAnn M. Hanowski was a senior research fellow at the University of Minnesota-Duluth's Natural Resources Research Institute. She has considerable expertise evaluating the effects of forest management on wildlife habitat, and is currently working on research projects involving the response of birds to various forest management practices in stream and seasonal pond buffers and the development of indicators of forest and water health and sustainability in Minnesota and across the Great Lakes. She was a member of the forest bird technical team for the original GEIS and participated on the wildlife technical team that wrote forest management guidelines for Minnesota. She served on the riparian science technical committee that investigated the effectiveness of Minnesota's current guidelines for forest management in riparian systems and provided scientific expertise for Minnesota's biomass harvesting guidelines. She has published 67 peer-reviewed journal articles and over 75 reports in her 21 year tenure with the University of Minnesota. In 2005 JoAnn participated in the largest forest certification project ever conducted in the United States, the joint FSC/SFI certification of Minnesota's state lands. JoAnn has contributed regional ecological expertise to the FSC and SFI audits in MN, WI and MA and now lives in VT.

2.3 Assessment Process

The scope of the 2009 audit included the following activities: document review, auditors spending time in the field and office, interviewing management personnel and, as appropriate, interacting with outside stakeholders. To enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of the assessment, the audit team was divided into three sub-teams that traveled to different sites. The use of three sub-teams allowed for more diversity and geographic coverage of field sites that could be visited within the allotted time frame.

The auditors inspected a variety of field sites to assess conformance with selected elements of the Lakes States-Central Hardwoods FSC Regional Standard. During the audit planning phase, the Lead Auditor and the WDNR representative reviewed the range of field activities and formulated a sampling plan. The Lead Auditor and WDNR representatives first determined appropriate sample areas or geographic strata within which to sample field sites. The Lead Auditor then used randomized selection methods to select a subset of all available sales and assigned a priority number to each site. Wisconsin DNR staff members worked with the Lead Auditor to designate the final selection list from this prioritized list and final adjustments were made during the audit to ensure flexibility and to allow for additional samples, as needed. Local WDNR field staff assisted with scheduling appropriate field site visits in a manner that balanced efficiency of travel routes, the priority number for sites, and factors designed to assure coverage of key issues relative to the certification standard.

Field Sites and Schedule of Site Visits:

Date	Location	Participants
<u>August 12, 2009</u>	<u>WDNR Offices in Madison</u>	Robert Hrubes, Lead Auditor Mike Ferrucci, Lead Auditor JoAnn Hanowski, Team Member Quinn Williams, DNR Forestry Attorney Kristin Shy, DNR State Forests Teague Prichard, State Forest Specialist Paul Pingrey, DNR Forest Certification Coordinator Tom Watkins, Facilities and Lands Kelly Kearns, Endangered Resources Kate Fitzgerald, Facilities and Lands Bob Mather, Bureau of Forest Management Randy Hoffman, State Natural Areas Jeff Barkley, Bureau of Forest Management Drew Feldkirchner, Forestry/Endangered Resources Tom Boos, Office of Forest Sciences
<u>August 12, 2009</u>	<u>Glacial Habitat Restoration Area</u>	Mike Ferrucci Curt Wilson, Regional Forestry Leader Jeff Pritzel, Regional Wildlife Supervisor Ron Jones, Lakeshore Area Forestry Team Leader Mark Randolph, Wildlife Biologist Wade Oehmichen, Property Manager Tom Vanden Elzen (FR Fond du lac)
	<u>Mullet Creek / Collins Marsh Wildlife Management Areas</u>	Mike Ferrucci Aaron Buchholz, Wildlife Biologist Sue Crowley, Forester FR Manitowoc Jack Kellerman, Wildlife LTE Others from previous list continued on
	<u>Point Beach State Forest</u>	Mike Ferrucci Guy Willman, Superintendent Bryan Woodbury (Wildlife Biologist) Erin Dembski, Ranger PBSF
	<u>Quincy Bluff and Wetlands</u>	JoAnn Hanowski Bob Mather, Drew Feldkirchner Greg Dahl (Area Wildlife Supervisor), Steve Courtney (Area Forestry Leader) Nina Stensburg (Forester), & others.
	<u>Roche-A-Cri State Park.</u>	JoAnn Hanowski Bob Mather, Drew Feldkirchner Greg Dahl (Area Wildlife Supervisor), Steve Courtney (Area Forestry Leader) Joe Stecker Kochanski (Park Manager), Nina Stensburg (Forester), & others.
	<u>Emmons Creek Fishery Area</u>	JoAnn Hanowski Bob Mather, Drew Feldkirchner Greg Dahl (Area Wildlife Supervisor), Steve Courtney (Area Forestry Leader), Tom Meronek (Fisheries), Shirley Bargander (Forestry Team Leader) & others.
	<u>3 field stops Lower Wisconsin State Riverway (Peck's</u>	Robert Hrubes, Brian Hefty (Wyalusing Property Supervisor), Ryder S. Will, (Wyalusing SP);

	<u>Landing, WP&L, Blue River Bottoms) and Wyalusing State Park</u>	Bradley M. Hutnik (DNR Forester), William L Carlson (Forestry Team Leader)
<u>August 13, 2009</u>	<u>North East Regional Headquarters</u>	Mike Ferrucci Curt Wilson, Regional Forestry Leader Jeff Pritzel, Regional Wildlife Supervisor Joe Henry (Regional Ecologist), Arnie Lindauer, Regional Park Supervisor Shelley Wrzochaski, Forester Dick Nikolai, Wildlife Biologist Ron Jones, Lakeshore Area Forestry Team Leader John Lubbers, Regional Forestry Staff Sup <u>Wausaukee Office</u> Mike Folgert, Area Forestry Leader) Cole Couvillion, Forestry Team Leader-Wausaukee Dave Halfmann, Wildlife Biologist), Aaron McCullough, (Wildlife Tech), Craig Leitzke, Facilities and Lands Tech LTE); Bruce Djupstrom, Forester/Ranger Pembine Kate Lenz, Area Forestry Specialist Many individuals from the first two meetings continued on for the field sites.
	<u>Peshigo River State Forest</u>	Mike Ferrucci Dan Mertz (PRSF Property Manager)
	<u>Tomahawk, WI.</u>	JoAnn Hanowski Bob Mather, Tom Duke (Regional Forestry Staff Supervisor), Gary Bartz (Facilities and Lands Field Manager), Jeff Olsen - (State Forest Management Supervisor), Steve Ave'Lallemant (Fisheries Supervisor), Paul Bruggink (Facilities and Lands Supervisor), Bill Smith (Regional Lands Leader), Dawn Bishop (State Park Superintendent), Chuck McCullough (Antigo Area Lands Supervisor), Rick Weide (Wildlife Mgmt), Drew Feldkirchner (ER/Forestry), Brian Spencer, Mark Aquino (Land Division), Laurie Osterdorf (Land Division), Andy Shaney (Forestry Tomahawk), Mike Lietz (Forestry Merrill).
	<u>Menard Island Resource Area</u>	JoAnn Hanowski Most of all from above list from Tomahawk
	<u>Wolf River Fisheries Area</u>	JoAnn Hanowski Most of all from above list from Tomahawk
	<u>Peters Marsh Wildlife Area</u>	JoAnn Hanowski Most of all from above list from Tomahawk
	<u>LaCrosse - Area Office</u>	Robert Hrubes, Kris Belling (Wildlife Regional Program Manager), Tim Babros (Wildlife Area Supervisor), Jean Rygiel (Parks Regional Program Manager), Joe Stecker-Kochanski (Buckhorn SP Manager), Armund Bartz (ER Conservation Biologist), Dave Vetrano (Fisheries Team Supervisor), Craig Thompson (Regional Land Leader), Arvid Haugen (West Central Regional Forester). Greg Edge (Area Forestry Leader - La Crosse)

	<u>Coon Creek Fishery Area (Neprud property project - Vernon County), Jersey Valley property (State owned but operated by Vernon County -- Wildcat Mountain SP-Ontario; Mill Bluff State Park in Monroe County</u>	Robert Hrubes and most others from above list.
August 14,2009	<u>Black River State Forest</u>	Robert Hrubes Mike Ferrucci JoAnn Hanowski Jennifer Boice, Forester, BRSF Teague Prichard, State Forest Specialist Tom Duke, NOR Region Randy Hoffman, SNA Ecologist Bob Mather, Bureau of Forest Management Paul Pingrey, Forest Certification Coordinator Drew Feldkirchner, Endangered Resources/Forestry Allan Crossley, Public Lands Specialist—Wildlife Adam Wallace Forester, BRSF Armund Bargz, WCR Ecologist Kate Fitzgerald, Facilities and Lands Coordinator

Field Sites Visited:

Mike Ferrucci's Field Sites:

Wednesday August 12, 2009

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

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

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

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

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

Thursday August 13, 2009

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

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

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

Stop 4: Peshtigo River SF, Block

House Sale 3810-05: partially completed harvest

4A – 20 acres completed clearcut with reserves in declining, poor quality scrub oak stand.

4B – Marked thinning surrounding the site of a group camp shelter to be built soon (funded)

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

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

JoAnn Hanowski's Field Sites:

Wednesday, August 12, 2009

Quincy Bluff and Wetlands. Three stops to look at status of pine barren restoration. The difference between the three harvest sites was the presence/absence of tornado damage that affected the management at the sites. Three timber sales occurred on the unit (QB1, QB2, QB3), one before the tornado, one after and the other was a salvage harvest.

