

NSF-ISR, LTD**Surveillance Audit Report
July 11, 2007**

A. Program Participant's Name: Wisconsin County Forest Program, FRS 1Y943

B. Operations within the scope of SFIS Surveillance Audit:

Sustainable forestry activities of participating counties within the Wisconsin County Forest System and land management operations in selected Wisconsin County Forests including 25 counties encompassing approximately 2,185,641 acres of publicly owned forests, including the following counties: Ashland, Barron, Bayfield, Burnett, Douglas, Eau Claire, Florence, Forest, Iron, Jackson, Juneau, Langlade, Lincoln, Marathon, Marinette, Oconto, Oneida, Polk, Price, Rusk, Sawyer, Taylor, Vilas, Washburn, Wood.

C. NSF Audit Team:

Lead Auditor: Michael Ferrucci

Auditor: Dave Wager

D. Audit Dates: June 12-15, 2007

E. Scope:

No Change

Changed (see Section H, revised scope statement noted on FRS, adjusted acres)

F. Reference Documentation:

2005-2009 SFI Standard®, County Integrated Forest Plans (various)

G. Audit Results: Based on the results at this visit, the auditor concluded

Acceptable with no nonconformances; or

Acceptable with minor nonconformances that should be corrected before the next regularly scheduled surveillance visit;

Not acceptable with one or two major nonconformances - corrective action required;

Several major nonconformances - certification may be canceled unless immediate action is taken

H. Changes to Operations or to the SFI Standard

Are there any significant changes in operations, procedures, specifications, FRS, etc. from the previous visit? Yes No

The scope of lands is now 2,185,641 acres. New plans have been completed for nearly all counties involved, with the remaining plans in progress. The new plans integrate many SFI requirements including the commitment to the SFI Standard, use of loggers with SFI-approved training credentials, and management review of certification requirements.

I. Corrective Action Requests: (see Appendix III)

Correct Action Requests Issued this visit: None

Corrective Action Plan is not required.

Corrective Action Plan is required within sixty days of this visit (for Minor Nonconformances). CARs will be verified during the next Surveillance Audit.

Corrective Action Plan is required within thirty days of this visit (for Major Nonconformances). All major nonconformance(s) must be closed by the auditor prior to the next scheduled surveillance audit by a special verification visit or by desk review, if possible. The auditor will make arrangements to verify the corrective action has been effectively implemented.

Any Corrective Action Plans should be mailed to:

Mike Ferrucci, SFI Lead Auditor,
26 Commerce Drive, North Branford, CT 06471

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

MAJOR(S) : None

MINOR(S): None

In addition, Three Opportunities For Improvement (OFIs) were identified.

Appendices:

Appendix I: Surveillance Notification Letter and Audit Schedule

Appendix II: Attendees

Appendix III: Corrective Action Requests

Appendix IV: Summary Surveillance Audit Report

Appendix V: Audit Matrix

Appendix I



Surveillance Notification Letter and Audit Schedule



Draft: May 10, 2007; Revised May 29, 2007

Jeff Barkley, County Forest Program Specialist
Bureau of Forest Management
WI Department of Natural Resources
PO Box 7921, Madison, WI 53707-7921

Re: Confirmation of SFI and FSC Surveillance Audits, Wisconsin County Forest System

Dear Mr. Barkley:

We are scheduled to conduct the Annual Surveillance Audits of the Wisconsin County Forest System on June 12 to 15 as follows:

County	Date	Times	Program/ Auditor
Burnett-JN(8)	Tuesday, June 12	8 am to 5 pm	SFI Only / M.F.
Rusk-WT(10)	Wednesday, June 13	8 am to 5 pm	SFI Only / M.F.
Washburn-MP	Wednesday, June 13	8 am to 5	FSC and SFI / D.W.
Sawyer* GP(9)	Thursday, June 14	8 am to 5	FSC and SFI / D.W. & M.F
Polk- P.P (7)	Friday, June 15	7 am to 1 pm	SFI Only / M.F.
Barron	Friday, June 15	7 am to 2 pm	FSC and SFI / D.W.
Exit Meeting	Friday, June 15	2 pm to 3:45 pm	FSC and SFI / D.W. & M.F

* Revised: Wager may need to visit Lincoln County

This is a partial review of your SFI and FSC Programs to confirm that they continue to be in conformance with the requirements and that progress is being made in closing your CARs. The audit team will consist of Mike Ferrucci, NSF-ISR Lead Auditor and Dave Wager, SCS Lead auditor. During the audit we will focus on the following:

SFI Program:

- Review progress on achieving SFI objectives and performance measures and the results of the management review of your SFI Program;
- Review selected components of your SFI program;
- Verify effective implementation of the corrective action plan regarding logger training from the previous NSF audit; and
- Evaluate the effectiveness of planned activities aimed at continual improvement of your SFI Program.

FSC Program:

- A focused assessment of the status of outstanding corrective action requests
- Assess selected county forests against a portion of the FSC Lake States Standard. Counties will be assessed against Criteria and Indicators of the standard where non-conformances were observed in the original assessment, as well as other Criteria and Indicators, as determined by the SCS auditor.

- Review of any changes within DNR or enrolled Counties (e.g., staffing, land acquisitions, planning documents) that are pertinent to the certification.

Logistics

- As during the certification audit we should plan to have lunch on site to expedite the visit.
- You have agreed to make motel reservations in Spooner for both lead auditors, who will pay for their own rooms when they arrive.
- We will travel in your vehicle(s) each during the audit, but have our own transportation to Spooner from the airport and back.
- We ask that you provide hardhats.

Field Site Selections

As discussed, you will provide a list of sales that were established, sold, or closed during 2005 or 2006 or the first quarter of 2007. We will select an initial subset of about 20 sales per county and will ask for additional information on these sales, including their accessibility, the likelihood of being actively harvested during the visit, and their locations on county maps. Once we receive this information we will select a number of sites from each county that we hope to visit. For most counties that number will be 6 to 9 harvest sites; for Sawyer it will be 10 to 12 harvest sites because there will be two auditors there all day. On the day of the audit we would ask you to tell us about any sales that are being worked at that time, and we would add one or two of these if possible.

Documentation Requested

When we arrive each day please provide documentation for the selected sites similar to that provided for the certification audit (maps, project descriptions, and contracts). We would also need copies of the draft or recently completed management plans and any other information that would help us determine conformance to the certification requirements.

The enclosed tentative schedule should be reviewed by all participants. This schedule can be adapted either in advance or on-site to accommodate any special circumstances. If you have any questions regarding this planned audit, please contact either of us.

Sincerely yours,

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

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

Enclosure: Draft Agenda for Surveillance Audit; Contact Information for Counties

DRAFT Agenda for 2007 Surveillance Audit

<u>Burnett County</u>		<u>Tuesday, June 12</u>	<u>8 am to 5 pm</u>	<u>SFI Only</u>
<i>Time</i>	<i>Activity</i>			
7:45 am	Arrive County Forestry Offices			
8:00 am	Opening Meeting and Office Discussions Discuss SFI CAR; Changes to Overall County Forestry Program Overview of Burnett County Forest Management Program			
10:00 am	Review Selected Sales and Finalize Field Visit			
10:30 – 4 pm	Field Site Visits			
4-5 pm	Daily Briefing (office)			

<u>Rusk County</u>		<u>Wednesday, June 13</u>	<u>8 am to 5 pm</u>	<u>SFI Only</u>
<i>Time</i>	<i>Activity</i>			
7:45 am	Arrive County Forestry Offices			
8:00 am	Opening Meeting and Office Discussions Overview of Rusk County Forest Management Program			
9:30 am	Review Selected Sales and Finalize Field Visit			
9:45 – 4 pm	Field Site Visits			
4-5 pm	Daily Briefing (office)			

<u>Washburn County</u>		<u>Wednesday, June 13</u>	<u>8 am to 5 pm</u>	<u>FSC and SFI</u>
<i>Time</i>	<i>Activity</i>			
7:45 am	Arrive County Forestry Offices			
8:00 am	Opening Meeting and Office Discussions Discuss FSC CARs Overview of Washburn County Forest Management Program			
10:00 am	Review Selected Sales and Finalize Field Visit			
10:30 – 4 pm	Field Site Visits			
4-5 pm	Daily Briefing (office)			
8-10 pm	Group Manager CAR Report & Overview			

<u>Sawyer County</u>		<u>Thursday, June 14</u>	<u>8 am to 5 pm</u>	<u>FSC and SFI</u>
<i>Time</i>	<i>Activity</i>			
7:45 am	Arrive County Forestry Offices			
8:00 am	Opening Meeting and Office Discussions Overview of Sawyer County Forest Management Program			
9:30 am	Review Selected Sales and Finalize Field Visit			
9:45 – 4 pm	Field Site Visits			
4-5 pm	Daily Briefing (office)			

Polk County Friday, June 15 7 am to 1 pm FSC and SFI

<i>Time</i>	<i>Activity</i>
7:00 am	Arrive County Forestry Offices
7:15 am	Opening Meeting and Office Discussions Overview of County Forest Management Program
8:15 am	Review Selected Sales and Finalize Field Visit
8:30 – 1 pm	Field Site Visits
1-1:30 pm	Travel to Barron County for Exit Briefing

Barron County Friday, June 15 7 am to 1 pm FSC and SFI

<i>Time</i>	<i>Activity</i>
7:00 am	Arrive County Forestry Offices
7:15 am	Opening Meeting and Office Discussions Overview of Barron County Forest Management Program
8:15 am	Review Selected Sales and Finalize Field Visit
8:30 – 1:30 pm	Field Site Visits

Location TBD (Barron) Exit Meeting Friday, June 15 2 pm to 3:45 pm

1:30 – 2 pm	Auditor private discussion (lunch and meeting space needed)
2- 3 pm	Final SFI Exit Briefing: Polk, Barron, and overall (office)
3 – 3:45 pm	Final FSC Exit Briefing (office)

Appendix II



Attendees

<u>Burnett County*</u>	<u>Tuesday, June 12</u>	<u>SFI Only</u>
Mike Ferrucci	NSF-ISR, SFI Lead Auditor, FSC Auditor	
Jeff Barkley	DNR County Forest Specialist	
Mike Luedeke	DNR NOR Regional Forester	
Neil Ambourn	DNR Liaison Forester	
Jason Nichols	Burnett County Forest Administrator	
Brian Loyd	Assistant Forest Administrator	
Torrey Jeske	Equipment Operator, Parks	
Keri Letch	Secretary	
Susan Engals	Summer Intern, KBB Surveys	

* Opening Meeting and Field Session

<u>Rusk County</u>	<u>Wednesday, June 13</u>	<u>SFI Only</u>
Mike Ferrucci	NSF-ISR, SFI Lead Auditor, FSC Auditor	
Jeff Barkley	DNR County Forest Specialist	
Mike Luedeke	DNR Spooner	
Pete Wisdom	DNR Team Leader	
Wayne Tappon	DNR Liaison Forester	
Terry Tappon	DNR Forester, DNR	
Paul Teska	Rusk County Forest Administrator	
Pat Zimmer	Rusk County Assistant Administrator	

<u>Washburn County</u>	<u>Wednesday, June 13</u>	<u>FSC and SFI</u>
Dave Wager	SCS, FSC Lead Auditor, SFI Auditor	
Paul Pingrey	DNR Forest Certification Coordinator	
Peterson, Mike	Washburn County Forest Administrator	
Jim Pearson	DNR Liaison	
Buck Pettingill	Assistant Administrator	
Jeremy Erickson	Forestry Technician	
Dave Bailey	DNR Forester- Spooner	
Joe Menkol	DNR Forester/Ranger	
Nancy Christel	DNR Wildlife Biologist	
Harold Smith	Forest Tech II	
Duran Bjorklund	Washburn Co. Forest, Forester	

Sawyer County **Thursday, June 14** **FSC and SFI**
 Dave Wager SCS, FSC Lead Auditor, SFI Auditor
 Mike Ferrucci NSF-ISR, SFI Lead Auditor, FSC Auditor
 Jeff Barkley DNR County Forest Specialist
 Paul Pingrey DNR Forest Certification Coordinator
 Mike Luedeke DNR NOR Regional Forester
 Tom Duke Regional Staff Supervisor, DNR Antigo
 Larry Glodoski Area Forestry Supervisor, DNR Hayward
 Pete Wisdom DNR Sawyer/Rusk Team Leader
 Shirley Riedmann Sawyer County Forestry Committee Member
 Greg Peterson Sawyer County Forest Administrator
 Pete Sievert Sawyer County Forest Assistant Administrator
 David Todus Sawyer County Forester
 Jeff Stiedl Sawyer County Forester
 Nick Koltz DNR Liaison
 Dee Dobiles Secretary (100% forestry since last year)