A fairly large area with good cooperation and coordination of efforts with TNC who owns adjacent property. The bluff areas were important indigenous use areas and there is some known history of native use in the area. The area was designated an SNA in 1993 but does not have a current plan. The long term goal is to maintain pine barren habitat with fires

Roche-a-cri State Park. The Park is working off a 1977 management plan. We viewed the Native American petroglyphs and pictographs and took the stairs to the top of one of the 300 foot rock outcroppings. We looked at a marked timber sale that will be harvested this November (Sale # 0140-03). The sale was put up to reduce the impact of gypsy moth damage in the Park and to increase the age structure and diversity. Goal is to regenerate oak by removing the basal area to 15ft²/acre. Engaged in discussion about sensitivity of harvests in State Parks to the public. The friends group here has signed off on the plan for the harvest that occurs along one of the trails in the Park. A riparian area RMZ has been established along a small trout stream.

Emmons Creek Fishery Area Personnel: This area does not have an up to date plan-the last plan was dated 1982. Previous plan did not include management for the Karner Blue Butterfly which is a big emphasis for current management. Fisheries has done some stream improvement projects which have been effective in improving fish habitat. Surveys will be conducted later this month to document fish in the restoration area. This area has a lot of invasive species problems that are hard to deal with. Lots of Garlon use and they are using the invasive species handbook. They have put out root boring weevils for spotted knapweed bio-control. Harvest Tract 4-2008 has been marked but not yet cut.

Visited a marked timber sale that will create more Karner blue butterfly habitat, removal of a small pine plantation, and oaks to connect critical habitat; harvest will be done on the SNA. Saw butterfly survey points and an actual butterfly!

Thursday, August 13, 2009

Menard Island Resource Area. This 1674 acre parcel protects 5.6 miles of Wisconsin River Frontage and over 800 acres of scenic easements it does not have a current master plan. ATV are a problem in the area, primarily due to lack of enforcement. Looked at 3 year old harvest site. Good green retention and regen.

Wolf River Fisheries Area. This property has a 1978 master plan and is included in a Tier 2 plan. It is 11-12,000 acres in size and about 65% of the area is in non-forest habitat. Have received some monies to do alder management for woodcock. Stopped at one area where they are doing grassland management for rare and threatened grassland bird species (saw a northern harrier).

Stop 2 was at a seep pond that was dredged. This region of WI has the largest number of these ponds in North America. Dredging removes sediments and increases spawning habitat for trout. Before and after surveys are conducted for fish populations. An EA is completed before each project is initiated. Stop three was at a red pine plantation that is marked for thinning (4th entry). An rmz was left along the Wolf River. Lack of long range planning, vision for this stand.

Peters Marsh Wildlife Area. This 1687 acre property includes a variety of habitat types. Observed that DNR personnel had planted GMO soybeans. A visit to a timber harvest in a northern hardwoods site appeared to be successfully completed. Discussed protection of vernal ponds during harvest and found that staff are aware of the need for protection. DNR should accelerate their work on developing management guidelines (BMP's) for this special resource.

Friday, August 14, 2009 (Ferrucci, Hanowski and Hrubes)

Stop 1. An ATV trail that had been recently worked on to fix several wetland crossings on one of the most popular trails on the Forest. Staff have identified 39 problem areas

and thus far, they have enough resources to fix 14 of the sites. Need more money for enforcement and more money to fix and repair trails.

Stop 2. Pine Barrens restoration for Kirtland's Warbler habitat. Two warblers have been identified on the area. Plan is to provide matrix of jack pine habitat in three age classes about 80 acre patch sizes.

Stop 3: 56 acre jack pine site that was harvested before the green retention BMP's were in place. The site was aerial seeded and there is good regeneration; will do a mechanical release if necessary.

Stop 4; Timber sale 1086- harvest of 50 year old jack pine stand with many residual white and jack pine. Logger did good job, little rutting or soil compaction or residual tree damage.

Stop 5. ATV trail that has been repaired. 40-60 foot wide area and big puddles. Should have all fixed by 2011.

Stop 6. Jack pine barrens restoration site for Karner Blue done with a fecon mower. Saw a few Karner Blues.

Robert Hrubes' Field Sites:

Wednesday, August 13, 2009

3 field stops Lower Wisconsin State Riverway:

Peck's Landing: control of invasives, recreational use management, coordination between Lands and Forestry

Lamanski Tract: staffing levels, condition of field equipment, prioritizing projects in the face of insufficient funding, archeological surveys

Wyalusing State Park: training of field personnel wrt to certification requirements; Master Planning; control of invasives; management of cultural and archeological resources (e.g., mounds); consultation/interaction with Native Americans.

Thursday, August 14, 2009

Opening Meeting at the La Crosse Area Office: attendees included representatives from Wildlife, Parks, Endangered Resources. Focus was on Master Planning

Coon Creek Fisheries Area: partnership with Trout Unlimited, non-game habitat enhancement and natural habitat restoration.

Jersey Valley County Park: cooperation with local jurisdictions; dam safety and reconstruction; county-level park ordinance applied to state land; recreation easements; fisheries management.

Wildcat Mountain State Park: public use management--horse trails and erosion, public rowdiness on the river; recon coming due, utility of dated Master Plan; use of herbicides; state natural areas within state parks

Mill Bluff State Park: status of Master Plan; Division of Forestry field forester support to state parks; coordinating recon with SNAs

Friday, August 15, 2009

See itinerary under Hanowski, as all 3 auditors were back together for the last morning of the audit.

2.4 Status of 2008 Corrective Action Requests Based Upon the 2009 Surveillance Audit

Note: All text in the cells below associated with “Accomplishments for 2009 surveillance audit” was submitted to SCS by Wisconsin DNR on August 5, 2009. Documents referenced via imbedded electronic links in the DNR responses are not accessible in this certification report but they are on file at the SCS offices and can be obtained upon request to DNR.

Background/Justification: FSC Principle 7 requires that management of certified lands be guided by management plans that are “written, implemented and kept up to date.” The WDNR has made substantial progress toward planning for the strategic development of Master Plans for state managed properties by using a well-structured 3-tiered approach. In the interim as plans are being developed, the WDNR needs to institute measures for maintaining the currency of operational components of outdated plans and/or providing operational guidance for Tier 1 and Tier 2 properties that lack a plan. These efforts should include correlating the annual work plans with the master plans or other guidance documents and addressing the management plan requirements of Principle 7.	
CAR 2008.1	By the time of the first annual audit after award of certification, WDNR must develop protocols and make substantial progress in developing key operational components of the Master Plans for state-managed properties that will not be undergoing a full re-planning within the next 5 years. Key components to develop include: management objectives for each property (by individual tract or groups), descriptions of the natural resources to be managed, the management systems to be used, and any unique considerations for the property. Updates should be made publicly available (e.g., through updates to property websites).
Deadline	2009 annual audit
Reference	<i>FSC Indicators 7.1.a.2, 7.2.a., 7.3.a</i>
Accomplishments for 2009 surveillance audit (presented to the audit team on August 5th)	<p>“Kate Fitzgerald - Lead</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protocols and guidance are in place to assure projects and operational activities specified in annual work plans support the master plan, or the

	<p>stated management objectives of the properties. Management activities are also constrained by the requirements of statute, administrative code, and federal funding (SFR/PR/LAWCON) requirements. Numerous Manual Codes and other program policy provide guidance and consistency to property operations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The DNR Internet is being used to document current management objectives and provide the other information required in CAR2008.1. Specific progress to date: <p>The Bureaus of Wildlife Management, Endangered Resources, and Parks are enhancing their existing property page descriptions where needed to include the required key components identified in the CAR.</p> <p>A new "gateway" page has been created for fishery properties since fishery properties did not have information about each individual property on the internet. The write-ups for each property include (or will include) the key components identified in the CAR as well as other basic property information. Data has been collected for 115 fishery properties so far. It is anticipated that some of those will be posted by the time of the audit.</p> <p>Information has been added to the master planning internet page directing people to the property pages referenced above. This provides another source of information for the properties, so that property objectives, prescriptions, maps, and contacts are readily available even if there is no recent master plan.</p> <p>Although the CAR only required action for those properties not undergoing a full re-planning within the next 5 years, due to the value of providing this information to our customers, we are creating or enhancing our property information pages for all Land Division properties that require a master plan</p> <p>In addition, the programs are working together to find a common "home" for all DNR properties on DNR's Internet site regardless of the type of property. There is wide spread recognition that the current website is not very user-friendly in its organization related to finding information about the properties.”</p>
<p>Additional Documentation</p>	<p>“See attachments in this e-mail from Alan Crossley for a couple property examples and Wildlife’s schedule for completing Tier 1 and 2 plans. [Imbedded document deleted.]</p> <p>WI DNR Property Master Planning Internet Home Page”</p>
<p>Auditors’ Response</p>	<p>Although the Department made progress collecting survey information from property managers, accomplishments were variable by bureau and</p>

	<p>in almost all cases incomplete. The CAR also required that the information be made available to the public via the web, but very few of the Internet property pages have actually been revised.</p> <p>We conclude, therefore, that insufficient progress has been made by the Department to warrant closure of this CAR. Per FSC protocols, it is required to elevate this issue to a Major Corrective Action Request—see Major CAR 2009.1.</p>
--	--