Polk County **Friday, June 15** **SFI**
 Mike Ferrucci NSF-ISR, SFI Lead Auditor, FSC Auditor
 Paul Pingrey DNR Forest Certification Coordinator
 Tom Duke Regional Staff Supervisor, DNR Antigo
 Paul Heimstead DNR Liaison
 Janette Cain DNR Private Lands Forester
 Paul Pedersen Polk County Forest Administrator

Barron County **Friday, June 15** **FSC and SFI**
 Dave Wager SCS, FSC Lead Auditor, SFI Auditor
 Jeff Barkley DNR County Forest Specialist
 Jack Nedland Barron County Forest Administrator
 Chris Rucinski DNR Liaison Forester
 Jake Elder DNR Forester
 Brad Johnson DNR Forestry Team Leader
 Jim Varro DNR Area Specialist
 Mike Luedeke DNR NOR Regional Forester

Appendix III



Corrective Action Requests

Corrective and Preventive Action Request (CAR)

Company/Location: <u>Wisconsin County Forest System</u>	Date: <u>February 9, 2006</u> FRS # <u>1Y943</u>
Auditor: <u>Michael Ferrucci</u>	CAR Number: <u>MF-2006-1</u>
Location of Finding: <u>Price, Ashland Counties</u>	Previous CAR Number/Date: <u>none</u>
Discussed with: <u>Jeff Barkley, County Forestry Specialist</u>	Nonconformance Type (underline): Major <u>Minor</u>

AUDITOR FINDING: Standard Number and Clause: SFI Indicator 10.1.4 Contractor education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities

Description: Although all three loggers interviewed have FISTA (SIC SFI Approved) training, not all counties have incorporated contractor training into their timber sale requirements.

IF NECESSARY, PLEASE ATTACH A SEPARATE REPORT ADDRESSING THE FOLLOWING THREE ITEMS:

1) **ROOT CAUSE ANALYSIS BY COMPANY**—Include potential causes & assurance problem does not exist in other areas. Use of trained contractors has long been encouraged on the county forests. When originally SFI-certified in 2004, the County Forest program was evaluated under the 2002-04 SFI standard which only required training to that level. Changes to the 2005-09 SFI standard now require appropriate training. The Wisconsin County Forest Certification / Legislative committee has acknowledged the new requirement and has distributed the recommended plan of action to all member counties (completed in summer of 2005). Wisconsin DNR implemented the requirement effective 1/1/2006. Member counties are still in the process of implementing the requirement.

2) **CORRECTIVE ACTION BY COMPANY** – Based on the Root Cause Analysis, the following action has been planned/taken to correct the problem. Please include expected completion date.

a) At the March 2006 Spring County Forest Administrators meeting a recap of the 2006 surveillance audit will be presented and the need to follow through on the previously distributed process will be communicated.

b) During the approval phase of the individual County Forest Comprehensive Land Use plans (occurring in 2005) the DNR will ensure that language requiring contractor training is included.

3) **PREVENTIVE ACTION BY COMPANY** – Based on the Root Cause Analysis, the following action has been planned/taken to correct the problem. Please include expected completion date.

WDNR (and County Boards) approve the County Forest Comprehensive Land Use plans that are required by statute (28.11) and serve as the framework for all management on each forest. In addition, any amendments to this plan require DNR and County Board approval. The initial approval of the plans and any subsequent amendments will continue to ensure that member counties include the appropriate training for their contractors.

AUDITOR REVIEW OF COMPANY'S PLAN:
The plan as outlined above is appropriate and should serve to close the non-conformance.

STATUS: **OPEN** AUDITOR/DATE: Mike Ferrucci 2-27-06

AUDITOR REVIEW OF COMPANY'S COMPLETED ACTION:
During the 2007 Surveillance Audit the above actions were confirmed at all 5 counties visited. Contractor training requirements are in place, and procedures to confirm training are operating well.

STATUS: Closed AUDITOR/DATE: Mike Ferrucci, June 15, 2007

LEGEND: OPEN=CA Plan Accepted CLOSER=CA implemented, verified & accepted REJECTED=CA Plan or Implementation rejected

Appendix IV**SFI Surveillance Audit Report**

The SFI Program of the Wisconsin County Forest Program has demonstrated continuing conformance with the Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard ®, 2005-2009 Edition (SFIS), according to the NSF-ISR SFIS Certification Audit Process.

NSF-ISR initially certified Wisconsin County Forest Program to the SFIS on December 10, 2004 and used the “continuous surveillance option” to update the certificate to the 2005-2009 edition in February, 2006. This report describes the second follow-up Surveillance Audit designed to focus on changes in the standard, changes in operations, the management review system, and efforts at continuous improvement. In addition, a subset of SFI requirements were selected for detailed review.

Wisconsin County Forest Program includes 2.3 million acres of forestland managed by 29 counties in the central and northern portions of Wisconsin. The scope of the SFIS Certification encompasses sustainable forestry activities of participating counties within the Wisconsin County Forest System and land management operations in selected Wisconsin County Forests including 25 counties encompassing approximately 2,185,641 acres of publicly owned forests, including the following counties:

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

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

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

The surveillance audit was performed by NSF-ISR on June 12-15, 2006 by an audit team including Lead Auditor Mike Ferrucci and Audit Team Member Dave Wager, Forest Ecologist. Auditors fulfill the qualification criteria for conducting SFIS Certification Audits contained in the Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Audit Procedures and Qualifications (SFI APQ). The

objective of the audit was to assess continuing conformance of the organization's SFI Program to the requirements of the Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Standard, 2005-2009 Edition. Forest practices that were the focus of field inspections included those that have been conducted since January 1, 2006. In addition, a subset of SFI obligations to promote sustainable forestry practices, to practice sustainable forestry while protecting soil and water resources, and to incorporate continual improvement systems were reexamined during the audit.

The requirements of the 2005-2009 Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard were used in the audit; no indicators were modified. As with the initial certification the scope included timberland only, as the Wisconsin County Forest Program's SFI programs do not include procurement operations. Several of the SFI Performance Measures were outside of the scope of the county programs and were excluded from the scope of the SFI Certification Audit as follows:

- Indicator 2.1.3 Plantings of exotic tree species
- Indicator 3.2.5 Riparian experts consulted where guidelines do not exist
- Objective 8 – Procurement Requirements

SFIS Surveillance Audit Process

The review was governed by a detailed audit protocol designed to enable the audit team determine conformance with the applicable SFI requirements. The process included the assembly and review of audit evidence consisting of documents, interviews, and on-site inspections of ongoing or completed forest practices. Documents describing these activities were provided to the auditor in advance, and a sample of the available audit evidence was designated by the auditor for review.

The possible findings for specific SFI requirements included Full Conformance, Major Non-conformance, Minor Non-conformance, Opportunities for Improvement, and Practices that exceeded the Basic Requirements of the SFIS. Surveillance Audits generally focus on conformance issues and do not generally address exceptional practices.

Overview of Audit Findings

Wisconsin County Forest Program's SFI Program was found to be in substantial conformance with the SFIS Standard. There were no new non-conformances identified

The NSF-ISR Audit team reviewed and closed the previous minor non-conformance and corrective action plan implemented by Wisconsin County Forest Program. This involved requiring appropriate training for contractors; at this time all counties require that logging crews working on these forests (at least one logger present at all times) have received appropriate FISTA training offered through the Forest Industry & Safety Training Alliance (FISTA).

Three opportunities for improvement were also identified. These findings do not indicate a current deficiency, but served to alert Wisconsin County Forest Program to areas that could be strengthened or which could merit future attention. These include efforts to implement soil erosion controls on seasonal forest roads, to develop guidelines to sustain forest productivity as demands for forest biomass intensity, and to update and apply guidelines for stand level retention, particularly coarse woody debris.

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

- Indicator 4.1.3: “Plans to locate and protect known sites associated with viable occurrences of critically imperiled and imperiled species and communities. Plans for protection may be developed independently or collaboratively and may include Program Participant management, cooperation with other stakeholders, or use of easements, conservation land sales, exchanges, or other conservation strategies.” Management goes further than this requirement, with assessments conducted to find new sites, and to locate and protect features which are locally rare (the requirement is to protect globally rare features).
- Indicator 12.2.3: “Recreation opportunities for the public, where consistent with forest management objectives.” These lands provide an exemplary array of recreation opportunities; forest management is implemented so as to enhance these.
- Performance Measure 12.3: “Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall participate in the development of public land planning and management processes.” and the two underlying indicators for public involvement. The county forests provide a model for citizen participation, with leadership from each county forest committee.

Further, the organization has improved its SFI program by revising most of the County Forest Management Plans (the remaining plan updates are in process), by increasing emphasis on forest certification in training and information activities, and by strengthening procedures for internal audits to ensure conformance with all standards including certification requirements.

The next surveillance audit is scheduled for spring or early summer of 2008.

For More Information Contact:

Jeffrey Barkley, County Forests Specialist
Wisconsin DNR – Forestry Division
101 S Webster Street - FR/4
Madison WI 53703
jeffrey.barkley@dnr.state.wi.us
608-264-9217

or

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

Appendix V



Audit Matrix

NSF-ISR auditors use this document to record their findings for each SFIS Performance Measure and Indicator. If a non-conformance is found the auditor shall fully document the reasons on the Corrective Action Request (CAR) form. The first portion of the matrix provides an overall record of audit findings over time. This ensures that all requirements are audited within the five-year life of the certificate. The "Audit Notes" portion provides the detailed findings.

Surveillance audits involve a partial review, so not all requirements are audited each visit.]

- NA in the Auditor column indicates that the associated Performance Measure or Indicator does not apply; otherwise the Auditor column is optional.
- Findings codes: C=Conformance; EXR=Exceeds the SFI requirement; Maj= Major Non-conformance; Min=Minor Non-conformance; OFI= Opportunity for Improvement (OFI may be combined with other findings)
- Findings are indicated by a date or date code: Audit Date: June 2007; Date Code: 7

Objective 1: To broaden the implementation of sustainable forestry by ensuring long-term harvest levels based on the use of the best scientific information available.

Performance Measure/ Indicator		<u>Audit- or</u>	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				<u>OFI</u>
			<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
1.1	<i>Program Participants shall ensure that long-term harvest levels are sustainable and consistent with appropriate growth and-yield models and written plans.</i>		7				
1.1.1	A long-term resource analysis to guide forest management planning at a level appropriate to the size and scale of the operation, including: a. a periodic or ongoing forest inventory; b. a land classification system; c. soils inventory and maps, where available; d. access to growth-and-yield modeling capabilities; e. up-to-date maps or a geographic information system (GIS); f. recommended sustainable harvest levels; and g. a review of nontimber issues (e.g., pilot projects and economic incentive programs to promote water protection, carbon storage, or biological diversity conservation).		7				
1.1.2	Documentation of annual harvest trends in relation to the sustainable forest management plan.		7				
1.1.3	A forest inventory system and a method to calculate growth.		7				
1.1.4	Periodic updates of inventory and recalculation of planned harvests.		7				
1.1.5	Documentation of forest practices (e.g., planting, fertilization, and thinning) consistent with assumptions in harvest plans.		7				

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

Performance Measure/ Indicator		<u>Audit</u> <u>-or-</u>	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				<u>O</u> <u>F</u> <u>I</u>
			<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
2.1	<i>Program Participants shall reforest after final harvest, unless delayed for site-specific environmental or forest health considerations, through artificial regeneration within two years or two planting seasons, or by planned natural regeneration methods within five years.</i>						
2.1.1	Designation of all management units for either natural or artificial regeneration.		7				
2.1.2	Clear Requirements to judge adequate regeneration and appropriate actions to correct under-stocked areas and achieve desired species composition and stocking rates for both artificial and natural regeneration						
2.1.3	Minimized plantings of exotic tree species and research documentation that exotic tree species, planted operationally, pose minimal risk.		7				
2.1.4	Protection of desirable or planned advanced natural regeneration during harvest.		7				
2.1.5	Artificial reforestation programs that consider potential ecological impacts of a different species or species mix from that which was harvested.						
2.2	<i>Program Participants shall minimize chemical use required to achieve management objectives while protecting employees, neighbors, the public and the forest environment.</i>						
2.2.1	Minimized chemical use required to achieve management objectives.		7				
2.2.2	Use of least toxic and narrowest spectrum pesticide narrowest spectrum and least toxic pesticides necessary to achieve management objective.		7				
2.2.3	Use of pesticides registered for the intended use and applied in accordance with the label requirements.						
2.2.4	Use of Integrated Pest Management where feasible.		7				
2.2.5	Supervision of forest chemical applications by state-trained or certified applicators.		7				

Performance Measure/ Indicator		<u>Audit</u> <u>-or-</u>	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				<u>OFI</u>
			<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
2.2.6	Use of best management practices appropriate to the situation; for example: adjoining landowners or nearby residents notified of applications and chemicals used; appropriate multi-lingual signs or oral warnings used; public road access controlled during and after applications; streamside and other needed buffer strips appropriately designated; positive shut-off and minimal drift spray valves used; drift minimized by aerially applying forest chemicals parallel to buffer zones; water quality monitored or other methods used to assure proper ...						
2.2.6	...equipment use and stream protection of streams, lakes and other waterbodies; chemicals stored at appropriate locations; state reports filed as required; or methods used to ensure protection of federally listed threatened & endangered species						
2.3	<i>Program Participants shall implement management practices to protect and maintain forest and soil productivity.</i>		7				
2.3.1	Use of soils maps where available.		7				
2.3.2	Process to identify soils vulnerable to compaction and use of appropriate methods to avoid excessive soil disturbance.		7				
2.3.3	Use of erosion control measures to minimize the loss of soil and site productivity.		7				7
2.3.4	Post-harvest conditions conducive to maintaining site productivity (e.g., limited rutting, retained down woody debris, minimized skid trails).		7				7
2.3.5	Retention of vigorous trees during partial harvesting, consistent with silvicultural norms for the area.		7				
2.3.6	Criteria that address harvesting and site preparation to protect soil productivity.		7				
2.3.7	Minimized road construction to meet management objectives efficiently.		7				
2.4	<i>Program Participants shall manage so as to protect forests from damaging agents such as environmentally or economically undesirable wildfire, pests and diseases to maintain and improve long-term forest health, productivity and economic viability.</i>		7				
2.4.1	Program to protect forests from damaging agents.		7				
2.4.2	Management to promote healthy and productive forest conditions to minimize susceptibility to damaging agents.		7				

Performance Measure/ Indicator		<u>Audit -or</u>	<i>--- Indicate Only One ---</i>				<u>OFI</u>
			<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
2.4.3	Participation in, and support of, fire and pest prevention and control programs.		7				
2.5	<i>Program Participants that utilize genetically improved planting stock including those derived through biotechnology shall use sound scientific methods and follow all applicable laws and other internationally applicable protocols.</i>		7				
2.5.1	Program for appropriate research, testing, evaluation and deployment of genetically improved planting stock including trees derived through biotechnology.		7				

Objective 3: To protect water quality in streams, lakes and other water bodies.

Performance Measure/ Indicator	<u>Audit</u> <u>-or-</u>	<i>--- Indicate Only One ---</i>				<u>OFI</u>
		<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
3.1 <i>Program Participants shall meet or exceed all applicable federal, provincial, state and local water quality laws and meet or exceed Best Management Practices developed under Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)-approved state water quality programs other applicable federal, provincial, state or local programs.</i>		7				
3.1.1 Program to implement state or provincial equivalent BMPs during all phases of management activities.		7				
3.1.2 Contract provisions that specify BMP compliance.		7				
3.1.3 Plans that address wet weather events (e.g., inventory systems, wet weather tracts, defining acceptable operational conditions, etc.).		7				
3.1.4 Monitoring of overall BMP implementation.		7				
3.2 <i>Program Participant shall have or develop, implement, and document, riparian protection measures based on soil type, terrain, vegetation and other applicable factors.</i>		7				
3.2.1 Program addressing management and protection of streams, lakes and other water bodies and riparian zones.		7				
3.2.2 Mapping of streams, lakes and other water bodies and riparian zones, and where appropriate, identification on the ground.		7				
3.2.3 Implementation of plans to manage or protect streams, lakes and other water bodies.		7				
3.2.4 Identification and protection of nonforested wetlands, including bogs, fens, vernal pools and marshes of significant size.		7				
3.2.5 Where regulations or BMPs do not currently exist to protect riparian areas, use of experts to identify appropriate protection measures.		N.A.				

Objective 4: Manage the quality and distribution of wildlife habitats and contribute to the conservation of biological diversity by developing and implementing stand- and landscape- level measures that promote habitat diversity and the conservation of forest plants and animals including aquatic fauna.

Performance Measure/ Indicator		<u>Audit</u> <u>-or-</u>	--- Indicate Only One ---				<u>O</u> <u>F</u> <u>I</u>
			<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
4.1	<i>Program participants shall have programs to promote biological diversity at stand- and landscape- scales.</i>		7				
4.1.1	Program to promote the conservation of native biological diversity, including species, wildlife habitats, and ecological or natural community types, at stand and landscape levels.		7				
4.1.2	Program to protect threatened and endangered species.		7				
4.1.3	Plans to locate and protect known sites associated with viable occurrences of critically imperiled and imperiled species and communities. Plans for protection may be developed independently or collaboratively and may include Program Participant management, cooperation with other stakeholders, or use of easements, conservation land sales, exchanges, or other conservation strategies			7			
4.1.4	Development and implementation of criteria, as guided by regionally appropriate science, for retention of stand-level wildlife habitat elements (e.g., snags, mast trees, down woody debris, den trees, nest trees).		7				7
4.1.5	Assessment, conducted individually or collaboratively, of forest cover types and habitats at the individual ownership level and, where credible data are available, across the landscape, and incorporation of findings into planning and management activities, where practical and when consistent with management objectives.		7				
4.1.6	Support of and participation in plans or programs for the conservation of old-growth forests in the region of ownership.		7				
4.1.7	Participation in programs and demonstration of activities as appropriate to limit the introduction, impact, and spread of invasive exotic plants and animals that directly threaten or are likely to threaten native plant and animal communities.		7				
4.1.8	Program to incorporate the role of prescribed or natural fire where appropriate.						
4.2	<i>Program Participants shall apply knowledge gained through research, science, technology, and field experience to manage wildlife habitat and contribute to the conservation of biological diversity.</i>						

Performance Measure/ Indicator	<u>Audit</u> <u>-or-</u>	--- Indicate Only One ---				<u>O</u> <u>F</u> <u>I</u>
		<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
4.2.1	Collection of information on critically imperiled and imperiled species and communities and other biodiversity-related data through forest inventory processes, mapping, or participation in external programs, such as NatureServe, state or provincial heritage programs, or other credible systems. Such participation may include providing nonproprietary scientific information, time, and assistance by staff, or in-kind or direct financial support.					
4.2.2	A methodology to incorporate research results and field applications of biodiversity and ecosystem research into forest management decisions.					

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

Performance Measure/ Indicator	<u>Audit</u> <u>-or-</u>	--- Indicate Only One ---				<u>O</u> <u>F</u> <u>I</u>
		<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
5.1	<i>Program Participants shall manage the impact of harvesting on visual quality.</i>					
5.1.1	Program to address visual quality management.	7				
5.1.2	Incorporation of aesthetic considerations in harvesting, road, landing design and management, and other management activities where visual impacts are a concern.	7				
5.2	<i>Program Participants shall manage the size, shape, and placement of clearcut harvests.</i>	7				
5.2.1	Average size of clearcut harvest areas does not exceed 120 acres, except when necessary to respond to forest health emergencies or other natural catastrophes.	7				
5.2.2	Documentation through internal records of clearcut size and the process for calculating average size.					
5.3	<i>Program Participants shall adopt a green-up requirement or alternative methods that provide for visual quality.</i>					
5.3.1	Program implementing the green-up requirement or alternative methods.					
5.3.2	Harvest area tracking system to demonstrate compliance with the green-up requirement or alternative methods.					
5.3.3	Trees in clearcut harvest areas are at least 3 years old or 5 feet high at the desired level of stocking before adjacent areas are clearcut, or as appropriate to address operational and economic considerations, alternative methods to reach the performance measure are utilized by the Program Participant.	7				

Objective 6: To manage Program Participant lands that are ecologically, geologically, historically, or culturally important in a manner that recognizes their special qualities.

Performance Measure/ Indicator		<u>Audit</u> <u>-or-</u>	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				<u>OFI</u>
			<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
6.1.	<i>Program Participants shall identify special sites and manage them in a manner appropriate for their unique features.</i>		7				
6.1.1	Use of existing natural heritage data and expert advice in identifying or selecting sites for protection because of their ecologically, geologically, historically, or culturally important qualities.		7				
6.1.2	Appropriate mapping, cataloging, and management of identified special sites.		7				

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

Performance Measure/ Indicator		<u>Audit</u> <u>-or-</u>	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				<u>OFI</u>
			<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
7.1	<i>Program Participants shall employ appropriate forest harvesting technology and “in-woods” manufacturing processes and practices to minimize waste and ensure efficient utilization of harvested trees, where consistent with other SFI Standard objectives.</i>		7				
7.1.1	Program or monitoring system to ensure efficient utilization, which may include provisions to ensure a. landings left clean with little waste; b. residues distributed to add organic and nutrient value to future forests; c. training or incentives to encourage loggers to enhance utilization; d. cooperation with mill managers for better utilization of species and low-grade material; e. merchandizing of harvested material to ensure use for its most beneficial purpose; f. development of markets for underutilized species and low-grade wood; g. periodic inspections and reports noting utilization and product separation; or h. exploration of alternative markets (e.g., energy markets).		7				

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

Objective 9: To improve forestry research, science, and technology, upon which sound forest management decisions are based.

Performance Measure/ Indicator		<u>Audit</u> <u>-or-</u>	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				<u>O</u> <u>F</u> <u>I</u>
			<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
9.1	<i>Program Participants shall individually, through cooperative efforts, or through associations provide in-kind support or funding, in addition to that generated through taxes, for forest research to improve the health, productivity, and management of forest resources.</i>		7				
9.1.1	Current financial or in-kind support of research to address questions of relevance in the region of operations. The research will include some or all of the following issues: a. forest health, productivity, and ecosystem functions; b. chemical efficiency, use rate, and integrated pest management; c. water quality; d. wildlife management at stand or landscape levels; e. conservation of biological diversity; and f. effectiveness of BMPs.		7				
9.2	<i>Program Participants shall individually, through cooperative efforts, or through associations develop or use state, provincial, or regional analyses in support of their sustainable forestry programs.</i>						
9.2.1	Participation, individually or through cooperative efforts or associations at the state, provincial, or regional level, in the development or use of a. regeneration assessments; b. growth-and-drain assessments; c. BMP implementation and compliance; and d. biodiversity conservation information for family forest owners.						

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

Performance Measure/ Indicator		<u>Audit</u> <u>-or-</u>	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				<u>OFI</u>
			<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
10.1	<i>Program Participants shall require appropriate training of personnel and contractors so that they are competent to fulfill their responsibilities under the SFI Standard.</i>		7				
10.1.1	Written statement of commitment to the SFI Standard communicated throughout the organization, particularly to mill and woodland managers, wood procurement staff, and field foresters.		7				
10.1.2	Assignment and understanding of roles and responsibilities for achieving SFI Standard objectives.		7				
10.1.3	Staff education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities.		7				
10.1.4	Contractor education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities.		7				
10.2	<i>Program Participants shall work closely with state logging or forestry associations, or appropriate agencies or others in the forestry community, to foster improvement in the professionalism of wood producers.</i>		7				
10.2.1	Participation in or support of SFI Implementation Committees to establish criteria and identify delivery mechanisms for wood producers' training courses that address <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. awareness of sustainable forestry principles and the SFI Program; b. BMPs, including streamside management and road construction, maintenance, & retirement; c. regeneration, forest resource conservation, and aesthetics; d. awareness of responsibilities under the U.S. Endangered Species Act, the Canadian Species at Risk Act, and other measures to protect wildlife habitat; e. logging safety; f. U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration regulations, wage and hour rules, and other employment laws; g. transportation issues; h. business management; and i. public policy and outreach. 		7				

Objective 11: Commitment to comply with applicable federal, provincial, state, or local laws and regulations.