Background/Justification: The WDNR has developed a plan for completing Master Plans for Tier 1 and Tier 2 properties. There is a 10-12 year timeframe for the process of developing these plans. This timeframe should be accelerated as much as possible and training efforts should be planned to accompany plan implementation.	
CAR 2008.2	The WDNR must provide an update on progress toward the Master Planning goals on an annual basis as well as the training programs for supporting plan development and implementation.
Deadline	2009 annual audit
Reference	<i>FSC Indicators 7.1.a.2, 7.2.a., 7.3.a</i>
Accomplishments for 2009 surveillance audit (presented to the audit team on August 5th)	<p>“Kate Fitzgerald - Lead <u>Update on Progress Toward Master Planning Goals</u> Response to CAR 2008.2 Accomplishments since last Certification audit (September 2008)”</p> <p>[Imbedded document deleted.]</p>
Auditors’ Response	<p>An update on the Department’s progress in developing new Master Plans was provided as part of the 2009 surveillance audit. There has been good progress on completing Tier 2 plans over the past year. As well, some Tier 1 plans have also been completed. While the time frame for achieving a status where all properties have “current” Master Plans has been pushed back due to budget realities, we are satisfied that the Department is earnestly working to make progress to the maximum extent allowed under present funding limitations and that acceptable progress is being made. As such, we conclude that closure of this CAR is warranted. The Department is advised that Master Planning will be within the scope of all subsequent surveillance audits and that it will be expected that an update is provided to the auditors in conjunction with future surveillance audits.</p> <p>CAR 2008.2 is now CLOSED.</p>

Background/Justification: The WDNR has implemented a process for State Forest Master Plan Monitoring and Evaluation Reporting. The Master Plan monitoring process needs to be expanded to include those properties managed by the Division of Land. The expanded Master Plan Monitoring and Evaluation reporting process should also be supported by training or additional guidance that increases consistency in the reporting and more clearly links accomplishments with management objectives and goals.	
CAR 2008.3	By the next annual audit, Wisconsin DNR must develop and apply a property plan implementation and monitoring reporting template and

	instructions in order to expand the Master Plan monitoring and evaluation reporting procedures to include properties administered by the Division of Land and provide evidence of training or guidance that provide direction on how to complete the reporting in a manner that links to the management objectives and quantified progress toward goals.
Deadline	2009 annual audit
Reference	<i>FSC Indicator 8.1.b</i>
Accomplishments for 2009 surveillance audit (presented to the audit team on August 5th)	<p><i>“Tom Watkins & Kristin Shy - Lead</i> <i>“The ad hoc Master Plan Monitoring Working Group members include Tom Watkins, Kristin Shy, Jeff Prey and Kate Fitzgerald.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An ad hoc team chose to use the State Forest monitoring report template, instructions and example report for application on other DNR lands. The objective is to have one standard, baseline master plan monitoring template and instructions for the whole Department. The State Forest template and instructions will apply to all Department properties. • State Forests updated the template with directions to tie accomplishments back to objectives (see attached document, below). ...Don't report that you had a timber sale, but explain how that timber sale accomplished the management objective for that area. • State Forests completed monitoring master plan implementation for the calendar year of 2008. Exempt properties, due to involvement in an active master planning process are, Black River State Forest, Coulee Experimental State Forest, and Flambeau River State Forest. • Flambeau River State Forest is assessing the option of placing their monitoring plan as an appendix of their new master plan. The Master Plan Technical Team will discuss the specifics. • Monitoring reports are in the process of being posted online for open and transparent information sharing for the public. They will be updated annually. • The ad hoc monitoring working group is developing a Manual Code on master plan monitoring to assure the monitoring tools are used consistently. The Manual Code will be ready by January 2010.”
Additional Documentation	<p>“Master Plan Monitoring Memo and Attachments: [Imbedded document deleted.] Land Bureaus will also continue traditional accomplishment reporting as shown in this Wildlife Bureau example:” [Imbedded document deleted.]</p>
Auditors’ Response	Based upon our review of the materials put forward in the Department’s response to this CAR and based upon our discussions with DNR staff during the 2009 surveillance audit, we must conclude that almost no substantive progress was actually accomplished on this CAR over the past year. Although the Land Division bureaus have individual accomplishment reporting systems, they are not adequate for capturing information related specifically to master plan implementation.

	Accordingly, and per FSC protocols, we must elevate this issue to a Major Corrective Action Request—see Major CAR 2009.2 .
--	---

Background/Justification: The WDNR, Division of Forestry, has developed a written crosswalk between High Conservation Value Forest (HCVF) requirements found in P.9 and DNR’s approach to identifying and managing areas of high conservation value. This crosswalk needs to be expanded to address state properties administered by the Division of Land that are within the scope of this certification evaluation.	
CAR 2008.4	By the time of the first annual audit, the Division of Land must update the HCVF crosswalk to include properties it administers. This expanded crosswalk must demonstrate that management of all DNR-administered properties within the scope of this certification evaluation meets the HCVF requirements set forth in Principle 9.
Deadline	2009 annual audit
Reference	<i>FSC Indicator 9.3.a</i>
Accomplishments for 2009 surveillance audit (presented to the audit team on August 12th)	<i>“Randy Hoffman - Lead</i> Completed as shown in the attachments.”
Additional Documentation	[Imbedded documents deleted.]
Auditors’ Response	<p>An expanded HCVF crosswalk was provided, as requested, that incorporates Division of Lands procedures and processes that map (cover) the HCVF requirements codified in FSC Principle 9. The expanded crosswalk clearly demonstrates that Lands division procedures very extensively seek to identify and appropriate manage areas that possess high conservation values.</p> <p>During the 2009 surveillance audit, the auditors observed that the expanded crosswalk did not fully articulate the extent to which Lands Division personnel consult with external experts and stakeholders in the identification of high conservation values and the appropriate management prescriptions for areas possessing high conservation values. On September 18th, a revised and further augmented crosswalk was conveyed to the SCS Lead Auditor. This revised crosswalk provides additional detail on consultative efforts in the context of management of high conservation values.</p> <p>On the basis of the information supplied to the auditors, at the time of the field audit and subsequently, we conclude that closure of the CAR is now warranted.</p> <p>CAR 2008.4 is now CLOSED.</p>

Background/Justification: The WDNR has developed guidelines for biomass harvesting that include woody debris retention and recruitment standards. The guidelines were in the public review process at the time of the September 2008 assessment.	
CAR 2008.5	At the time of the first annual audit, the WDNR must update SCS on the status of the implementation of the guidelines. If the guidelines are

	not approved and disseminated in a timely manner the WDNR will need to identify an alternative approach to address woody debris retention in the context of biomass harvesting operations on properties included in the scope of this certification evaluation.
Deadline	2009 annual audit
Reference	<i>FSC Indicators 5.3.a, 6.3.b, and 6.3.c</i>
Accomplishments for 2009 surveillance audit (presented to the audit team on August 5th)	<p>“Paul Pingrey - Lead</p> <p>The BHG Implementation Plan was accepted by the Council on Forestry at its March 17, 2009 meeting. Below are three documents that summarize the Implementation Plan process: 1) A summary report of the Implementation Plan; 2) An implementation calendar and write-ups of individual implementation elements that provide additional details to supplement the summary report; 3) Summarized and full-text comments received from stakeholders about the implementation plan.</p> <p>The DNR Secretary accepted the BHG implementation plan. The Land and Forestry Divisions are following through.”</p>
Additional Documentation	[Imbedded documents deleted.]
Auditors’ Response	<p>As requested, an update was provided to the audit team during the surveillance audit. New biomass harvesting/retention guidelines have been duly developed and approved. DNR has developed and is following through on an extensive roll-out plan for implementing the guidelines and new timber sale contracts now incorporate the guidelines.</p> <p>On the basis of the evidence provided, the audit team concludes that closure of this CAR is now warranted.</p> <p>CAR 2008.5 is now CLOSED.</p>

Background/Justification: The WDNR has inconsistent guidance regarding the training and licensing requirements for chemical pesticide applicators. The FSC Lakes States Regional Standard also requires that an up-to-date list of all chemical pesticides being used on WDNR-managed properties is provided to the certification body to confirm compliance with the FSC Pesticides Policy; that is, to confirm that no chemicals on the FSC prohibited list are in use on certified properties. It is also required that land managers employ integrated pest management and other strategies that effectively minimize the use of chemical pesticides.	
CAR 2008.6	The WDNR must provide evidence of clearly communicated chemical pesticide training and licensing requirements and implement training programs, as needed. The WDNR must also provide an up-to-date complete list of chemical pesticides being used on properties within the scope of the certification evaluation. The WDNR must provide evidence of an integrated pest management policy or other strategies that result in the reduction, avoidance, and minimization of chemical pesticide use.
Deadline	2009 annual audit
Reference	<i>FSC Indicator 6.6.b</i>