Performance Measure/ Indicator		<u>Audit</u> <u>-or-</u>	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				<u>OFI</u>
			<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
11.1	<i>Program Participants shall take appropriate steps to comply with applicable federal, provincial, state, and local forestry and related environmental laws and regulations.</i>						
11.1.1	Access to relevant laws and regulations in appropriate locations.		7				
11.1.2	System to achieve compliance with applicable federal, provincial, state, or local laws and regulations.						
11.1.3	Demonstration of commitment to legal compliance through available regulatory action information.		7				
11.1.4	Adherence to all applicable federal, state, & provincial regulations and international protocols for research & deployment of trees derived from improved planting stock & biotechnology.		7				
11.2	<i>Program Participants shall take appropriate steps to comply with all applicable social laws at the federal, provincial, state, and local levels in the country in which the Program Participant operates.</i>						
11.2.1	Written policy demonstrating commitment to comply with social laws, such as those covering civil rights, equal employment opportunities, antidiscrimination and anti-harassment measures, workers' compensation, indigenous peoples' rights, workers' and communities' right to know, prevailing wages, workers' right to organize, and occupational health and safety.						

Objective 12: To broaden the practice of sustainable forestry by encouraging the public and forestry community to participate in the commitment to sustainable forestry and publicly report progress.

Performance Measure/ Indicator		<u>Audit</u> <u>-or-</u>	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				<u>O</u> <u>F</u> <u>I</u>
			<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
12.1	<i>Program Participants shall support and promote efforts by consulting foresters, state and federal agencies, state or local groups, professional societies, and the American Tree Farm System® and other landowner cooperative programs to apply principles of sustainable forest management.</i>						
12.1.1	Support for efforts of SFI Implementation Committees.		7				
12.1.2	Support for the development and distribution of educational materials, including information packets for use with forest landowners.						
12.1.3	Support for the development and distribution of regional or statewide information materials that provide landowners with practical approaches for addressing biological diversity issues, such as specific wildlife habitat, critically imperiled or imperiled species, and threatened and endangered species.						
12.1.4	Participation in efforts to support or promote conservation of working forests through voluntary market-based incentive programs (e.g., current-use taxation programs, Forest Legacy, or conservation easements).						
12.1.5	Program Participants are knowledgeable about credible regional conservation planning and priority-setting efforts that include a broad range of stakeholders. Consider the results of these efforts in planning where practical and consistent with management objectives.						
12.2	<i>Program Participants shall support and promote, at the state, provincial or other appropriate levels, mechanisms for public outreach, education, and involvement related to forest management.</i>		7				
12.2.1	Support for the SFI Implementation Committee program to address outreach, education, and technical assistance (e.g., toll-free numbers, public sector technical assistance programs).		7				
12.2.2	Periodic educational opportunities promoting sustainable forestry, such as a. field tours, seminars, or workshops; b. educational trips; c. self-guided forest management trails; or d. publication of articles, educational pamphlets, or newsletters; or e. support for state, provincial, and local forestry organizations and soil and water conservation districts.		7				
12.2.3	Recreation opportunities for the public, where consistent with forest management objectives.			7			

Performance Measure/ Indicator		Audit -or-	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				OFI
			C	EXR	Maj	Min	
12.3	<i>Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall participate in the development of public land planning and management processes.</i>			7			
12.3.1	Involvement in public land planning and management activities with appropriate governmental entities and the public.			7			
12.3.2	Appropriate contact with local stakeholders over forest management issues through state, provincial, federal, or independent collaboration.			7			
12.4	<i>Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall confer with affected indigenous peoples.</i>		7				
12.4.1	Program that includes communicating with affected indigenous peoples to enable Program Participants to a. understand and respect traditional forest related knowledge; b. identify and protect spiritually, historically, or culturally important sites; and c. address the sustainable use of nontimber forest products of value to indigenous peoples in areas where Program Participants have management responsibilities on public lands.		7				
12.5	<i>Program Participants shall establish, at the state, provincial, or other appropriate levels, procedures to address concerns raised by loggers, consulting foresters, employees, the public, or Program Participants regarding practices that appear inconsistent with the SFI Standard principles and objectives.</i>						
12.5.1	Support for SFI Implementation Committee efforts (toll-free numbers and other efforts) to address concerns about apparent nonconforming practices.		7				
12.5.2	Process to receive and respond to public inquiries.		7				
12.6	<i>Program Participants shall report annually to the SFI Program on their compliance with the SFI Standard.</i>		7				
12.6.1*	Prompt response to the SFI annual progress report. (*Note: This indicator will be reviewed in all audits.)		7				
12.6.2	Recordkeeping for all the categories of information needed for SFI annual progress reports.		7				
12.6.3	Maintenance of copies of past reports to document progress and improvements to demonstrate conformance to the SFI Standard		7				

Objective 13: To promote continual improvement in the practice of sustainable forestry and monitor, measure, and report performance in achieving the commitment to sustainable forestry.

Performance Measure/ Indicator		<u>Audit</u> <u>-or-</u>	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				<u>O</u> <u>F</u> <u>I</u>
			<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
13.1*	<i>Program Participants shall establish a management review system to examine findings and progress in implementing the SFI Standard, to make appropriate improvements in programs, and to inform their employees of changes. (*This Performance Measure will be reviewed in all audits.)</i>		7				
13.1.1	System to review commitments, programs, and procedures to evaluate effectiveness.		7				
13.1.2	System for collecting, reviewing, and reporting information to management regarding progress in achieving SFI Standard objectives and performance measures.		7				
13.1.3	Annual review of progress by management and determination of changes and improvements necessary to continually improve SFI conformance.		7				

Auditor Notes The full requirements are listed in the first section of the matrix above. The requirements are repeated here to facilitate the use of this form.

Requirement	Auditor	Notes
1.1	C	<i>“Program Participants shall ensure that long-term harvest levels are sustainable and consistent with appropriate growth and-yield models and written plans.”</i>
1.1.1	C	<p>“A long-term resource analysis to guide forest management planning at a level appropriate to the size and scale of the operation, including: a. a periodic or ongoing forest inventory; b. a land classification system; c. soils inventory and maps, where available; d. access to growth-and-yield modeling capabilities; e. up-to-date maps or a geographic information system (GIS); f. recommended sustainable harvest levels; and g. a review of nontimber issues (e.g., pilot projects and economic incentive programs to promote water protection, carbon storage, or biological diversity conservation).”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each county has a management plan for its county forest. During F.Y. 2006-07 expect completion of updated plans, with most fully approved and at least preliminary approval for all but 2 of the County Forest plans. • From Burnett County plan, page 100-17: The County Forest has been divided into several layers of management units to aid in the planning and focus for activities on the Forest. The largest unit is the landscape management unit, dividing the Forest into 27 separate geographic units. Landscape units are further divided into compartments. There are a total of 133 forest compartments, ranging in size from 285 acres to nearly 1600 acres. Each compartment is further subdivided into forest stands with similar vegetative characteristics.” • Soils, Rusk: A generalized soil map can be found in Chapter 900.1. Detailed soils information is not available in the form of a soil survey for the Rusk County Forest. • Polk Plan: “810.1.2 Forest Habitat Classification System: The Forest Habitat Classification System (A Guide to Forest Communities and Habitat Types of Northern Wisconsin Second Edition; Kotar, et al.) is a natural classification system for forest communities and the sites on which they develop. It utilizes systematic interpretation of natural vegetation with emphasis on understory species... Data will be collected in order to classify the entire forest. This information should be collected along with, and made part of, the compartment reconnaissance system during regular field inspections. This data should also be compared to soil survey information in order to associate the relationships between forest habitat types and soil types.”
1.1.2	C	<p>“Documentation of annual harvest trends in relation to the sustainable forest management plan.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Computer-generated reports are readily available from the WISFIRS Computer system. These show that the counties are making slow progress on their backlog of acres that are shown in RECON as being ready to be treated. • Excerpted from the Environmental Assessment (for each county plan): <i>“The County Forests could sustainably harvest approximately 61,000 acres annually. Recon inventory indicates a need to examine approximately 75,000 acres for harvest annually. This includes a backlog, most notably on northern hardwood, aspen and scrub oak types. Historically, upon examination, 14,000 of the acres prove to be not ready for harvest as yet. These forest stands may not have grown as quickly as anticipated or the original stand data may have been erroneous. Of the remaining 61,000 acres, a certain percentage are not harvested because they are in areas unsuitable / unfeasible for harvest (e.g. natural areas, river buffers, difficult logging chance) or foresters cannot ensure regeneration of the type (e.g. cedar). Approximately 12,000 acres on the County Forests are withheld from harvest for such reasons. These are local management decisions. Of the remaining 49,000 acres scheduled for harvest annually, the County Forests are cutting 43,400. The shortfall is due primarily to insufficient staff to set up and administer the timber sales. In comparing County Forest harvesting to forest inventory analysis (FIA) growth data, approximately 76% of net growth is being harvested.”</i> • Rusk County Management plan, contains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 906 Timber Sale History; ○ 906.1 Annual Gross Timber Sale Receipts *

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirmed that harvest levels are tracked annually and reported by species or species group for each forest and totaled across entire county forest system (25 of 29 counties are enrolled in the SFI certification). Untreated stands are moved into the treatment queue for a subsequent year, and observed stands remain within appropriate stocking levels or rotation lengths to sustain healthy, productive forests.
1.1.3	C	<p>“A forest inventory system and a method to calculate growth.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RECON collection system being significantly improved. WisFIRS project just started roll-out of Phase I, five additional phases are funded and to be implemented in next year or two. WISFIRS generates reports showing RECON progress for each county. Growth calculated from FIA data; area control method used.
1.1.4	C	<p>“Periodic updates of inventory and recalculation of planned harvests.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reviewed reports from new WISFIRS database showing RECON progress for each county. Significant progress has been made in the timeliness of recon updates. Statewide the goal is to eventually have the RECON on all stands whose management is dependent on stocking levels updated within 20 years. RECON updates on even-aged types such as aspen, scrub oak, jack pine, black spruce, balsam fir, tamarack, cedar and non-commercial types are less critical. These areas are to be updated when scheduled management dictates, unless they are recognized as unique areas of high conservation value. This implies 5% of the 849,000 acres of stocking-dependent types would require RECON each year (42,450 acres). This has been exceeded each of the past 5 years (an average of 59,600 annually). RECON for all cover types exceeded 58,000 acres in the first quarter of 2007 alone. From response to FSC Minor CAR 2006.1 “Expanding Chapter 3000 to include the monitoring elements listed in <i>County Forest Program Monitoring & Assessment Protocol</i> and how those provide feedback into management of County Forests”. Reviewed Chapter 3000 in County Forest Plans Response to past OFI for improving RECON currency was robust; issue was included in some internal audit reports; counties are putting additional resources into RECON; for example, from Washburn County 2007 Internal Audit report: <i>“Improve the frequency of forest RECON. Washburn County has 22% of its productive acres in RECON older than 20 years (DNR report dated 2-17-2006 by Pam Dembinski); In 2007 the County Forest plans to a hire Limited Term Employee (LTE) to revisit Swamp Hardwood stands and other wetland types to update and improve inventory information in preparation for the Emerald Ash Borer and to improve management of these types. Other stands, with entries older than 20 years, and adjacent to these wetland stands will be updated as the forester visits and records inventory data; The forest administrator plans to update other stands older than 20 years as the stands are scheduled for activity in WisFIRS and/or when a forester is collecting information in a neighboring stand in the Compartment.”</i>
1.1.5	C	<p>“Documentation of forest practices (e.g., planting, fertilization, and thinning) consistent with assumptions in harvest plans.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reviewed Rusk County 2006, and 2005 “Annual Accomplishment Reports”; Reviewed data similar to the county “Annual Accomplishment Reports” provided by Jeff Barkley confirming implementation of management practices is generally in line with goals Review of data in Environmental Assessment confirmed that plan assumptions that relate to allowable harvests are conservative, and that needed cultural practices are implemented. Confirmed that WISFIRS has this data and that all foresters have access; training is being conducted 2Q and 3Q 2007; forester at Polk County demonstrated his use of it
2.1		<p><i>“Program Participants shall reforest after final harvest, unless delayed for site-specific environmental or forest health considerations, through artificial regeneration within two years or two planting seasons, or by planned natural regeneration methods within five years.”</i></p>
2.1.1	C	<p>“Designation of all management units for either natural or artificial regeneration.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural regeneration is the preferred method; when site-specific factors dictate planting this is done.