<p>Accomplishments for 2009 surveillance audit (presented to the audit team on August 5th)</p>	<p>“Kelly Kearns and Tom Boos – Leads <i>Ad hoc Pesticide Working Group members/advisors: Kelly Kearns, Tara Bergeson, Tom Boos, Kate Zurlo-Cuva, Carol Schweiger, Rebecca Schroeder, Matt Zine, Joe Vande Hey, Erin Crain, Paul Cunningham.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Inconsistent guidance regarding the training and licensing requirements for chemical pesticide applicators. Provide evidence of clear communication about this and implement training programs as needed.</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Department currently follows all DATCP requirements for certification and licensing and will continue to do so. The Forestry Division currently has a more specific standard that is being considered for incorporation into a Department-wide policy (see proposed Intranet page – Appendix A). ○ The Department Integrated Certification Implementation Team (ICIT) has developed an Intranet webpage as an easily accessible resource on DNR pesticide use issues. The content of the webpage is below as Appendix A. ○ The ICIT is reviewing other Manual Codes that address chemical use and plan changes for clarification of the policy. An issue brief regarding policy revisions will be submitted to the Division leadership teams for consistency and agreement from the top down. <p><u>Training-</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The ICIT ad hoc pesticide team developed a draft training plan – see Appendix B. ○ There have been two regional (SER, NER) training sessions that covered safety, certification, and details of specific herbicides. Staff is interested in conducting similar training in the other regions. ○ The Department is has developed fact sheets for many invasive plant species (http://www.dnr.state.wi.us/invasives/plants.asp), which include the best known information on which herbicides to use and methods to apply them with minimal non-target impacts, as well as all other known control techniques. ○ The ICIT will utilize the DNR Digest, the Intranet and direct email to provide updates to DNR staff in order to broadly disseminate information on herbicides and other control methods. Currently there are regular reminders about pesticide safety sent out in some of the regions. 2. <u>Maintain an up-to-date list of all chemical pesticides being used on WDNR-managed properties</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The existing database tracks chemical use and can be queried by chemical name. It can be found at: http://wiatri.net/projects/chemuse/ ○ The list of chemical pesticides used since May 30, 2005 is listed below in Appendix C. ○ Although the database exists and is required to be filled out, a review suggests that not everyone is using it. The ICIT is therefore developing an improved approval/use-recordkeeping system to compel staff to use the database.
--	---

	<p>3. <u>Ensure that no chemicals on the FSC prohibited list are in use on certified properties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Pesticide training sessions and the Intranet Pesticide Use webpage clearly identify FSC prohibited chemicals. ○ The webpage described above contains the most recent list of prohibited chemicals for easy reference. ○ The ICIT and supervisors check the database for any use of prohibited chemicals. ○ Supervisors will be alerted of any use of a FSC prohibited chemical to ensure future compliance. ○ Since May 2005, there were four instances of prohibited chemical use in the database. All occurred prior to DNR Land being FSC certified on January 13, 2009 certification date. The incidents: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Simazine- used on agricultural land by sharecropper on Riverway property, May 2008. Share crop fields are excised from DNR's certified land and so use there is not an issue. 2. Simazine- used on plantation by hired applicator on state park land, May 2008. Contracts will now specify that FSC-prohibited pesticides may not be used. 3. Simazine- used on plantation by staff on wildlife area property, October 2008. DNR policies have been updated to prohibit use of FSC-designated highly-hazardous pesticides. 4. Atrazine- used on agricultural land by sharecropper on wildlife property, May 2008. Share crop fields are excised from DNR's certified land and so use there is not an issue. <p>4. <u>Provide evidence that land managers employ integrated pest management and other strategies that effectively reduce, avoid and minimize the use of chemical pesticides</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Manual Code 4230.1 describes and requires IPM techniques. The DNR Pesticide Use Intranet page will allow staff to easily understand and reference the policy. The DNR Forest Health Internet includes instructions on developing an IPM plan. ○ The Invasive Species Fact Sheets include alternative control techniques that can be used instead of pesticides. The web-based resource is replacing 1990's printed fact sheets for invasive species. ○ Department silvicultural practices and property management practices include procedures to prevent and avoid pest problems that might require pesticide treatment. For example, see practices related to EAB and Gypsy moth "slow the spread". ○ There are several bio-control programs the Department is involved in, including programs for purple loosestrife, spotted knapweed, leafy spurge and garlic mustard. ○ The use of post prescribed burn reports can be used to determine effectiveness of burning. ○ The proposed Invasive Species Rule, NR40, includes much
--	---

	<p>training for DNR staff, targeted stakeholders such as landowners and managers, and the public. These will certainly include control discussions.</p> <p>5. <u>DNR needs a manual code establishing uniform policy on pesticide use and training.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Such a manual code currently exists (4230.1). The Department will work on clarifying it, consider any updates and interpret in plain language on the abovementioned webpage. The specific manual codes are attached in Appendix A below.”
Additional Documentation	[Imbedded documents deleted.]
Auditors’ Response	<p>A complete list of chemicals used on the lands within the scope of the certificate was provided to the audit team during the 2009 surveillance audit.</p> <p>The auditors recognized that DNR has completed a substantial amount of responsive work in draft form that provides potential evidence to warrant closure of this CAR. However, the policies have not been finalized and the training has not been deployed. As such, we cannot conclude that sufficient progress has been made to warrant closure. It remains necessary for the additional guidelines to be promulgated as either Manual Code or a Directive.</p> <p>Accordingly, and per FSC protocols, we must elevate this issue to Major Corrective Action Request—see Major CAR 2009.3.</p>

Background/Justification: The FSC Lake States Regional Standard requires that when conflicts between legal mandates and conformance with the FSC Principles and Criteria occur that such conflicts are referred to the appropriate FSC body for guidance and resolution. To comply with this requirement it is necessary that responsible parties including field staff have sufficient familiarity with the FSC standard to be able to recognize potential conflicts and that guidance is provided regarding reporting mechanisms. Certification training should be provided to staff consistent with their roles and may include the use of information tools, handbook revisions and other delivery mechanisms or approaches.	
CAR 2008.7	The written commitment must be conveyed to SCS that WDNR will bring any conflicts between applicable laws/regulations and the FSC certification standard to the attention of FSC/SCS. This commitment must be supported by actions aimed at improving relevant DNR employees’ familiarity with the FSC Lake States Regional Standard including providing ready access to the full standard.
Deadline	2009 annual audit
Reference	<i>FSC Indicator 1.4.a</i>
Accomplishments for 2009 surveillance audit (presented to the audit team on August 5th)	<p>“Paul Pingrey - Lead</p> <p>DNR Manual Code 2406.1 on Forest Certification was submitted for the Secretary’s approval on June 11, 2009. The MC adoption process involves a 60-day Regional review, which will be concluded soon when we expect Secretary approval. The MC affirms the agency’s commitment to FSC conformance and directs agency personnel to bring any conflicts between the FSC standard and DNR’s policies to the attention of the CB. The Manual Code formally establishes an Integrated Certification Implementation Team, identifies the role of the Certification Coordinator,</p>

	<p>and explains the ICIT relation to the Division leadership teams (LLT and FLT).</p> <p>A few of the certification awareness activities in the last year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Development of a certification training toolkit on the Land Division Intranet ○ Distribution of FSC-US, FSC-IC and SFI standard revision documents to DNR staff. Meetings and conference calls for staff to contribute comments on the revisions ○ News releases and press conferences related to DNR certification ○ Forest Certification presentation at the January 2009 Statewide Wildlife Meeting in Appleton ○ Distribution of ICIT meeting minutes ○ Certification presentations and updates at Division leadership meetings ○ Preparation of SAF Certification Working Group newsletters (Pingrey is chair), which are shared with DNR staff. ○ A Tri-State meeting of Wisconsin, Minnesota and Michigan DNR Secretaries held in April 2009 to discuss forest certification and future opportunities to collaborate on common issues.”
<p>Additional Documentation</p>	<p>[Imbedded document deleted.]</p>
<p>Auditors’ Response</p>	<p>During the mid-August surveillance audit, we learned that, pending the Secretary’s signature², the Land and Forestry Divisions have implemented MC 2406.1 by Division Administrator directive. The new Code makes substantial changes that collectively increase the Department’s commitment to FSC forest management certification. Additionally, and as is detailed in the DNR’s written response above, there have been numerous additional actions that have been taken that increase DNR’s overall involvement in and knowledge of the FSC certification requirements, thereby enhancing the Department’s ability to identify situations of conflict (with legal requirements) were any to arise.</p> <p>For these reasons, the audit team concludes that closure of this CAR is now warranted.</p> <p>CAR 2008.7 is now CLOSED.</p>

Background/Justification: The FSC Lake States Regional Standard requires the protection of threatened, endangered, of special concern, or sensitive species and their habitats. A key step to complying with this requirement is the use of a robust Natural Heritage Inventory (NHI) database that is

² At the time of writing of this report, MC 2406.1 is sitting in the Secretary’s “In” basket. Of note, the Regional review did not raise any objections to the proposed policy.