2.1.3	C	<p>“Minimized plantings of exotic tree species and research documentation that exotic tree species, planted operationally, pose minimal risk.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No exotics are planted; confirmed by interview and field observations.
2.1.4	C	<p>“Protection of desirable or planned advanced natural regeneration during harvest.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirmed by field observations at sites visited.
2.2		<p><i>“Program Participants shall minimize chemical use required to achieve management objectives while protecting employees, neighbors, the public and the forest environment.”</i></p>
2.2.1	C	<p>“Minimized chemical use required to achieve management objectives.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 5 county forests included in the 2007 Surveillance Audit use chemicals sparingly.
2.2.2	C	<p>“Use of least toxic and narrowest spectrum pesticide narrowest spectrum and least toxic pesticides necessary to achieve management objective.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Glyphosate (roundup) for site preparation in Polk County
2.2.4	C	<p>“Use of Integrated Pest Management where feasible.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> IPM is the approach taken in this program, as documented in the plans: <i>“Integrated pest management for the purpose of this Plan, is defined as follows: The maintenance of destructive agents, including insects, at tolerable levels, by the planned use of a variety of preventive, suppressive, or regulatory tactics and strategies that are ecologically and economically efficient and socially acceptable.”</i>
2.2.5	C	<p>“Supervision of forest chemical applications by state-trained or certified applicators.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews with foresters indicated that certified applicators, generally contractors, are used.
2.3		<p><i>“Program Participants shall implement management practices to protect and maintain forest and soil productivity.”</i></p>
2.3.1	C	<p>“Use of soils maps where available.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Available soils maps are available in management plans.
2.3.2	C	<p>“Process to identify soils vulnerable to compaction and use of appropriate methods to avoid excessive soil disturbance.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Foresters plan all harvests and consider soils and site-topography during sale planning and layout. Confirmed extensive use of mitigation techniques on all active sales observed, including use of modern, low impact logging equipment, extensive harvest on snow-covered, frozen ground, careful planning of harvest units to avoid sensitive soils, and excellent logging technique including use of brush mats.
2.3.3	OFI	<p>“Use of erosion control measures to minimize the loss of soil and site productivity.”</p> <p><u>There is an opportunity to improve the use of erosion control measures to minimize the loss of soil and site productivity.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirmed by field observations at sites visited that a variety of measures are used, including careful planning and layout of harvest sites, seasonal restrictions, and post-harvest drainage structures. At some sites not all of the drainage measures that could be employed were effectively employed (water bars on skid trails, maintenance of drainage structures on seasonal access roads). Sawyer County Forest does not have any equipment; roads are rehabilitated only in conjunction with timber harvests, generally at 15-year intervals. Working on, but have not completed, their road access plan. Part of the solution will be a “spring closure” provision; spring 2007 had closure April 15-May 1, but this was controversial; trying to decide about having a flexible date or fixed date. Sawyer County Sheriff’s Department has law enforcement responsibilities through

		their recreation officer, which helps somewhat with protecting roads from illegal ATV use, which can be damaging.
2.3.4	OFI	<p>“Post-harvest conditions conducive to maintaining site productivity (e.g., limited rutting, retained down woody debris, minimized skid trails).”</p> <p><u>There is an opportunity to improve the guidelines for retention of coarse woody debris and for establishing limits to removal of wood fiber to maintain soil productivity, consistent with existing scientific knowledge.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Field observations confirmed limited rutting, minimized skid trails, limited soil disturbance at all sites, and significant down woody debris at many sites. Aspen and Jack Pine clearcuts have little retained woody debris. • Utilization is very good; in most cases only a small portion of the tops are retained, and the trend is for increasing levels of utilization (biomass removals). Guidelines for appropriate levels of removal/retention were not known.
2.3.5	C	<p>“Retention of vigorous trees during partial harvesting, consistent with silvicultural norms for the area.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Field observations confirmed the retention of vigorous trees in partial harvests; residual trees are generally healthy, well-formed, and have adequate growing space; marking is done with care to allow space for harvesting; felling damage, basal stem barking, and impacts to roots from logging equipment are minimal. • Observations in Northern hardwood stands showed that the full range of options to create canopy gaps and to release crop trees as per the application of state-of-the-art hardwood silviculture contained in the handbook are not always understood.
2.3.6	C	<p>“Criteria that address harvesting and site preparation to protect soil productivity.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DNR has developed definition of an “excessive rut” and associated BMP guidelines. Counties used that definition as a benchmark and applied similar criteria to their local county. Confirmed timber sale contract and most county forest plans contain rutting definitions and protocols to manage. • Sawyer County has not completed their rutting policy for insertion into their plan or contracts, but no significant rutting was observed. During contract administration Sawyer County field foresters use criteria similar to that developed by DNR and adopted by the other counties to address rutting issues.
2.3.7	C	<p>“Minimized road construction to meet management objectives efficiently.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Counties visited have minimal road systems; many roads in the county forests are not under county forest jurisdiction, but are maintained by township or county road departments. • Permanent, all-season county forest roads that were managed by county forestry programs met BMPs and are generally better designed and maintained than other public roads.
2.4	C	<p><i>“Program Participants shall manage so as to protect forests from damaging agents such as environmentally or economically undesirable wildfire, pests and diseases to maintain and improve long-term forest health, productivity and economic viability.”</i></p>
2.4.1	C	<p>“Program to protect forests from damaging agents.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From response to FSC Minor CAR 2004.8 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The County Forests continue to be very engaged in the Forest and Health status of Wisconsin’s forests through contact with DNR’s Forest Health staff. Contact includes on-site visits by Regional Forest Health staff, distribution of printed and electronic materials, and presentations by Forest Health staff at County Forest functions. ○ Training session on Emerald Ash Borer and other invasive species was an agenda item for March 30-31, 2006 WCFA Spring Administrator’s Meeting (Instructor Jane Cummings-Carlson, DNR Forest Health). ○ WCFA Executive Director is on Advisory committee for Forestry Invasives

		<p>BMP development. In addition, in the summer of 2006 a WCFA representative (Brian Loyd, Asst. Burnett County Administrator) was added to the Technical team that is actually drafting the Forestry invasive BMPs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmed that invasive species information can be collected and reported using the standard RECON collection (WisFIRS project just started roll-out of Phase I, five additional phases are funded and to be implemented in next year or two) • Two forest health protection specialist positions exist in the Northern Region (all county forests visited during the 2007 SA are in this region). One position is vacant but will soon be filled • Interviews confirmed that county foresters can and do obtain forest health protection advice from these specialists.
2.4.2	C	<p>“Management to promote healthy and productive forest conditions to minimize susceptibility to damaging agents.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmed by field observations at sites visited.
2.4.3	C	<p>“Participation in, and support of, fire and pest prevention and control programs.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rusk County Management plan, section 605 Fire Control: • ... The DNR is responsible for all matters relating to the prevention, detection and suppression of forest fires outside the limits of incorporated villages and cities. (s.26.11(1), Wis.Stats). The DNR works cooperatively with local fire departments in all fire control efforts. Rusk County Forest is part of the intensive Forest Fire protection area. The Fire Prevention Handbook No. 4310.5, Fire Pre-suppression Handbook No. 4320.5, the Fire Suppression Handbook No. 4342.05 and the Area Fire Plan shall serve as the guidelines for fire control activities.”
2.5	C	<p><i>“Program Participants that utilize genetically improved planting stock including those derived through biotechnology shall use sound scientific methods and follow all applicable laws and other internationally applicable protocols.”</i></p>
2.5.1	C	<p>“Program for appropriate research, testing, evaluation and deployment of genetically improved planting stock including trees derived through biotechnology.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no use of trees derived through biotechnology. • Some white pine seedlings bred for resistance to white pine blister rust are used. DNR employs a forest geneticist, who runs the improvement programs.
3.1	C	<p>“Program Participants shall meet or exceed all applicable federal, provincial, state and local water quality laws and meet or exceed Best Management Practices developed under Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)-approved state water quality programs other applicable federal, provincial, state or local programs.”</p>
3.1.1	C	<p>“Program to implement state or provincial equivalent BMPs during all phases of management activities.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Foresters and loggers are trained; foresters layout and inspect all jobs.
3.1.2	C	<p>“Contract provisions that specify BMP compliance.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmed BMPs are required by review of “Notice of Sealed Bids for Timber Stumpage – Burnett County Forest” and in contracts in all sales reviewed for which a sale has been made.
3.1.3	C	<p>“Plans that address wet weather events (e.g., inventory systems, wet weather tracts, defining acceptable operational conditions, etc).”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Burnett County is so sandy, except for the Roosevelt Unit (heavier soils, no spring logging allowed) that wet weather issues are not a problem. This county is known as the place to work during spring break-up; essentially a giant “wet weather tract”. See also rutting policy. • Sawyer County has six forest blocks; foresters know which blocks have fine soils and susceptibility to damage when wet; these areas are harvested when dry or frozen.

3.1.4	C	<p>“Monitoring of overall BMP implementation.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Burnett County Administrator uses a “Timber Sale Report Form” and keeps them all in a single notebook while sales are active; when closed goes with the 2460 Form as part of a close-out file. • Confirmed similar process in Rusk and Sawyer Counties.
3.2	C	<p><i>“Program Participant shall have or develop, implement, and document, riparian protection measures based on soil type, terrain, vegetation and other applicable factors.”</i></p>
3.2.1	C	<p>“Program addressing management and protection of streams, lakes and other water bodies and riparian zones.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each county visited demonstrated strong programs to address stream, lake, and riparian protections.
3.2.2	C	<p>“Mapping of streams, lakes and other water bodies and riparian zones, and where appropriate, identification on the ground.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These are mapped in timbersale documents and often marked on the ground.
3.2.3	C	<p>“Implementation of plans to manage or protect streams, lakes and other water bodies.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmed by field observations at sites visited.
3.2.4	C	<p>“Identification and protection of nonforested wetlands, including bogs, fens, vernal pools and marshes of significant size.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These features, when of significant size, are protected by avoiding them; they are mapped, flagged or painted off, excluded from sale boundaries, or otherwise not impacted by policy and practice. Small wetlands features are generally also avoided. • At one site a small vernal pool was generally protected by retaining all trees within and nearby; some logs were placed on the edge, but no damage was done (down woody debris is part of the ecology of these systems.) • Some loggers interviewed were not certain regarding the need to avoid impacts to vernal pools.
3.2.5	N.A.	<p>“Where regulations or BMPs do not currently exist to protect riparian areas, use of experts to identify appropriate protection measures.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BMPs do exist.
4.1	C	<p><i>“Program participants shall have programs to promote biological diversity at stand- and landscape- scales.”</i></p>
4.1.1	C	<p>“Program to promote the conservation of native biological diversity, including species, wildlife habitats, and ecological or natural community types, at stand and landscape levels.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecological landscapes and ecological context for each County Forest– Completed and available at http://dnr.wi.gov/org/land/er/wwap/explore/property.asp • Species lists have been developed from Wildlife Action Plan for each County Forests as referenced by their ecological land type composition – available at – http://dnr.wi.gov/org/land/er/wwap/plan • Inventory information is now searchable on the Aquatic & Terrestrial Resources Inventory website at: – http://wiatri.net • Rusk County Forest Comprehensive Land Use Plan contains descriptions of designated natural areas, including one of statewide significance and many local natural areas (page 500-33 to 38). Blue Hills Felsenmeer, 160 acres, is designated as a Wisconsin State Natural Area. • Local natural areas are listed below, preceded by the section number in the Rusk County Forest Comprehensive Land Use Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 530.2.1 Deer Creek 530.2.2 Spring Creek Felsenmeer 530.2.3 Lost Man’s Lake 530.2.4 Weirgor Headwaters Bog