<p>inclusive and kept up to date. The WDNR must ensure that land managers are provided the most current NHI data possible and that where a backlog in data entry occurs land managers must still be able to access records of occurrences and/or expert advice. To the extent practical, staff and resources should be reallocated to address the data entry backlog. The WDNR must also ensure that all recorded occurrences (including those not yet entered in the database) are included in Master Plan development and operational planning.</p>	
<p>CAR 2008.8</p>	<p>By the time of the first annual audit, the WDNR must provide a report on the status of the data entry backlog, efforts that are underway to address the backlog (including collaborations with stakeholders), and evidence of guidance that addresses the procedures land managers must use to access the most current records and information and details for how this procedure is used for Master Plan development and operational planning.</p>
<p>Deadline</p>	<p>2009 annual audit</p>
<p>Reference</p>	<p><i>FSC Indicator 6.2.e.</i></p>
<p>Accomplishments for 2009 surveillance audit (presented to the audit team on August 12th)</p>	<p>“ER Management Team- Lead (Drew Feldkirchner – contact)</p> <p>1. “provide a report on the status of the data entry backlog”</p> <p>The department’s commitment to support master planning efforts, along with several new grants, has significantly increased DNR’s capacity to map new rare species and community records into the NHI database. Based on currently available staff and funding, mapping efforts for each of the next two fiscal years are projected to be 160% higher than FY09 mapping efforts. This is much better than previously anticipated, given the state’s severe budget deficit. Significant progress has already been made in reducing the backlog; for example, the backlog for animal records was reduced by 62% since this time last year. The future ability to incorporate NHI information in a timely manner will continue to depend on available funds.</p> <p>2. “efforts that are underway to address the backlog (including collaborations with stakeholders)”</p> <p>New rare species records are being incorporated into the NHI database (“mapped”), with the following records given the highest priority: 1) records for Threatened or Endangered species, 2) records collected for state properties that are either in the process or soon to undergo master planning, and 3) other records as resources allow. Top priorities for natural community data are records needed to support master planning and other exemplary natural community examples that do not meet these criteria but are high priority candidates for State Natural Area designation.</p> <p>The department initiated pre-master planning work for a number of state lands, including biotic inventory work conducted by NHI. Thirteen properties were surveyed in 2008 and another 23 are being surveyed in 2009-2010. Since biotic inventory budgets for this work include mapping costs, backlogged records will be mapped along with new records, resulting in the most current data possible for these properties. This work is planned to continue concurrent with the department master planning schedule in the</p>

	<p>hopes of providing the best available information for developing property master plans.</p> <p>The NHI Program secured several State Wildlife Grants, as well as other federal funds, to support further mapping and data backlog reduction. Grant funds will cover the costs of mapping all NHI working list plants, animals, and high quality Natural Community occurrences in NHI tracking databases that were documented on Conservation Opportunity Areas (COAs) ranked as globally or continentally significant (COAs were delineated during the implementation phase of the Wisconsin Wildlife Action Plan. See dnr.wi.gov/org/land/er/wwap/ for more information).</p> <p>3. “evidence of guidance that addresses the procedures land managers must use to access the most current records and information...”</p> <p>The Bureau of Endangered Resources will continue to notify property managers of newly located species / community occurrences identified through ongoing inventory efforts. The NHI Program develops Biotic Inventory Reports (for some properties they are “Rapid Ecological Assessments”) for each property surveyed in support of master planning. These documents provide information related to rare species and high-quality communities for use by master planning teams, highlighting the most important opportunities for conserving biological diversity (e.g., http://dnr.wi.gov/org/land/er/nhi/projects/state/flambeau.htm). In the interim period prior to report development and final data mapping, communications are sent directly to managers notifying them of new species or communities that have been documented and encouraging them to work with their Regional Ecologists to interpret this information and utilize it as part of adaptive management strategies (see example below).”</p>
Additional Documentation	<p>“A sample memo that is routinely sent to property managers to alert them about new NHI occurrences:” [Imbedded document deleted.]</p>
Auditors’ Response	<p>Evidence provided by DNR, in the judgment of the audit team, constitutes an earnest and effective response to this CAR. The NHI backlog has been substantially reduced and new procedures should assure that the remaining backlog is eliminated in an appropriate time frame. Accordingly, we conclude that closure of this CAR is warranted.</p> <p>CAR 2008.8 is now CLOSED.</p>

Background/Justification: The FSC Lake States Regional Standard requires that the use of exotic/non-native species be informed by a risk assessment conducted prior to their use.	
CAR 2008.9	The WDNR must demonstrate that risk assessments for the use of exotic/non-native species (such as in seed mixes for erosion control and other management applications) are completed prior to such use.
Deadline	2009 annual audit

Reference	<i>FSC Indicator 6.9.b</i>
Accomplishments for 2009 surveillance audit (presented to the audit team on August 12th)	<p><i>“Alan Crossley & Kelly Kearns - lead</i></p> <p>Risk assessments for non-native species were completed as part of Chapter NR 40 Relating to Invasive Species Classification & Regulation. See the Assessment Summary Tables on-line:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terrestrial Plants • Aquatic Plants • Vertebrates • Terrestrial Invertebrates & Plant Disease-causing Microorganisms • Fish & Aquatic Invertebrates <p>The ICIT (Crossley lead) also conducted a survey of DNR land managers regarding seed mixes they use. Seed contents can be appraised with the above terrestrial plants assessment and through data on Nature Serve. The ICIT is developing a follow-up Manual Code advising appropriate seed mixes and caution to evaluate seed mix content.</p>
Auditors’ Response	<p>The requested risk assessments have been completed and the Department has elevated its attention to the issue of unintended introduction of invasive non-native species when using management tools such as seed mix for erosion control.</p> <p>The audit team concludes that closure of this CAR is warranted.</p> <p>CAR 2008.9 is now CLOSED.</p>

2008 Observations:

Observation 2008.1: Field visits during the September 2008 evaluation resulted in observed instances of contractors having first aid kits and spill kits kept in vehicles at the landing and not at the active harvest site. Training should emphasize the importance of health and safety materials being kept in multiple locations and/or with the operators and equipment.

DNR Response: The Wisconsin SFI Training Standard adopted by the SIC requires logging training that is OSHA compliant. The training is provided by Game of Logging (GOL) certified contractors and Forest Industry Safety and Training Alliance (FISTA). Wisconsin DNR, however, is not authorized under state statutes to be an OSHA administrator. Non-conformances to OSHA standards are discovered by logging inspections conducted by the Wisconsin Department of Commerce.

Auditor Comments after 2009 Audit: DNR’s response is helpful and suggests that this issue is now less likely to constitute a non-conformity in the future. A question for the Department: can

DNR personnel bring OSHA non-conformances to the attention of the Department of Commerce if, during normal field activities, non-conformities are observed?³

Observation 2008.2: The WDNR has made significant efforts to ensure that road, trail and other transportation systems on state managed lands are designed to required standards. However, this level of performance cannot be maintained without adequate and reliable dedicated funding and staff. There is currently no secure funding source for road maintenance, leading to auditor concerns about the frequency of road maintenance treatments (such as grading) and BMP compliance.

DNR Response: DNR requested and received an additional \$2 million annually in the state budget for road maintenance and repair on DNR lands.

Auditor Comments after 2009 Audit: We take positive note of the DNR's success in securing additional funding for road maintenance and repair which will hopefully enhance the Department's ability to enhance its demonstration of conformance to the FSC certification standard in future years.

Observation 2008 3: The WDNR is instituting a plan for developing Master Plans for state managed lands. To support the timely, consistent and constructive development and implementation of Master Plans, the WDNR may want to engage in a process to promote the benefits of Master Plans to field personnel. The communication efforts could also help identify and address any field-level questions or concerns about the plans and planning process.

DNR Response: Training efforts appear to be achieving a broad level of buy-in and support for property master planning among DNR personnel.

Auditor Comments after 2009 Audit: Our informal monitoring of this issue during the course of the 2009 surveillance audit confirmed that ongoing training efforts are, in fact, increasing field-level buy-in for property master planning.

Observation 2008.4: The State of Wisconsin has made significant efforts to monitor the deer population in the state, set population goals, and manage deer in a manner that supports multiple land management objectives. The WDNR has tried a variety of hunting season structures and regulations in an effort to bring deer populations closer to desired levels. Deer levels vary throughout Wisconsin; in general populations are somewhat above target but generally not significantly so. Negative impacts to desirable advanced regeneration from deer browse were observed in many forests, particularly in east-central Wisconsin. Ongoing efforts to set and achieve deer population targets at which forest components and diversity can be sustained should be encouraged. Continuing attention is warranted.

DNR Response: The deer herd was below target in most zones following the 2008 hunting season. Wisconsin's 2008 statewide deer harvest dropped 13% compared to 2007. Deer management continues to be a controversial issue. See Secretary Frank's April 2009 testimony to the Senate Transportation, Tourism, Forestry and Natural Resources Committee and the state Assembly Fish and Wildlife Committee.

[Imbedded document deleted.]

³ In response to this question being posed in the draft report, we were informed that this course of action is available on an informal basis but that liability issues prevent DNR from formalizing it in a written policy.

Auditor Comments after 2009 Audit: We will continue to monitor this issue during future surveillance audits. While it is helpful that deer herd levels were below target in some zones during 2008, excessive deer browse damage remains an issue in many zones.

Observation 2008.5: There are opportunities for better understanding on the part of some Forestry Division field foresters of Division of Land management objectives for state parks, wildlife areas, and other properties administered by the Land Division so that stand management prescriptions designed for these categories of properties will better contribute to management objectives, objectives that typically do not include sustained yield timber production.

DNR Response: The Division of Land updated its vegetative management policy. Certification training and master planning efforts are resolving these issues.

Auditor Comments after 2009 Audit: Our discussions with Division of Forestry foresters and Lands Division field personnel during the course of the 2009 audit indicates that the issue was probably limited in its extent when it was first observed in 2008. We are satisfied that the Department's foresters that support management of Lands Division properties appropriately understand that their harvesting prescriptions must be crafted to achieve the goals established by the property managers.

Observation 2008.6: Recognizing that the WDNR does not regulate workers compensation insurance rates and that the agency did testify in support of rate changes, logging and roading contractors have expressed concerns about current workers compensation insurance rates and the lack of distinction between hand-felling and mechanized operations. These stakeholders concerns and the status of any legislative actions will continue to be monitored.

DNR Response: The Legislature recently adopted changes that will lower mechanized workers compensation insurance rates effective October 1, 2009. The hand-felling insurance premium rate will be \$33.80 and the mechanized rate will be \$19.67 for each \$100 in remuneration provided by an employer to his or her employees.

Auditor Comments after 2009 Audit: We take positive note of the upcoming reduction in mechanized workers compensation insurance rates.

Observation 2008.7: Concerns have been raised by some DNR field personnel regarding the potential use of contract foresters for land management activities on State Forests, a strategy that is being considered in response to the mandate for WDNR to meet timber production goals. The administrative rule that sets up forester contracting includes contractor training requirements and safeguards on contractor performance. Property managers are phasing in contracting trials to assure the concept works as intended. The results of these trials could be monitored and a report prepared to summarize the findings and provide recommendations.

DNR Response: DNR is still monitoring initial timber harvest set-up contracting trials. Only limited use of this tool, five harvests in FY 2009, was made. Evaluations were mixed. Each State Forest has been directed to try at least one timber sale set-up contract in FY 2010 for further analysis.

Auditor Comments after 2009 Audit: We take positive note of DNR's ongoing monitoring of this issue. During this year's audit, we did not observe the same level of concern as was expressed in 2008.

Observation 2008.8: Field personnel were found to have a lack of familiarity with the rutting guidelines and thresholds. While it was confirmed that the guidelines are included in the contracts and as such, are readily available, there is nonetheless an opportunity to improve the working knowledge of the guidelines with foresters who are overseeing logging operations.

DNR Response: DNR continues to provide training on the soil compaction guidelines. We expect field personnel will have a better understanding this year.

Auditor Comments after 2009 Audit: The ongoing training on soil compaction guidelines appears to be yielding positive results as we observed a solid level of awareness and working knowledge of the guidelines during the 2009 audit.

Observation 2008.9: There are opportunities for the Division of Land to enhance tribal stakeholder consultation related to land management activities and impacts on traditional uses and customary rights. The consultation could include a specific request for land management input from tribal interests and representatives. Consultation could also include providing information to tribal members to clarify which activities are permitted on the various land classifications and guidance for non-timber forest product gathering.

DNR Response: DNR is conducting tribal cultural training in collaboration with tribal officials. The training includes an emphasis on consultation. Seven courses have been held to date, and more are planned:

[Imbedded document deleted.]

The DNR Tribal Liaison program continues to mature. Each tribe has a DNR contact, and training was held for the liaisons in January 2009. Personnel from the DNR Land and Forestry Divisions also met with tribal representatives at the Great Lakes National Visitors Center in Ashland in October 2008 to discuss ways to improve consultation efforts.

Auditor Comments after 2009 Audit: We take positive note of the DNR's response to this Observation. We will continue to monitor this issue as part of future surveillance audits.

Observation 2008.10: The WDNR may find benefit in continuing to develop The Sustainability Framework as an element of its 10-year Statewide Forest Assessment. The Framework includes its own Criteria and Indicators for Sustainable Forest Management and provides an opportunity to gather valuable, readily available statewide information without additional data generation. Given the statewide scale and scope of WDNR land management the scale of the Framework assists in meeting the need for landscape scale monitoring.

DNR Response: DNR's first full assessment using the new Sustainability Framework is nearing completion, the report to be published in January 2010. The Statewide Forestry Assessment has been a major effort involving about 20 staff and thousands of hours invested in analysis and writing.

Auditor Comments after 2009 Audit: We take positive note of the progress made in utilizing the Sustainability Framework and the resources committed to that effort. As part of the 2010 surveillance audit, we will want to review the report for the first full assessment using the Framework.

Observation 2008.11: The WDNR should complete the process of developing Best Management Practices (BMPs) that address invasive species in forest management and methods for incorporating observed instances of invasive species into the inventory data. The program could include specifics on mapping/identification, removal/control, and prevention, including specifically how the major pathways of invasive species introduction will be contained/controlled.

DNR Response: The Forestry Invasive Species BMPs are complete, and an implementation plan has been adopted. Work continues on the Recreation and Urban BMP's see the following links for more information:

- [Forestry BMP's](#)
- [Recreational Forest User BMPs](#)
- [Urban Forestry BMPs](#)

Wisconsin DNR is also developing ROW (right of way) Invasive BMPs and a comprehensive invasive species control State Administrative Code (NR 40), which was approved Sept. 30 by the State Legislature.

Auditor Comments after 2009 Audit: The audit team takes positive note of the completion of the Forestry Invasive Species BMPs. During the course of the 2009 surveillance audit, it was our impression that the level of awareness of the BMPs on the part of field personnel is good. During the 2010 surveillance audit, we will want to review the implementation of the Recreation and Urban BMPs as well as further progress in assuring full integration of the Forestry Invasive Species BMPs.

2.5 General Observations from the 2009 Audit

Significant Changes, Initiatives and Actions in the Wisconsin State Forest Program:

The DNR's Division of Forestry recently published the *Statewide Forest Plan 2004-2009 Accomplishments*. This *Accomplishments* report is the culmination of a planning process that started with the 2000 Millennium Assessment [<http://dnr.wi.gov/forestry/assessment/FRresources.htm>](http://dnr.wi.gov/forestry/assessment/FRresources.htm) , 2004 Governor's Conference on Forestry, and 2004 Statewide Forest Plan [<http://dnr.wi.gov/forestry/assessment/index.htm>](http://dnr.wi.gov/forestry/assessment/index.htm) . This report uses the structure developed in the 2004 plan to show how much the forestry community has accomplished over the past five years. Items listed in this report include major accomplishments, new initiatives, and major research undertaken since the 2004 Statewide Forest Plan by many of the partners involved in the protection and sustainable management of Wisconsin's forests. Many of the handbooks that are used by DNR in planning and implementing forest plans are listed in the accomplishment report including Silvicultural Handbook, Woody Biomass Guidelines, Invasive Species Guidelines, Wildlife Action Plan, and Karner Blue Butterfly HCF (as examples). Many of the documents and accomplishments are directly related to the commitment that the DNR has to FSC certification.

Summary of Auditor Findings:

Overall, the SCS audit team was favorably impressed by the continuing high level of forest stewardship associated with the Wisconsin DNR’s administration and management of the State Forests and “other state lands” now within the scope of the FSC-endorsed forest management certification. We note, also, that WDNR continues to be a standard setter in its preparation for the annual FSC audits and, in that regard, recognition must again be paid to Paul Pingrey, DNR Forest Certification Coordinator.

No doubt because of its much longer engagement with FSC certification and the relative administrative simplicity of ten State Forests compared to over 1,500 “other state properties,” the Division of Forestry, Bureau of Forest Management, and its administration of the State Forests is presently operating at a higher level of conformity to the Lake States Regional Standard than is the Lands Division, particularly with respect to management planning. This differential is reflected in the subject areas and scope of 2 Major CARs and 1 Minor CAR resulting from this surveillance audit, detailed in Section 2.6. With closure of these CARs, we expect that the 2010 surveillance audit will reveal that the inter-Divisional differences in level of conformity to the certification standard will be largely dissipated. We also recognize that the complexity of Land Division programs, which has 56 Tier 1, 200 Tier 2 and approximately 430 Tier 3 individual or combined properties⁴ administered by five separate bureaus, will, by nature of its broad scope and diverse funding mechanisms, continue to present administrative challenges.