		<p>530.2.5 Three Lakes Bog 530.2.6 Gundy’s Canyon/Rock Creek 530.2.7 Chippewa River Sedge Meadow</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 530.3 of the Rusk plan describes “Other Exceptional Resource Areas”: 530.3.1 Hemlock Stands 530.3.2 White Cedar Stands 530.3.3 Hemlock Springs Section 530.4 describes “Important Bird Areas”
4.1.2	C	<p>“Program to protect threatened and endangered species.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rusk County Management plan, section 900.5 has map showing General Endangered Resource Listing And Map For Rusk County, with general locations of Aquatic, Terrestrial occurrences, including animals, plants, and natural communities. County and DNR management staff have access to actual locations.
4.1.3	EXR	<p>“Plans to locate and protect known sites associated with viable occurrences of critically imperiled and imperiled species and communities. Plans for protection may be developed independently or collaboratively and may include Program Participant management, cooperation with other stakeholders, or use of easements, conservation land sales, exchanges, or other conservation strategies.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All approved plans have included and addressed HCVF’s in their plans. G1, G2, and many less imperiled sites were included in the process for review and protection of HCVF and other special ecological sites and described in each county’s County Forest Comprehensive Land Use Plan in Section 530 - Exceptional Resources, with management implications found in Chapter 850.3. County Plans for 2006-2015 are not all completed / approved as yet. However, all have had a preliminary DNR review and all but one passed County Board as of 5/07.
4.1.4	OFI	<p>“Development and implementation of criteria, as guided by regionally appropriate science, for retention of stand-level wildlife habitat elements (e.g., snags, mast trees, down woody debris, den trees, nest trees).”</p> <p><u>There is an opportunity to improve the retention guidelines for retention of coarse woody debris and for establishing limits to removal of wood fiber to maintain soil productivity, consistent with existing scientific knowledge. See also OFI for Indicator 2.3.4</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Burnett County stand-level retention is by site-specific design; where opportunities for good-sized (10” or larger) retention exist they are taken and results are very good; discussion of retention in stands with smaller trees, large woody debris raised concerns about the need for clear criteria. Silvicultural Guidelines contain criteria for stand-level habitat retention. These criteria are generally implemented in the field, although the amount and type of retention in clearcuts varies considerably. Retention of larger trees for future snags, dens, or down coarse woody debris is not understood or accepted by all foresters. Discussion was held on whether retention guidelines should necessarily be specific to a stand or rather, be looked at on a larger scale that would incorporate tree retention and coarse wood debris in riparian areas and areas not passively managed.
4.1.5		<p>“Assessment, conducted individually or collaboratively, of forest cover types and habitats at the individual ownership level and, where credible data are available, across the landscape, and incorporation of findings into planning and management activities, where practical and when consistent with management objectives.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6/07 – Distribution of RECON Status and Accomplishment reports to Counties. Draft - Opportunities for Ecological Reference Areas by Public Land Owner by Randy Hoffman is part of process to assess each County Forest and identify gaps of existing ecosystems that may be present on County Forests; Counties have individually addressed the recommended sites and evaluated the appropriate management on their particular forest. Identification and proposed management of these areas is encompassed in Chapter 500 and 800 of the County Plans.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note: Some of the counties (e.g. Taylor) have adjacent forests (e.g. Chequamegon-Nicolet N.F.) that satisfy all of the ecological needs within that particular ecological land type.
4.1.6	C	<p>“Support of and participation in plans or programs for the conservation of old-growth forests in the region of ownership.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> From Burnett County plan, page 200-9: “210.1 PUBLIC AGENCIES 1. The Forestry Committee cooperates with the National Park Service in the administration and management of the St. Croix River National Scenic Riverway as provided in Section 505.5 of chapter 500 and any other agreements between Burnett County and the National Park Service.
4.1.7	C	<p>“Participation in programs and demonstration of activities as appropriate to limit the introduction, impact, and spread of invasive exotic plants and animals that directly threaten or are likely to threaten native plant and animal communities.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> From Burnett County plan, page 100-16: “g. Invasive exotic species pose an ever-increasing threat to the County Forest. Gypsy moth, Asian long-horned beetle, buckthorn, honeysuckle and others have all gained a foothold in Wisconsin’s forests. Refer to Chapter 600 (610.3) for specifics on this subject.” Burnett County: focus on regeneration (want to keep the forest fully stocked), will consider activities where invasives prevent regen, but right now the deer and the drought are more important. Burnett: one project where they mowed an area leafy spurge was growing in fuel breaks, then DNR wildlife will spray RECON form allows identification and documentation of invasive species From response to FSC Minor CAR 2004.8 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Invasive Species of the Upper Midwest - E. Czarapata, has been purchased for all Counties as an excellent reference for identification and management. DNR efforts are progressing on invasive species management. The County Forests are participating in an advisory committee for one of the four tracks (Track 1 - Forestry BMP’s for Invasive Species) of DNR’s effort to develop BMP’s for Invasive Species in Wisconsin. Sawyer, Price, Taylor, and Rusk (SFI-only) are participating in the Upper Chippewa Invasives Species Cooperative. Land Conservation and UW-Extension have been coordinating some of these in cooperation with DNR.
4.1.8		<p>“Program to incorporate the role of prescribed or natural fire where appropriate.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Burnett County: although fire exclusion continues to influence forest composition trends, fire is used to maintain barrens and fire breaks.
5.1		<p><i>“Program Participants shall manage the impact of harvesting on visual quality.”</i></p>
5.1.1	C	<p>“Program to address visual quality management.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of professionally trained foresters, Silviculture and Aesthetics Handbook, harvest planning and layout, requirements for utilization and review by county foresters and DNR continue to comprise an effective visual quality management program.
5.1.2	C	<p>“Incorporation of aesthetic considerations in harvesting, road, landing design and management, and other management activities where visual impacts are a concern.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirmed by field observations at sites visited.
5.2	C	<p><i>“Program Participants shall manage the size, shape, and placement of clearcut harvests.”</i></p>
5.2.1	C	<p>“Average size of clearcut harvest areas does not exceed 120 acres, except when necessary to respond to forest health emergencies or other natural catastrophes.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirmed by field observations at sites visited. No clearcuts viewed at selected field sites or during extensive travels throughout six forests were larger than 40 acres.

5.3		<i>“Program Participants shall adopt a green-up requirement or alternative methods that provide for visual quality.”</i>
5.3.3	C	<p>“Trees in clearcut harvest areas are at least 3 years old or 5 feet high at the desired level of stocking before adjacent areas are clearcut, or as appropriate to address operational and economic considerations, alternative methods to reach the performance measure are utilized by the Program Participant.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirmed by field observations at sites visited.
6.1.	C	<i>“Program Participants shall identify special sites and manage them in a manner appropriate for their unique features.”</i>
6.1.1	C	<p>“Use of existing natural heritage data and expert advice in identifying or selecting sites for protection because of their ecologically, geologically, historically, or culturally important qualities.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirmed that the 15-Year County Forest Management Plans include sections describing identification and protection of special sites. Confirmed that a specialist with the Bureau of Endangered Resources worked with most of the counties to assess their ownerships and determine areas that should receive special management or protection (occasionally HCVF). All 6 counties visited have such areas.
6.1.2	C	<p>“Appropriate mapping, cataloging, and management of identified special sites.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rusk County Management plan, page 500-33 to 38, contains “Section 530 Exceptional Resources: The Rusk County Forest has areas of high natural value such as significant geological featured areas, wild rivers and lakes, natural areas, historical and archeological sites. Such areas may contain habitat for endangered, threatened, and species of greatest conservation need; eastern hemlock stands; natural origin pine stands; rare natural communities, such as boreal rich fen, forested seeps, alkaline bogs and swamps, large muskegs, and animal concentration spots. It is the policy of Rusk County to manage these types of resources and protect their individual exceptional features.” See also Indicator 4.1.3
7.1	C	<i>“Program Participants shall employ appropriate forest harvesting technology and “in-woods” manufacturing processes and practices to minimize waste and ensure efficient utilization of harvested trees, where consistent with other SFI Standard objectives.”</i>
7.1.1	C	<p>“Program or monitoring system to ensure efficient utilization, which may include...”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sale administration foresters monitor utilization regularly; inspections are often documented on forms and included in sale files. Landings are left clean with little waste; residues are generally distributed to add organic and nutrient value to future forests; lump-sum sales encourage loggers to enhance utilization; WDNR cooperation with development of new markets (bio fuel rods) for better utilization of species and low-grade material; loggers are carefully merchandizing harvested material to ensure appropriate use. Utilization is very good; in most cases only a small portion of the tops are retained, and the trend is for increasing levels of utilization (biomass removals). Guidelines for appropriate levels of removal/retention were not known. See also OFI for Indicator 2.3.4
9.1	C	<i>“Program Participants shall individually, through cooperative efforts, or through associations provide in-kind support or funding, in addition to that generated through taxes, for forest research to improve the health, productivity, & management of forest resources.”</i>
9.1.1	C	<p>“Current financial or in-kind support of research to address questions of relevance in the region of operations. The research will include ...”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> From Burnett County plan: “130.2.4 Education and Research Education and research continue to be critical components in making decisions that

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • affect our natural resources. As public needs and demands of our forest and its products increase, we must be prepared to assure that sound decisions result. To this end, Burnett County encourages and supports research efforts that relate to the forest, and educational opportunities that will promote a better understanding of forest communities and management.”
10.1	C	<p><i>“Program Participants shall require appropriate training of personnel and contractors so that they are competent to fulfill their responsibilities under the SFI Standard.”</i></p>
10.1.1	C	<p>“Written statement of commitment to the SFI Standard communicated throughout the organization, particularly to mill and woodland managers, wood procurement staff, and field foresters.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmed commitment to SFI is contained within each county’s forest management plan • Confirmed Burnett County plan, page 300-6 contains Burnett County’s Commitment to Sustainable Forestry, with specific mention of the commitment to SFI. All other plans reviewed had similar provisions.
10.1.2	C	<p>“Assignment and understanding of roles and responsibilities for achieving SFI Standard objectives.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wisconsin DNR County Forest Specialist and DNR Forest Certification Coordinator work closely with DNR Liaison Foresters and with County Forest Administrators to ensure that all parties understand their responsibilities regarding certification requirements. • Confirmed regular certification meetings, updates, and directives relating to certification-related changes. The annual partnership meeting with the counties includes certification issues. Certification requirements are steadily becoming integrated into standard operating procedures and are a normal part of each county forestry program.
10.1.3	C	<p>“Staff education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From Burnett County plan, page 200-16: “The County Forest administrator will keep concise and orderly records ... A job description, time and expense report, and training records will be kept on each employee. • From Burnett County plan, page 200-20: “225.5 TRAINING The Forester Administrator will be responsible for scheduling and providing appropriate training to keep staff current with safety requirements, BMP’s, silviculture, pesticides, new technologies, and other training appropriate to manage the Burnett County Forest. A training record will be retained for each employee identifying the course name, content and date of attendance.” • From response to FSC Minor CAR 2004.8 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ NHI training for County Forest staff conducted Feb. 13 & 14, 2006 ○ 3/07 Update and additional training on invasive species at WCFA Spring Administrator’s meeting by DNR Forest Health coordinator Jane Cummings-Carlson including discussion of firewood policies. In addition, update and additional training by Darrell Zastrow and Tom Boos on invasive plants and invasives BMPs at the same meeting. ○ Sawyer, Price, Taylor, and Rusk (SFI-only) are participating in the Upper Chippewa Invasives Species Cooperative. Land Conservation and UW-Extension have been coordinating some of these in cooperation with DNR. ○ • Four Invasive species ID training sessions scheduled for 9/18, 9/20, 9/25, and 9/27 -2007 for County Forest staff.
10.1.4	C	<p>“Contractor education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since early 2006 contractor training (SFI approved, either FISTA or equivalent), is in the plan, current contracts and prospectuses. Certificate is required upon signing the contract; occasionally have to wait until logging started.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirmed by review of documentation and by interviews of loggers at each county forest visited that the requirement to have FISTA-trained loggers present on all jobs is enforced; loggers interviewed indicated that training was generally useful, though some modules are repetitive.
10.2	C	<i>“Program Participants shall work closely with state logging or forestry associations, or appropriate agencies or others in the forestry community, to foster improvement in the professionalism of wood producers.”</i>
10.2.1 12.1.1, 12.2.1, and 12.5.1	C	<p>“Participation in or support of SFI Implementation Committees to establish criteria and identify delivery mechanisms for wood producers’ training courses...”</p> <p>Note: Indicators 10.2.1, 12.1.1, 12.2.1, and 12.5.1 all relate to SFI Implementation Committee activities. Description of evidence may be included here for all of these indicators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirmed by interview with Paul Pingrey that DNR provides representatives to SIC in addition to Executive Director for WCFA; discussed subject matter of recent meetings.
11.1		<i>“Program Participants shall take appropriate steps to comply with applicable federal, provincial, state, and local forestry and related environmental laws and regulations.”</i>
11.1.1	C	<p>“Access to relevant laws and regulations in appropriate locations.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Burnett County ordinance book in secretary’s office. 2460 Timbersale form requires process that hits all regulated activities. Rusk County Management plan, Section 905 has Laws And Ordinances, including Wisconsin County Forest Law ((s. 28.11, Wis. Stats) and Rusk County Ordinances relevant to management of the county forests (lands management and recreation).
11.1.3	C	<p>“Demonstration of commitment to legal compliance through available regulatory action information.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Burnett County: Complaint on a timbersale in Roosevelt tract went straight to Paul DeLong, turned out not to be a legal violation. No tickets in 10 years.
11.1.4	C	<p>“Adherence to all applicable federal, state, & provincial regulations and international protocols for research & deployment of trees derived from improved planting stock & biotechnology.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See above
12.1		<i>“Program Participants shall support and promote efforts by consulting foresters, state and federal agencies, state or local groups, professional societies, and the American Tree Farm System® and other landowner cooperative programs to apply principles of sustainable forest management.”</i>
12.1.1	C	<p>“Support for efforts of SFI Implementation Committees.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See above.
12.2	C	<i>“Program Participants shall support and promote, at the state, provincial or other appropriate levels, mechanisms for public outreach, education, and involvement related to forest management.”</i>
12.2.1	C	<p>“Support for the SFI Implementation Committee program to address outreach, education, and technical assistance (e.g., toll-free numbers, public sector technical assistance programs).”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See 10.2.1 above.
12.2.2	C	<p>“Periodic educational opportunities promoting sustainable forestry, such as ...”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Burnett County Management Plan states on page 100-16: “d. Conflict over timber management practices will likely continue to increase as more individuals and groups demand greater involvement in forestry decisions. Practices such as clear cutting and even-aged management will continue to be controversial. Efforts to educate the public