2.6 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations Resulting from the 2009 Surveillance Audit

Background/Justification: This Major Corrective Action Request is a follow-on to CAR 2008.1 (related to Master Plans), as insufficient progress in addressing the Minor CAR was observed during the 2009 surveillance audit. Accordingly, SCS is obligated to raise the issue to the status of a Major CAR.	
Major CAR 2009.1	By the end of calendar year 2009, DNR will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Post property Internet pages with land management objective information for most Tier 1 and Tier 2 DNR properties. (Small Tier 3 property objectives that are not individually listed on the Internet would be covered by the program-wide statements described under “c”, below.) b) Develop a timely schedule for updating the remainder. c) Provide program-wide statements of objectives for each Land Bureau's property and post them on the Internet.
Deadline	December 31, 2009
Reference	<i>FSC Indicators 7.1.a.2, 7.2.a., 7.3.a</i>

Background/Justification: This Major Corrective Action Request is a follow-on to CAR 2008.3 (Master Plan implementation monitoring), as insufficient progress in addressing the Minor CAR was observed during the 2009 surveillance audit. Accordingly, SCS is obligated to raise the issue to the

⁴ Corresponding acreage owned by DNR per master planning category: Tier 1 (943,579 a.), Tier 2 (511,540 a.) and Tier 3 (230,716 a.). About 100,000 acres of Tier 3 lands are covered by forest certification. The rest are outside of scope due to intensive non-forest uses or limited-control easements. Tier 1 figures include State Forests.

status of a Major CAR.	
Major CAR 2009.2	By the end of calendar year 2009, the Land Division must develop a master plan implementation monitoring system for Tier 1 and Tier 2 properties with DNR Administrative Rule NR 44 plans that is functionally equivalent to the State Forests program and that evaluates whether any general objectives for other properties (as described in CAR 2009.1, except for lands that have active planning efforts underway) are not being met.
Deadline	December 31, 2009
Reference	<i>FSC Indicator 8.1.b</i>

Background/Justification: This Major Corrective Action Request is a follow-on to CAR 2008.6 (training and licensing for pesticide applicators), as insufficient progress in addressing the Minor CAR was observed during the 2009 surveillance audit. Accordingly, SCS is obligated to raise the issue to the status of a Major Corrective Action Request.	
Major CAR 2009.3	By the end of calendar year 2009, WI DNR will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Revise Manual Code 4230.1 in respect to consistent pesticide training requirements and implement the changes by Land and Forestry Division Administrator directives pending the DNR Secretary signing the revision. b) Create a DNR Intranet page with training requirements and pesticide use information. c) Inform DNR managers and staff of the pesticide use training policy through an internal newsletter.
Deadline	December 31, 2009
Reference	<i>FSC Indicator 6.6.b</i>

Background/Justification: During the 2009 field audit, it was learned that a DNR Wildlife Biologist had planted GMO Roundup-Ready Soybeans with DNR equipment on a field being preparing for conversion to prairie. This field is within the scope of the FSC certificate as it is not an excised sharecropping parcel. The DNR biologist did not know that FSC prohibits use of GMOs on certified land.	
CAR 2009.1	DNR must develop a policy in regard to staff not planting GMOs on lands within the scope of the Department's FSC certificate and provide related training by the end of 2009.
Deadline	December 31, 2009
Reference	<i>FSC Criterion 6.8</i>

General 2009 Observations

Observation 2009.1: The ICIT is presently developing new Manual Code guidance for the appropriate seed mixes to use on DNR properties and guidance for evaluating seed mix content. This process was

underway during the August 2009 surveillance audit. Completion of this initiative and Secretary approval as new Manual Code will be helpful in better demonstrating conformance with FSC Criterion 6.8.

Observation 2009.2: There is an opportunity for establishing better guidance for field foresters who develop timber harvesting prescriptions in State Natural Areas and Native Community Management Areas.

Observation 2009.3: There is an opportunity to enhance protection of vernal pools by developing additional guidelines.

2.7 Certification Decision Resulting from the Annual Surveillance Audit

Based upon information gathered through site visits, interviews, and document review, SCS concludes that management of the WI DNR administered State Forests and “other lands” continues to be in sufficient overall conformance with the FSC Principles and Criteria, as elaborated by the Lake States Regional Standard. That is, the SCS audit team has concluded from this annual audit that the DNR’s forest management program is in general conformance with FSC Principles 1 through 9 (Principle 10 is not applicable as the State Forests are classified as “natural forest management” under the FSC definitions). As such, we conclude that continuation of the WI DNR FSC-endorsed forest management (FM) certificate is warranted, subject to timely closure of open CARs and subject to future annual surveillance audits.

However, as described in Sections 2.4 and 2.6, there are CARs that must be addressed, three of which are Major CARs resulting from our inability to close three Minor CARs issued in 2008. Addressing these CARs within the stipulated timeframes should be considered of high importance for maintaining the DNR’s certification.

3.0 DETAILED OBSERVATIONS

This section presents the auditors’ conformity assessment against selected elements of the certification standard. Note that annual surveillance audits are not “full scope.” Only during initial and subsequent 5-year re-certification evaluations is the audit conducted against the full scope of the certification standard.

3.1 Evaluation of Conformance

SCS auditors selected Principles 3 and 7 for assessment in 2009. Furthermore, Sections 2.4 and 2.6 also discuss DNR’s performance relative to a number of other FSC Criteria.

C= Conformance

C*= Overall Conformance, but there are outstanding discretionary CARs

NC= Non-Conformance

Principle 3: The legal and customary rights of indigenous peoples to own, use and manage their lands, territories, and resources shall be recognized and respected.

This FSC Principle is concerned about the rights of indigenous peoples to own, use and manage their lands and territories. The 4 Criteria elaborating upon this Principle focus on issues such as tenure rights of indigenous people, protection of cultural sites, and compensation for traditional knowledge.

Standard	C/N/C	Comments/CARs
C3.1. Indigenous peoples shall control forest management on their lands and territories unless they delegate control with free and informed consent to other agencies.		This Criterion is deemed to be not applicable to the evaluation of the state lands managed by the DNR. This Criterion is understood to be applicable only to entities engaged in the management of tribal forestlands.
3.1.a. On tribal lands, forest management and planning includes a process for input by tribal members in accordance with their laws and customs.	NA	
3.1.b. Forest management on tribal lands is delegated or implemented by an authorized tribal governing body.	NA	
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. Forest owners or managers identify and contact American Indian groups that have customary use rights or other legal rights to the management area and invite their participation in the forest planning processes, appropriate to the scale and intensity of the operation. (see also Criterion 4.4.)	C	The 2009 audit team found that the WDNR maintains ongoing consultation with Tribal groups and organizations in relation to management activities.
3.2.b. Steps are taken during the forest management planning process and implementation to protect tribal resources that may be directly affected by certified operations such as adjacent lands, bodies of water, critical habitats, and riparian corridors as well as other resource uses such as rights to hunt, fish, or gather.	C	Collectively, management planning and project implementation on DNR-managed properties assures a high degree of assurance that adverse impacts to tribal resources and sites will be avoided. The State Archaeologist is active in identifying cultural resources, training land managers in their identification, and advising on the appropriate protections. The 2009 audit team confirmed that land managers demonstrated a working knowledge of resources and their identification and an understanding of the appropriate protections including consultation with the State Archaeologist. Training has been completed in this regard. Gathering rights are being protected and used.
C3.3. Sites of special cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance to indigenous peoples shall be clearly identified in cooperation with such peoples, and recognized and protected by forest managers.	C	
3.3.a. Forest owners or managers make systematic efforts to identify areas of cultural, historical, and/or religious significance. They invite participation of tribal representatives (or other appropriate persons, where tribal entities are lacking) in the identification of	C	The 2009 audit team found that most forest managers merely mail timber sale notices to tribal representatives and that very few respond to this type of solicitation. DNR Tribal liaisons have personal relationships with Tribes and are more successful in

current or traditionally significant sites within the forest proposed for certification.		engaging them in these activities. While there is some variability across individual property managers, the strong impression formed by the audit team is that DNR field personnel are sensitive to the possible presence of cultural, historical and/or religious sites of significance to Native Americans.
3.3.b. Forest owners and managers consult with tribal leaders (or other appropriate persons, where tribal entities are lacking) to develop mechanisms that ensure forest management operations protect from damage or interference those areas described in 3.3.a. and incorporate these special places into forest management and operational plans.	C	Consultation with tribal groups is on-going, including formal, periodic meetings as well as informal conversations and open communications, and effective mechanisms exist to protect sites of special significance. The 2009 audit team confirmed that tribal input was sought and received in the process of completing the Master Plan for the Black River State Forest.
3.3.c. Confidentiality of disclosures is maintained in keeping with applicable laws and the requirements of tribal representatives.	C	DNR complies with all applicable requirements for maintaining confidentiality of cultural sites of significance to Native Americans.
C3.4. Indigenous peoples shall be compensated for the application of their traditional knowledge regarding the use of forest species or management systems in forest operations. This compensation shall be formally agreed upon with their free and informed consent before forest operations commence.	NA	There is no evidence to suggest that this Criterion is relevant/applicable to DNR's management of the state properties.
3.4.a. Forest owners or managers respect the confidentiality of tribal knowledge and assist in the protection of tribal intellectual property rights.	NA	No instances of non-compliance were identified.
3.4.b. A written agreement is reached with individual American Indians and/or tribes prior to commercialization of their indigenous intellectual property, traditional knowledge, and/or forest resources. The individuals and/or tribes are compensated when such commercialization takes place.	NA	No instances of applicability were identified.

Principle 7: A management plan-appropriate to the scale and intensity of the operations shall be written, implemented, and kept up to date. The long-term objectives of management, and the means of achieving them, shall be clearly stated.

This Principle is elaborated through 4 Criteria, which collectively call for a very high level of commitment to management planning.