		<p>on the merits of these sound forest management techniques will continue.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
12.2.3	EXR	<p>“Recreation opportunities for the public, where consistent with forest management objectives.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Burnett County Management Plan states: “130.2 CULTURAL FACTORS • 130.2.1 Recreation: Forest-based recreation has expanded rapidly in recent years in Burnett County. Recreational opportunities with developed facilities include parks, campgrounds, boat landings, snowmobile, all-terrain vehicle, hunter/hiker and cross-country ski trails. The county forest also provides tremendous opportunities for informal recreational pursuits not requiring developments. These include hunting, fishing, berry and mushroom picking, bird watching, hiking, mountain biking, and sightseeing.” • Rusk County recreation facilities list (from plan): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Four campgrounds: Josie Creek Park, Audie Lake Park, Perch Lake Campground, Murphy Flowage Campground ○ Three Day-Use Areas and ○ Twenty-one boat landings.
12.3	EXR	<p><i>“Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall participate in the development of public land planning and management processes.”</i></p>
12.3.1	EXR	<p>“Involvement in public land planning and management activities with appropriate governmental entities and the public.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County and State land planning and management activities are closely coordinated through the use of the Liaison foresters and by incorporating state forest management, private forestry, and county forestry activities within the same administrative line-staff field organization. County forests are managed by elected county board members (through a forestry committee that is a sub-set of the full board). Confirmed through review of planning procedures and records of public meetings that extensive public opportunities for comment were employed during the recent effort to update all county plans. • County forests are run by the citizens; Public members can comment during any monthly county forestry committee meeting.
12.3.2	EXR	<p>“Appropriate contact with local stakeholders over forest management issues through state, provincial, federal, or independent collaboration.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From Burnett County plan, page 300-5: “The development and any future amendments to this plan will include considerations, and if warranted, participation in other planning efforts. It is expected that these other plans will also, in turn, consider and mesh their efforts with the County Forest plan. Coordination between Town and County Comprehensive plans (e.g. Smart Growth) s.66.1001, Wis. Stats, Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation plans (SCORP), State Land master plans, the Chequamegon-Nicolet N.F. plan, St. Croix Scenic Riverway Management plan, Land & Water Resource Plans, Forest Legacy, and others is essential for effective land management.”
12.4	C	<p><i>“Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall confer with affected indigenous peoples.”</i></p>
12.4.1	C	<p>“Program that includes communicating with affected indigenous peoples to enable Program Participants to a. understand and respect traditional forest related knowledge; b. identify and protect spiritually, historically, or culturally important sites; and c. address the sustainable use of nontimber forest products of value to indigenous peoples in areas where Program Participants have management responsibilities on public lands.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From Burnett County plan, page 200-17: “210.4 TRIBAL NATIONS The County will collaborate with Tribal representatives on projects that could potentially impact Native American archeological or cultural resources. Native American tribes are encouraged to contribute to the comprehensive Forest planning process. Gathering rights for Tribal members on County Forest land is provided and detailed in Chapter

		525 of this Plan.”
12.5		<i>“Program Participants shall establish, at the state, provincial, or other appropriate levels, procedures to address concerns raised by loggers, consulting foresters, employees, the public, or Program Participants regarding practices that appear inconsistent with the SFI Standard principles and objectives.”</i>
12.5.1	C	<p>“Support for SFI Implementation Committee efforts (toll-free numbers and other efforts) to address concerns about apparent nonconforming practices.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 800 NUMBER is not publicized. Wisconsin DNR and the Wisconsin County Forests Association do work with Wisconsin SIC.
12.6	C	<i>“Program Participants shall report annually to the SFI Program on their compliance with the SFI Standard.”</i>
12.6.1*	C	<p>“Prompt response to the SFI annual progress report.” (*Note: This indicator will be reviewed in all audits.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirmed with SFI, Inc.
12.6.2	C	<p>“Recordkeeping for all the categories of information needed for SFI annual progress reports.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> From Burnett County plan, page 200-16: “The County Forest administrator will keep concise and orderly records and accounts of all revenue received, expenditures incurred and accomplishments resulting from the operations of the forestry department. A job description, time and expense report, and training records will be kept on each employee. All salaries, authorized employee expenses, bills for supplies and equipment, bills for other expenditures, and all credits and income are submitted to the Committee on invoices.” Reviewed Rusk County 2006, and 2005 “Annual Accomplishment Reports”; also reviewed data similar to the county “Annual Accomplishment Reports” provided by Jeff Barkley confirming record-keeping for silvicultural practices
12.6.3	C	<p>“Maintenance of copies of past reports to document progress and improvements to demonstrate conformance to the SFI Standard.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Copies of past reports maintained by Paul Pingrey in Madison.
13.1*	C	<i>“Program Participants shall establish a management review system to examine findings and progress in implementing the SFI Standard, to make appropriate improvements in programs, and to inform their employees of changes.”</i>
13.1.1	C	<p>“System to review commitments, programs, and procedures to evaluate effectiveness.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The system includes the annual partnership meeting and the three-year program audits. The forest certification aspects of these have been developed and are being systematically implemented. Regular certification meetings, updates, and directives, as well as the close integration of certification into the revision of all participating counties’ 15-Year Forest Management Plans ensure that progress and reporting of progress have been effectively implemented.
13.1.2	C	<p>“System for collecting, reviewing, and reporting information to management regarding progress in achieving SFI Standard objectives and performance measures.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised methods for the three-year audits and partnership meetings have been finalized and funding and personnel are allocated for this requirement. Area staff specialists are involved in the three-year county forest audits, as well as financial specialists from Bureau of Finance. One-day on site with two-person audit team per county; 9 counties each year Confirmed Section 24605.230 was added to the Public Forest Lands Handbook that describes the audits. The certification portion is shown as one of five main purposes of the audits: “... Forest Certification compliance (for those counties participating in FSC or SFI group forest certification)”

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmed that the following internal audits covered certification issues, with a focus on CARs and OFIs (note that counties are audited on a three-year interval: Rusk County-2006, Washburn County-2007, Polk-2007 • From Polk County “Internal review of SFI Programs. This audit, scheduled for every third year, provides an opportunity for internal review. In addition the annual integrated meeting that is held each fall discusses certification standards on the Forest. SFI standards were discussed at the last integrated meeting, as documented in the December 7, 2006 meeting minutes. The forest administrator reports that he is well plugged in to SFI standards via communications with the DNR Public Lands Specialist. He offered no suggestions for improvements.”
13.1.3	C	<p>“Annual review of progress by management and determination of changes and improvements necessary to continually improve SFI conformance.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roll-up of above: WFCA Certification Committee, meets 4 or 5 times per year • Each year meet to discuss CARs and debrief regarding audit • County Forest Specialist and Certification Specialist meet to review internal and third-party audit findings.

Field Sites:**Burnett County Tuesday, June 12 SFI Only (Mike Ferrucci)**

1. Tract #9-06: Contract #2814 Completed CC patch releasing existing Red Pine
2. Same: Completed Red Pine 4th Thinning; skid road drainage issues
3. Same: Completed regeneration harvest (Aspen, birch, Jack Pine) with oak retained
4. Yellow River Firelane, County Forest Access Road recently graded
5. Tract #3-06: Contract #2824-06 Completed oak, JP, Aspen clearcut with Red and White Pine retention
6. Same: Logger Interview (forwarder operator James Pankratz, Jr.
7. Same: Just started marked oak thinning, also harvest JP, Aspen, Birch
8. Camp 26 Recreation Facility: including overnight cabin and day-use beach, lunch
9. Review protocols and documentation of K.B.B./Lupine survey and protection obligations under the Multi-landowner Habitat Conservation Plan for Karner Blue Butterfly
10. Tract #10-056, Contract #2794-05: (near #8) not yet harvest marked Red Pine
11. Same: pre-harvest scarification to promote Jack Pine regeneration
12. Same: Northern Pin Oak (scrub oak) area, unmarked "logger select" thinning to remove JP and Aspen, space oak 20 feet
13. Deer Lake Fuels Break: area 0.25 by 2.5 miles, burned every 4th year, maintained for many years, also early seral habitat and provides corridor for moving K.B.B.; some doubts about potential effectiveness as fire-break
14. Leafy spurge (invasive exotic plant) eradication site
15. Tract #23-05, Contract #2819-06: completed clearcut 10+ acres JP, Aspen, other; limited retention small RP
16. Same: completed harvest JP, larger oak cut in past; two-aged stand, lots of options to manage residual RP and oak.
17. Same: completed marked RP third thinning with oak retention
- 18.* Two oak wilt patches cc winter 2006-07
- 19.* Namakagon Barrens: owned by county, managed by DNR for Sharp-tail Grouse habitat
- 20.* Namakagon River Scenic Corridor and recreation site
21. Completed, logger-select unmarked oak spacing thinning to retain the best oak or oak clumps on 20-foot spacing and to release any pine 6 feet or taller; benefits include extending life of stand, getting fiber without clearcutting, diversity structure, perhaps get oak advance regeneration established or better established
22. Active harvest (unplanned) interview Scott Townsend, No Sweat Logging; nice pine thinning, excellent utilization.