Standard	C/NC	Comments/CARs
7.1. The management plan and supporting documents shall provide: a) Management objectives. b) Description of the forest resources to be managed, environmental limitations, land use and ownership status, socio-economic conditions, and a profile of adjacent lands. c) Description of silvicultural and/or other management	C	

<p>system, based on the ecology of the forest in question and information gathered through resource inventories.</p> <p>d) Rationale for rate of annual harvest and species selection.</p> <p>e) Provisions for monitoring of forest growth and dynamics.</p> <p>f) Environmental safeguards based on environmental assessments.</p> <p>g) Plans for the identification and protection of rare, threatened and endangered species.</p> <p>h) Maps describing the forest resource base including protected areas, planned management activities and land ownership.</p> <p>i) Description and justification of harvesting techniques and equipment to be used.</p>		
<p>7.1.a. Management objectives</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>7.1.a.1. A written management plan is prepared that includes the landowner's short-term and long-term goals and objectives (ecological, social, and economic). The objectives are specific, achievable, and measurable.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The new management handbook, although quite lengthy provides a great template for writing management plans. The 2009 estimate is that it will take >15 years to complete plans for all properties. Despite limited approved plans, property managers readily relate goals and objectives of parcels. Goals and objectives were available for public review on a majority of properties off the DNR website. The old plans are not very specific in all instances.</p>
<p>7.1.a.2. The management plan describes desired future conditions that will meet the long-term goals and objectives and that determine the silvicultural system(s) and management activities to be used.</p>	<p>NC</p>	<p>Updated Master Plans clearly identify desired future conditions and methods to reach them. The vast majority of properties are operating with outdated or no plans with little consideration for long term goals. In addition, management goals on some properties have changed substantially over the past 20 years and have not been articulated in a current plan. Not enough progress was made in addressing CAR 2008.1, and it was elevated to a Major CAR 2009.1. CAR 2008.2 was closed.</p>
<p>7.1.b. Description of forest resources to be managed, environmental limitations, land use and ownership status, socioeconomic conditions, and profile of adjacent lands</p>		
<p>7.1.b.1. The management plan describes the timber, fish and wildlife, harvested non-timber forest products, soils, and non-economic forest resources.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Updated Master Plans and planning template clearly describe resources present on properties. Many of the properties have plans that are over 20 years old and do not cover all that is included in 7.1 b1 thru 7.1b6, however as managers implement prescriptions in these plans they are looking at all of the factors. As new plans are written all factors will be considered and evaluated.</p>
<p>7.1.b.2. The management plan includes descriptions of special management areas; sensitive, rare, threatened, and endangered species and their habitats; and other ecologically sensitive</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>In absence of Master Plans, NHI data base is available to property managers and is utilized in project planning. Wildlife areas without</p>

features in the forest.		plans are utilizing national management information for rare species like the Karner Blue Butterfly Habitat Conservation Plan.
7.1.b.3. The management plan includes a description of past land uses and incorporates this information into the vision, goals, and objectives.	C	Updated Master Plans and planning template describes historical land use and will be incorporated in the new plans.
7.1.b.4. The management plan identifies the legal status of the forest and its resources (e.g., ownership, usufruct rights (see Glossary), treaty rights, easements, deed restrictions, and leasing arrangements).	C	Legal status and ceded territory rights are addressed in the Master Planning Handbook.
7.1.b.5. The management plan identifies relevant cultural and socioeconomic issues (e.g., traditional and customary rights of use, access, recreational uses, and employment), conditions (e.g., composition of the workforce, stability of employment, and changes in forest ownership and tenure), and areas of special significance (e.g., ceremonial and archeological sites).	C	Cultural issues are considered in Master Planning process. Heritage sites are mapped and available through state archeological inventory or through consultation with Tribal leaders.
7.1.b.6. The management plan incorporates landscape-level considerations within the ownership and among adjacent and nearby lands, including major bodies of water, critical habitats, and riparian corridors shared with adjacent ownerships.	C	Recent Master Plans incorporate adjacent land use patterns during planning process. Pershing WA feasibility study identified acquisition opportunities during property boundary adjustment.
7.1.c. Description of silvicultural and/or other management system	C	
7.1.c.1. Silvicultural system(s) and prescriptions are based on the integration of ecological and economic characteristics (e.g., successional processes, soil characteristics, existing species composition and structures, desired future conditions, and market conditions). (see also sub-Criterion 6.3.a)	C	All of these factors are considered when prescriptions are written and implemented.
7.1.c.2. Prescriptions are prepared prior to harvesting, site preparation, pest control, burning, and planting and are available to people who implement the prescriptions.	C	Field observation indicated that this is the case and managers were aware of and in most cases involved in the development of the prescription.
7.1.d. Rationale for the rate of annual harvest and species selection	C	
7.1.d.1. Calculations for the harvests of both timber and non-timber products are detailed or referenced in the management plan and are based on net growth, yield, stocking, and regeneration data. (see also 5.6.b)	C	New plans should reference this much better than the old plans. As the major objective for most of the properties that do not have plans is not timber production other values and products are considered in more detail.
7.1.d.2. Species selection meets the social and economic goals and objectives of the forest owner or manager and leads to the desired future conditions while maintaining or improving the ecological composition, structures, and functions of the forest.	C	Good job at this.
7.1.d.3. The management plan addresses potentially disruptive effects of pests, storms, droughts, and fires as they relate to allowable cut.	C	The audit team is satisfied that the collection of plan documents guiding DNR land management incorporate these issues.
7.1.e. Provisions for monitoring forest growth and dynamics (see also Principle 8)	C	
7.1.e.1. The management plan includes a description of procedures to monitor the forest.	C	Monitoring is addressed in planning documents.
7.1.f. Environmental safeguards based on environmental assessments (see also Criterion 6.1.)	C	
7.1.g. Plans for the identification and protection of rare, threatened, and endangered species. (see also Criterion 6.3.)	C	

7.1.h. Maps describing the forest resource base including protected areas, planned management activities, and land ownership.	C	
7.1.h.1. The management plan includes maps of such forest characteristics as: relevant landscape-level factors; property boundaries; roads; areas of timber production; forest types by age class; topography; soils; riparian zones; springs and wetlands; archaeological sites; areas of cultural and customary use; locations of sensitive, rare, threatened, and/or endangered species and their habitats; and designated High Conservation Value Forests.	C	Recent Master Plans utilize a large array of background information in the planning process. Archeological and NHI data bases are used to conserve key sites. All of these attributes are included on the maps in plans and in the maps generated for the management prescriptions
7.1.i. Description and justification of harvesting techniques and equipment to be used. (see also Criterion 6.5)	C	
7.1.i.1. Harvesting machinery and techniques are discussed in the management or harvest plan and are specifically matched to forest conditions in order to minimize damage.	C	Timing of harvests is utilized to minimize effects.
7.1.i.2. Conditions for each timber sale are established by a timber sale contract or written harvest prescription and accompanying timber sale map.	C	Sale contracts are standardized and include harvest prescriptions and maps. Each sale has a contract that includes prescriptions and detailed specifications of how operations are to be conducted.
C7.2. The management plan shall be periodically revised to incorporate the results of monitoring or new scientific and technical information, as well as to respond to changing environmental, social and economic circumstances.	C	
7.2.a. Operational components of the management plan are reviewed and revised as necessary or at least every 5 years. Components of the long-term (strategic) management plan are revised and updated at the end of the planning period or when other changes in the management require it. (see also Criterion 8.4)	NC	Monitoring plan process has been established but lacks analysis capabilities that would lead to adaptive methods to quickly address resource changes. Although old plans are reviewed yearly as managers develop their work plans for the coming year, the fact that the plans are so outdated makes the task of monitoring and responding to any changes impossible. Because not enough progress has been made in updating master plans CAR 2008.1 was elevated to Major CAR 2009.1 CAR 2008.2 was closed.
C7.3. Forest workers shall receive adequate training and supervision to ensure proper implementation of the management plans.	C	
7.3.a. The forest owner or manager assures that workers are qualified to implement the management plan (see also Criterion 4.2).	NC	State personnel are well qualified but training is needed following Master Plan development to fully understand and implement plans. Because not enough progress has been made in updating master plans CAR 2008.1 was elevated to Major CAR 2009.1 CAR 2008.2 was closed.
7.3.b. The management plan is understandable, comprehensive, and readily available to field personnel.	C	Recently completed Master Plans are understandable and available to field personnel. Audit found evidence of field personnel readily following Master Plans in project decision making.
C7.4. While respecting the confidentiality of information, forest managers shall make publicly available a summary	C	

of the primary elements of the management plan, including those listed in Criterion 7.1.		
7.4.a. A management plan summary that outlines management objectives (from sub-Criterion 7.1.a.), whether on private lands or the land pool under a resource manager, is available to the public at a reasonable fee. Additional elements of the plan may be excluded, to protect the security of environmentally sensitive and/or proprietary information.	C	Management plans are provided on request to the public at no charge. Many of the properties have the plan on a web page and the public can review plans in DNR offices. Progress has been made in getting at least a short version of a Management plan on the website.
7.4.b. Managers of public forests make forestry-related information easily accessible (e.g., available on websites) for public review, including that required by Criterion 7.1.	C	The Wisconsin DNR website contains a large amount of information for the public on resource management and other topics. Wisconsin has a good website and many of the properties have a web page specific to the property. This is still under development and has improved from 2008-2009.

3.1 Stakeholder Comment

Wisconsin DNR has not reported to SCS that it has received any stakeholder complaints or disputes since the July, 2008 re-certification and scope expansion evaluation, and stakeholder outreach by the audit team has not revealed any stakeholder complaints or disputes.

3.2 Controversial Issues

No exceptionally controversial or difficult issues presented themselves during this surveillance audit.

3.3 Changes in Certificate Scope

There were no changes in the scope of this certificate as part of or resulting from this annual surveillance audit.

3.4 Topics to Focus on during 2010 Audit

Wisconsin DNR will be informed as to the subject area focus (i.e., selected elements of the certification standard) of the 2010 annual surveillance audit at least 60 days prior to the as yet unscheduled date of that audit.