Rusk County Wednesday, June 13 SFI Only (Mike Ferrucci)

1. Tract #14-06, Contract #2250: Clearcut 16 acres Aspen, birch, hardwood; some hardwood retention, completed by Chris Hershey (copy of FISTA certificate confirmed) using tracked processor, some hand-felling, double-bunk forwarder
2. Same: hardwood thinning in 70-year old stand even-aged; selection system, a few modest gaps opportunistic where several poor-quality stems were removed; looked at several completed acres, very good utilization, protection of residual stand; looked at marked area as well, discussion of why they don't seek to create gaps, because they think there is time in the future (just completing most first entries) and because they think natural disturbance events (wind events) will create enough gaps over time.
3. Tract #17-16, Contact #2255: Ongoing harvest in marked N. hardwood stand with oak component; started when dry, significant rains caused logger to stop work before forester had to; tracked processor and 4-axle Timberjack forwarder on tracks. Looked at marking in oak-dominated patch (crop-tree release) and general hardwood areas.
4. Tract #12-05, Contract 2227: Completed winter selection harvest; 80-year old N. hardwoods (Hard maple most common, then basswood, red maple, scattered ash and oak, some incidental gaps (clumps of poor-quality trees removed); confirmed Rusk County Timbersale Inspection Report used to record sale inspections (every 1-2 weeks) and covering full range of issues; sale inspection forester understands new rutting policy (addendum to 15-year plan); sale boundary at tag-alder wetland respected, no machine in wetland.
5. Same: Aspen clearcut, very complete, some small hardwood saplings, no large woody debris seen, no soil compaction, starting to sprout.
6. Excelsor Road, a Rusk County Forest Road, very well designed and maintained.
7. Tract # 24-04, Contract #2212: A steep (6% grade) temporary access road within sale had some surface erosion, drainage not adequate as road was not properly crowned. Some ATV use of old and current logging road observed; traveled through wet spot without damaging road. The access route for the harvest and some of the internal harvest trails traverse cross-county ski trails developed by and maintained in cooperation with the Rusk County Trails Association, called Blue Hills Trails. These are also designated walking hunter trails. Thus the sale has a "summer only harvest condition" if access is to be over the trails from the east, and this was done. Partially cut, but logger has moved off due to other obligations, shortwood system. Excellent utilization, and residual stem protection, marking clearly took worst trees, some snags cut and left on ground, shorter snags seen left standing, discussion of "snag recruitment" but foresters feel wind and pest damage will kill enough trees over time for snag. A small vernal pool generally protected by not marking within 35 feet, closed canopy remains, and by not skidding through (do skid through small forest wetlands and vernal pools when frozen) but a small pile of pulpwood bolts was processed into edge of pool and left, probably because the forwarder couldn't get to them without damaging the soils near the pond, good judgment. This pool has lots of down dead trees, these were not disturbed.

8. Tract #24-04, Contract 2278: Marked selection harvest just getting started. Will Hodowanic logger works alone, hand cut, single-bunk skidder. Marking and limited area seen already harvested look good. Noted several cavity trees marked for harvest, including one actively being used in a 14-inch sugar maple; there were cavities in other nearby trees. Discussion of policy for dens, which is to retain a broad average of 2 to 4 per acre in Northern hardwood sales after harvest; this appears to be met, but the best cavity I saw was marked for harvest. No policy known for number of snags, down coarse woody.
9. Murphy Flowage Picnic Area – exit briefing in nice, new log cabin picnic shelter; observed developmentally disabled work crew packing up after mowing and cleaning.

Washburn County Wednesday, June 13 FSC and SFI (Dave Wager)

1. Tract #34-04, Contract # 3829, 73-acre oak improvement cut. First thinning of this stand. Eventual goal is shelterwood regeneration. Thin from below and crop tree release on 2+ sides. Basal area reduced from 140 to 80 sq ft. Typed as AAt-higher oak quality. Managed ATV/snowmobile trail within unit.
 2. Same 17-acre clearcut of 75 year old aspen with oak retention. AAt habitat type. Even aged treatment with objective to maintain aspen type for timber and wildlife values.
 3. Tract 40-04, Contract # 3795, 80-acre oak improvement cut (active). Very hilly topography. Thin from below and crop tree release. Basal area reduced from ~120 to ~85 sq ft. Managed ATV/snowmobile trail within unit. Logging contractor interview- Jim Smith Lennix Lumber.
 4. Same, 23-acre aspen clearcut. Mature aspen stand good retention of pine, black ash pockets and larger oaks.
 5. 2-acre birch scarification—some birch regeneration as well as aspen (seed origin).
 6. Tract 2-05, Contract #3791, 34-acre aspen (70 years) clearcut. Completed fall/winter 2006-2007. Good retention of white pine, swamp ash/tamarack. Aesthetic buffer zone along County B. Shadow Lake buffered. Adherence to guidance of keeping equipment out of vernal pool/wetland. No residual vegetation around wetland/vernal pool. Steep skid trails brushed, no water bars (erosion minimal)
 7. Same, 2-acre oak improvement thin. Buffer on Shadow Lake
 8. Tract 4-05, Contract #3787. 70-acre jack pine budworm salvage and red pine thin
 9. Tract 17-04, Contract #3807, 22-acre aspen clearcut partially complete. Contractor had shut himself down before any significant rutting. Retention scattered oak and conifers. Dearth of coarse woody debris.
 10. Same, oak improvement thin marked but uncut.
 11. Tract #30-06, Contract #3811, 39-acre red pine stand 2nd thinning
 12. Adjacent to Tract #30-06 Minong CCC Camp HCVF Area
- Other stops: Saw 3 different understory burns following oak thin to set back succession of red maple and other hardwoods. All appeared fairly effective

Sawyer County Thursday, June 14 FSC and SFI

1. (Dave and Mike) Tract #28-06, Sale # 2499-06 Intermediate thinning, logging started, logger left, so temp. closure, oak mostly 5-11", some 11-15"; Rx BA from 120-78; reviewed Sawyer County Timber Sale Inspection Report" and "PreStartup Meeting with Contractor" form;
2. (Dave and Mike) Tract #13-05; Sale 2436-05: Completed salvage and intermediate thinning; not closed out; high area bordered by Birkebeiner Trail; adjacent oak borer salvage, and some salvage was done in this sale, but mostly typical selection harvest
3. (Mike Ferrucci) Camp Smith Lake "z" reserve stand steep slope above the lake, which is a Class A lake; z is essentially reserve, as it is removed from the stand selection process for protection purposes.
4. (Mike Ferrucci) Camp Smith Access site: confirmed road and sign; discussed maintenance activities
5. (Mike Ferrucci) Tract #25-06, Sale 2496: 84 acre active timber harvest 10% cut; N. hardwood single-tree selection and crop-tree release; has oak component; interview with Dane Amundson, hand fell and forwarded; good residual stand, healthy, vigorous, well-spaced; saw retained wildlife trees.
6. (Mike Ferrucci) Tract # 7-05, Sale 2430-05: Third thin in 60-year old red pine plantation, cut 1/3 of basal area from below; processor harvest; long term goal maintain as red pine plantation.
7. (Mike Ferrucci) Aspen clearcut with good green-tree retention (conifers) pictures by P.P.; discussed aspen management: designate all conifers (except 3-stick Balsam fir), black ash (often clumps or patches), all oak for retention;
8. (Mike Ferrucci) Various aspen harvests observed from vehicle on Tag Alder Road; good regeneration and varied retention.
9. (Dave and Mike) Tract #45-05, Sale 2463-05: 89 acre Northern hardwood stand cut 2006-07 winter, single-tree selection, crop-tree release harvest to transition stand to all-aged condition. Tried to retain and release as many oak as possible, standard designate all merchantable, Aspen, white birch, and red maple for harvest. Told us wildlife retention goal is for 3-5 wildlife trees per acre. Crop-tree release not very aggressive, standard to release on two sides, up to three.
10. (Dave and Mike) Totogatic River State Natural Area and nearby stands with hemlock reserved from treatment for now ("z" designation).
11. (Dave Wager) Tract #4-07, not yet sold: long, bumpy drive to an aspen harvest with designated aspen, birch, soft maple, and 3-stick fir designated for removal, pine only those marked (very selective improvement thin), many "kegs" and wetlands. Good buffer around kegs; good wildlife tree retention
12. (Dave Wager) Tract #29-05, Sale 2452-05: completed red pine thinning. 3rd entry; high basal area; dense hardwood understory

13. (Dave Wager) adjacent to Tract #29-05: jack pine release- harvest aspen, spray competing brush; excellent results for jack pine release

Polk County Friday, June 15 SFI (Mike Ferrucci)

1. Tract #5-05, Sale 396: 53 acre improvement thinning in northern hardwood/red oak stand 80% complete (stopped late winter); 2 similar stands, one more oak; objective is all aged, method is focused on stand improvement, if one large or several nearby trees harvested logger should cut all trees 2" or larger, described as "gaps of opportunity"; loggers J&M Logging, partners each fell their own trees by hand and use their own forwarder; good residual stand, lopping, and utilization; some modest gaps observed. New temporary road built to access landing; spring rains caused minor gullying
2. Tract #7-05, Sale 398: Salvage harvest completed, removed only damaged trees.
3. Tract #4-06, Sale 401: Marked, uncut selection harvest and improvement thinning in oak and northern hardwood stands; also aspen clearcuts (did not see); in oak stand marked to reduce BA from 120 to 85 square feet basal area per acre; discussed oak release methods, not trying to release on more than 2 sides.
4. Adjacent to Tract #10-04: Planting of hardwood and pine on 40-acre tract bought 2001; site preparation mowed 8-01, sprayed 9-01 glyphosate; herbicide use documented in files, use commercial applicator; planted spring 2002 using grant from "Hardwood Forestry Fund"
5. Tract #10-04, Sale 391: Aspen clearcut completed; good "green tree retention" of oak greater than 12-inch dbh; not whole-tree chipped, used Timbco fixed-head FB, skidder, slasher on yard, redistributed most slash throughout sale area, including some larger pieces, small pile left at rear of landing for use as shelter by small mammals, herps.; Polk County has only used whole-tree chipping one time, still evaluating due to concerns about long-term productivity.
6. Active harvest (unscheduled): typed as aspen and pine (red and white) but field review showed mixed hardwood, aspen, oak; prescription cut all aspen and birch, remove marked pine and hardwood; sold to Futurewood; loggers Stanford and Darwin, interviewed Stanford, who is FISTA trained
7. Drove over and viewed a well built and maintained county forest road.
8. Tract #4-05, Sale 395: completed selection and improvement thinning of typical northern hardwood and oak stand. Excellent quality residual stand, little harvesting damage, oak crop trees released 2 to 3 sides (picture).

Barron County Friday, June 15 FSC and SFI (Dave Wager)

1. Tract #4-06, Contract # 313, red pine thinning (1st entry), marked not cut. Volunteer Quality Deer Management Area
 2. Same, mature aspen/birch regeneration harvest, marked not cut
 3. Same, oak thin to set-up shelterwood, marked as true improvement cut, den and snag tree goals were 2-4 per acre.
 4. Same, 20-year big tooth aspen stand. No harvest planned as part of sale, but considered thinning possibility. Discussed longer Recon update period for aspen, lowland conifer, tag alder, and other less dynamic even-aged types.
 5. Red pine planting. 1st planting 1995-1996. Regeneration failed, so planted again in 2000 to fill gaps
 - Tract 2-2005, Sale 305, Oak improvement cut and removal of storm damaged trees. Occasional gap. Pipestone quarry- Native American cultural/archeological site- within sale. 300 ft buffer (8-acres) with no management around sites. Lots of wildlife trees marked, did not observe many without paint. Archeologist recently visited site to remove a squatters camp as there was uncertainty as to whether it was Tribal—tribes were first contacted before removal, but no response.
 6. Same, Selection cut view from road Silver Creek stream buffer, only light marking within buffer.
 7. Tract 2-06, Contract #311, Aspen clearcut for fiber and wildlife. Pine and oak retention. Several kegs and swamps within sale. Large amount of small diameter woody debris.
- Same, 1st stage shelterwood of 97+ year oak stand prescribed but delayed because poor acorn crop year.

Exit Briefing Summary:

Recommendation for Continuing Certification

The sole remaining Minor Non-conformance is closed: **SFI- MF-2006-1: SFI Indicator 10.1.4**

“Contractor education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities.” Corrective actions implemented; all contractors required to have FISTA training; confirmed in field.

Three Opportunities to Improve:

2.3.3 “Use of erosion control measures to minimize the loss of soil and site productivity.”

There is an opportunity to improve the use of erosion control measures to minimize the loss of soil and site productivity.

- Confirmed by field observations at sites visited that a variety of measures are used, including careful planning and layout of harvest sites, seasonal restrictions, and post-harvest drainage structures. At some sites not all of the drainage measures that could be employed were effectively employed (water bars on skid trails, maintenance of drainage structures on seasonal access roads).

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

There is an opportunity to improve the guidelines for retention of coarse woody debris and for establishing limits to removal of wood fiber to maintain soil productivity, consistent with existing scientific knowledge.

4.1.4 “Development and implementation of criteria, as guided by regionally appropriate science, for retention of stand-level wildlife habitat elements (e.g., snags, mast trees, down woody debris, den trees, nest trees).”

There is an opportunity to improve the retention guidelines for coarse woody debris and to review the currency of overall guidelines for stand-level retention, including green-tree retention. (See also OFI for Indicator 2.3.4)